

**UNIVERZA V LJUBLJANI**  
**FAKULTETA ZA DRUŽBENE VEDE**

**Iva Paska**

**Nove oblike razmerij in njihove posledice: prijateljstvo med  
mladimi v pozni moderni**

**New forms of relating and their implications: friendships among  
youth in late modernity**

**Ljubljana, 2014**

**UNIVERZA V LJUBLJANI**  
**FAKULTETA ZA DRUŽBENE VEDE**

**Iva Paska**

Mentorica: prof. dr. Tanja Rener

**Nove oblike razmerij in njihove posledice: prijateljstvo med  
mladimi v pozni moderni**

**New forms of relating and their implications: friendships among  
youth in late modernity**

**Ljubljana, 2014**

## THANK YOU NOTE

Writing of this dissertation was a challenging journey, the one which I would not be able to pursue if it were not for the support of colleagues, family and friends. Therefore I would like to thank them in this note. I would first like to thank dr. Tanja Renner, my adviser, for agreeing to be my adviser and for the feedback, the support and the patience with my trips to Ljubljana, sometimes even at times stretching beyond working hours. Furthermore, I would like to thank dr. Aleksandar Štulhofer and dr. Ivan Bernik for agreeing to serve on my dissertation committee and for useful remarks in the process of the finishing of the dissertation.

Special thanks goes to my fellow sociologist Natalija Lukić, for conversations which often proved invaluable for the dissertation writing process. Furthermore, I thank colleagues Vedrana Baričević and Maja Keržan, for sharing of this experience with me. I would also like to thank to all friends and acquaintances who helped me to gather participants through snowball sampling method. I would also like to thank Meta Gnidovec, senior administrative officer at FDV, for her availability and assistance through the formal process.

I would very much like to thank my family for their financial and emotional support during these four years, especially my parents and sister, and my aunts and uncles for all of the emotional and financial support in this journey, especially aunt Marija and uncle Ratko. I would like to dedicate this thesis to my two grandmothers, Bosiljka Paska, who always encouraged and supported me in my intellectual pursuits and Milica Lukić, who gave her unconditional emotional support in this process. Although it saddens me deeply to see that they both did not live to see the day of finishing the dissertation, I like to think that their encouragement became embedded within this work.

Last, but not least, I would like to thank my friends for the emotional support during this process, especially Sandra Novko, Mateja Katalinić, Sanja Glušić, Ana Kovačić, Marina Bunić, Nikolina Filipović and Ivana Sikavica. I would also like to thank Željka Pleše for her proof reading of the dissertation.

I would also like to thank funds through which this doctoral dissertation was co-funded, more specifically Inovative scheme of co-financing by University of Ljubljana, which is part funded by European Regional Development Fund, Cohesion Fund and European Social Fund.

## **IZJAVA O AVTORSTVU**

## Povzetek

Prijateljstvo jemljemo kot zelo intimen odnos in zato običajno ni bilo upoštevano od strani tradicionalnih socioloških teorij. Področje intimnosti je tisto, ki je spodbudilo razvoj novega interesa sodobnih socioloških debat, vendar ta se večinoma osredotočajo na romantična partnerstva ter jim manjka empirična verodostojnost. Razen že omenjenega, vsebina prijateljstva je redko obravnavana. Namen te disertacije je nasloviti tako formo kot vsebino sodobnega prijateljstva in v zastavljenem okvirju vstopiti v dinamičen pojav znotraj socialnega konteksta pozne moderne.

Posameznike v sodobni družbi znotraj te disertacije umeščamo v časovni okvir "pozne moderne" (Giddens 1990), kar označuje tip družbe, v kateri so posledice modernosti radikalizirane. Ta radikalizacija se kaže v nekaterih fenomenih, med katerimi je najbolj očitna radikalizacija v spremembi družbenih form, ki se razpadejo hitreje, kot pa v zgodnji modernosti, kar prinaša s seboj občutek negotovosti (Bauman 2009). Nadalje, se kaže tudi v spremembi časovno-prostorske izkušnje v kateri se čas dokončno loči od prostora. Prav tako se izraža v osebnotnih izkušnjah v katere čedalje bolj posredujejo globalna digitalizirana tehnološka okolja in visoka stopnja mobilnosti, kar rezultira z množico socialnih okolji, ki jim je posameznik vsakodnevno izpostavljen (Bauman 2009; Giddens 1991, Gergen 2000; Urry 2009). To je družbeni kontekst znotraj katerega so umeščena prijateljstva pozne moderne.

Izhod tega je hkrati mnogoterost družbenih identitet in povečana reflektivnost posameznikov v pozni modernosti, ki dajejo poudarek osebnem angažmaju pri ustvarjanju njihovega vsakdanjega življenja (Beck in Beck-Gernsheim 2002). To je očitno tudi na področju medosebnih odnosov v povečani "demokratizaciji odnosov", ki vodijo v "čisto razmerje" kot idealno vrsto razmerja v pozni modernosti; odnosi se ohranijo z lastnim trudom, namesto da so zasidrana v socialno strukturo (Giddens 1990, 1991). Eno izmed takih razmerij je tudi prijateljstvo.

Izhodišče raziskave je bil razvoj fenomenologije prijateljstva – z željo razumeti bistvo oziroma vsebino sodobnega prijateljstva, kar bi potem služilo za oporo nadaljnji analizi vrst prijateljstva in njihovega dinamičnega vidika v pozni moderni. Pri nadgradnji že omenjenega teoretskega okvirja smo se spraševali, če spreminjajoč družbeni kontekst pozne moderne lahko razumemo, kot preizkušnjo za dolgotrajnost prijateljskih vezi ali pa ima bolj subverziven značaj pri odpornosti na omenjene spremembe. Cilj je bil nadalje raziskati, če so prijateljstva zaradi množice družbenih okolij, ki jim je posameznik izpostavljen v pozni moderni, naraščajoče parcialna v svoji naravi. Prevladujoče mnenje je bilo, da taka oblika razmerja zaradi bolj socialnega značaja, ne izpolnjuje posameznikove potrebe po intimnosti, kot smo jo zgoraj definirali. Vprašanje, ki se potemtakem zastavi je ali so prijateljstva v pozni moderni občutno negotova in če se je resnična intimnost preselila v druge sfere, ki so družinske ali terapevtske narave. Nazadnje smo se spraševali, ali je predlagano preoblikovanje prijateljstva v pozni modernosti mogoče povezati z občutkom osamljenosti, ki je občutno navkljub zadovoljevanja družbenih odnosov.

Raziskava je bila izvedena na primeru petdesetih respondentov z metodo snežne kepe, z uporabo kvalitativnih raziskovalnih tehnik v obliki osebnih intervjujev v prvi fazi raziskave in ciljnih skupin v kasnejši fazi raziskave. Vzorčenje je bilo opravljeno namensko po demografskih kriterijih. Namreč, smo iskali respondente stare med 20 in 30 let, kar ustreza starosti nastajajoče odraslosti. Nastajajoča odraslost je najlažje prepoznana prizadevanju po

terciarnem izobraževanju. Tako se je zahtevalo, da so anketiranci bodisi trenutno opravljali terciarno izobraževanje bodisi so ga že končali. Vse to je bilo storjeno, da bi vzorec ustrežal kriteriju posmaterialistični naravnosti mladih, ki ustreza mladim v družbi pozne moderne. Iz tega razloga so bili izbrani respondenti, ki trenutno prebivajo v Zagrebu, ki je najbolj razvit del Hrvaške v katerem so bili naraščujoči odrasli sposobni doživeti socialne razmere pozne moderne. Da bi se prepričali, da so izbrani anketiranci res postmaterialistično naravnani smo pozneje vstavili dodatek vprašalniku. Znanstvena ustreznost raziskovalne teme temelji na svojem prispevku k razumevanju neformalnih osebnih odnosov v pozni moderni, ki presega področje romantičnega partnerstva in empiričnem preverjanju. Nadalje pomen, ki ga prijateljstvo ima za posameznike v pozni moderni in njegov potencial za družbeno vpetost so obravnavani skozi to disertacijo.

Znotraj te raziskave prijateljstvo je razumljeno v okvirju družbenih praks. Zato je bila začetna premisa raziskave, preveč enodimenzionalno zastavljena. Namreč prišla sem do ugotovitve, da ko gre za prijateljstvo, respondenti ločijo med dvema tipoma družbenih praks. Te so različno organizirane v smislu dinamike in značilnosti: prvi tip prijateljstva, relativno majhno v številkah in organizirano okrog intimnosti, ki ga imenujemo "pravo prijateljstvo" in drugi tip prijateljstva, ki je bilo med analizo, imenovano kot "socialno prijateljstvo", saj je večinoma usmerjeno k zadovoljenju družbenih potreb. To vrsto odnosa vidimo kot manjkajoči člen med razlikovanjem pravega prijateljstva in poznanstvo, kar se zazna kot socialno bolj odtujeno. Pravo prijateljstvo, kot smo ugotovili, je zapleteno družbeno razmerje, ki se razvija na podlagi osebne izbire. Čeprav temelji na osebni izbiri, je razmerje, ki se istočasno delno razvije skozi dolgotrajen družabe čas, ki sta ga dva posameznika preživela skupaj. Iz tega sledi, da čeprav se pravo prijateljstvo temelji na osebni izbiri pogosto izhaja iz institucionaliziranih okoljih, v katerih mladi v pozni moderni porabijo veliko količino družabnega časa, ki ga delijo z drugimi posamezniki. Družabni čas, ki si ga posamezniki namenijo, omogoča oblikovanje zaupanja in vednosti o drugemu, ki sčasoma pripelje intimnosti, ki je videna kot najbolj pomembno lastnost prijateljstva.

Nastajajoči odrasli na splošno ne izgubijo vere v trajnost pravega prijateljstva, tudi v kljub neugodnim strukturnim razmerij pozne modernosti. V teh razmerah so našli, da je vzdrževanje prijateljstva prek spleta še posebej koristno. Vendar pa v praksi strukturne omejitve včasih prevladajo nad posameznikovim osebnim angažmajem, ko gre za vzdrževanje pravega prijateljstva. Tukaj tiči potencialno področje negotovosti v območju pravih prijateljev. Vnovič ugotavljamo, da je izkušnja trajnosti prijateljstva v pozni moderni povezana s tipom prijateljstva. Medtem ko je večina pravo prijateljstvo doživela kot vez, ki je trajne narave, odporne proti strukturnim spremembam pozne moderne, socialna prijateljstva ni nujno obravnavati kot take. Poleg tega pri socialnem prijateljstvu je poudarek pogosto ravno bežnega značaja. V tem smislu socialne razmere pozne modernosti so bolj naklonjene oblikovanju socialnih prijateljev, medtem ko ob istem času so oni tisti, ki se lažje razpadejo zaradi svoje minljive narave. Po drugi strani se lahko družbene razmere pozne moderne spremenijo v pogoje potrebne za oblikovanje in ohranjanje pravih prijateljstva. Vendar pa še vedno osebni angažma pogosto velja kot ključen pogoj, ki odloča ali se bo prijateljstvo ohranilo ali razpadlo. To se obravnava v okviru individualizacije v pozni modernosti.

To omogoča nastanek drugih lastnosti pravega prijateljstva, ki so bili v času analize razdeljeni na normativne poteze, ali tiste, ki usmerjajo vedenje v prijateljstvu in glavnih potez, ki tvorijo vsebino prijateljstva. Deljenje družbenih povezav je prav tako pomembno tudi v resničnem prijateljstvu. Ker se pravo prijateljstvo, kot smo ugotovili skozi raziskavo, izkazalo za zapleten odnos, čigavi pogoji za nastanek zahtevajo velike naložbe lastnega časa in truda, in čigavo vzdrževanje zahteva iskanje ravnotežja med potencialno nasprotujočimi si načini

obnašanja, ni presenetljiva ugotovitev, da ga vidimo kot številčno omejeno. Druga vrsta prakse prijateljstva, imenovano socialno prijateljstvo razlikuje se v njegovi družbeni ureditvi od resničnega prijateljstva. Pri tovrstni praksi prijateljstva organizacijski poudarek v odnosu ni na vsebino odnosa, ampak na koristi, pridobljenih iz združevanja, kot je druženje po sebi znotraj določenih kontekstov. Iz tega razloga je bila ta vrsta prakse, imenovana socialno prijateljstvo.

Vnovič ugotavljamo, da je izkušnja trajnosti prijateljstva v pozni moderni povezana s tipom prijateljstva. Medtem ko je večina pravo prijateljstvo doživela kot vez, ki je trajne narave, odporne na strukturne spremembe pozne moderne, socialna prijateljstvo ni nujno obravnavati kot take. Poleg tega pri socialnem prijateljstvu je poudarek pogosto ravno bežnega značaja. V tem smislu socialne razmere pozne modernosti so bolj naklonjene oblikovanju socialnih prijateljstev, medtem ko ob istem času so oni tisti, ki se lažje razpadejo zaradi svoje minljive narave. Po drugi strani se lahko družbene razmere pozne moderne spremenijo v pogoje potrebne za oblikovanje in ohranjanje pravih prijateljstva. Vendar pa še vedno osebni angažma pogosto velja kot ključen pogoj, ki odloča ali se bo prijateljstvo ohranilo ali razpadlo. To se obravnava v okviru individualizacije v pozni modernosti. Nastajajoči odrasli na splošno ne izgubijo vero v trajnost pravega prijateljstva, tudi v kljub neugodnim strukturnim razmeram pozne modernosti. V teh razmerah so našli da je vzdrževanje prijateljstva prek spleta še posebej koristno. Vendar pa v praksi strukturne omejitve včasih prevladajo nad posameznikovim osebnim angažmajem, ko gre za vzdrževanje pravega prijateljstva. Tukaj tiči potencialno področje negotovosti v območju pravih prijateljstev.

Nadaljnje ugotovitve kažejo, da se parcialnost, kot način odnosnosti dejansko izoblikuje v pozni modernosti v obliki, značilni za večino respondentov, ki imajo prijateljske odnose, ki izpolnjujejo samo del njihovih potreb in interesov. Ne glede na to so respondenti večinoma poročali o svojem zadovoljstvu s takšnimi razmerji, pri čemer so jih uporabljali za kompenzacijo pri zadovoljevanju različnih potreb z različnimi prijateljskimi. Nadalje, respondenti se pritožujejo nad nekritično uporabo besede "prijatelj", ki jo pojasnjujejo z odstotnostjo natančnejšega označevanja praks družbenega prijateljstva ter s potrebo po zaščitniških praksah, ko gre za znanstva. Nadaljnja razlika v percepciji prijateljstva v manjšem in večjem socialnem okolju je zaznana pri respondentsih, ki so imeli izkušnjo obojega.

Predvidena premestitev intimnosti v družinske in terapevtske sfere zastavljena z dispozicijo, ni bila najdena v pričakovani obliki. Namesto tega pričakovane posebne vrste podpor, smo našli prepletene skozi različne vrste odnosov. Prišli smo do ugotovitev, da prijateljstvo zajema le omejen obseg podpore. Občutki osamljenosti, ki obstajajo kljub zadovoljivim prijateljskim odnosom, lahko povežemo z drugimi praznimi polji zunaj okvirja prijateljske podpore.

Povzetek rezultatov te raziskave, ki temelji na ustvarjanju prijateljstva med nastajajočimi odrasli v pozni moderni na Hrvaškem so, da le-ta niso poenoten pojav, vendar kompleksen, katerega značilnosti in funkciji sta odvisni od vrste njegove družbene prakse. Ugotavljamo tudi, da je prijateljstvo visoko specializiran družbeni pojav, ki so ga se naraščajoči odrasli, uspešno naučili obvladati reflektivno.

**Ključne besede:** *prijateljstvo, osebni odnosi, pozna moderna*

## Abstract

Friendship is a relationship seen as personal and thus not traditionally considered to be the focus of sociological theories. The field of intimacy has awoken new interest within recent sociological debates, but these mostly focus on romantic partnerships and lack empirical verification. Furthermore, the content of friendship is rarely addressed. The purpose of this dissertation is to address both form and the content of contemporary friendship and within that to assess its dynamic aspect within the social context of late modernity.

Individuals in contemporary society are within this dissertation understood as residing in time-period of “late modernity” (Giddens 1990), meaning the type of society in which the consequences of modernity are radicalized. This radicalization is evident in certain phenomena of which the most notable is radicalization of fluctuations of social forms which disintegrate at faster speed than in early modernity which brings with itself feelings of uncertainty (Bauman 2009). It is further evident in the change of experience of time-space in which time is finally divorced from space, in the personal experience being increasingly mediated through technological digitalized globalized environments and in the high rates of mobility, all of which results in the multiplicity of social settings to which individual is exposed on a daily basis (Bauman 2009; Giddens 1991; Gergen 2000; Urry 2009). This is the social context within which friendships of late modernity are placed. This is said to result both in multiplicity of social selves and increased reflexivity of individuals in late modernity that put an emphasis on agency in creation of their everyday lives (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002). This is said to be evident also in field of personal relations in increased “democratization of relationships” which lead to “pure relationship” as an ideal type of relationships in late modernity; relationships maintained on their own behalf instead of their being anchored in the social structure (Giddens 1990; 1991). One of such relationships is also friendship.

The starting point of the research was the buildup of the phenomenology of friendship, which would assess the content of friendship from the individual subjective perspective and would serve as a backdrop for the subsequent analysis of friendship in late modernity. Building on the previously mentioned theoretical framework it was further asked if increasingly changing social context of late modernity is experienced as tampering with the durability of bonds of friendship, or if friendship was subversive in the sense of its resistance to fluctuations of social forms of late modernity. The aim was further to explore if, due to the multiplicity of social settings to which individual is exposed in late modernity, friendships are experienced as increasingly partial in their nature. However, these kinds of relationships were assumed not to satisfy the need for real intimacy as defined above, due to their more social character. Following all of this, it was asked whether friendships are in late modernity increasingly felt as insecure and thus if real intimacy is relocated to other spheres, such as familial or therapeutic ones. Finally, it was asked whether this proposed remodulation of friendship in late modernity can be linked to the feelings of loneliness which are felt in spite of satisfying social relationships.

The research was conducted on fifty respondents chosen by snowball method, using qualitative research techniques in the form of personal interviews in the first stage of research and focus groups in the later stage of research. Sampling was done purposively due to demographic criteria. Namely, respondents of the age between 20 and 30 years were sought, corresponding to the age of emerging adulthood. Emerging adulthood was most easily



identified by the pursuing of tertiary education. Thus, it was demanded that respondents are either currently pursuing tertiary education or that they have already finished it. All of this was done in order to fit the sample into the criteria of the postmaterialistically oriented youth corresponding to the youth in societies of late modernity. For this reason also respondents currently residing in Zagreb were chosen, as it was taken to be the most developed part of Croatia, in which emerging adults have been able to experience social conditions of late modernity. Subsequently, the questionnaire add-on was added to ensure that the respondents chosen were indeed postmaterialistically oriented. Scientific relevance of the research topic is found in its contribution to understanding of informal personal relationships in late modernity beyond the realm of romantic partnerships and in the sense of empirical verification. Further, the perceived meaning which friendship has for the individuals in late modernity and thus its potentiality for social embedding are assessed within the dissertation.

Within this research, friendship is thought of in terms of social practices. In this sense, initial preposition of the research was found to be too unidimensional. Namely it was found that respondents differentiate between two types of social practices when it comes to friendship which are differently organized in the sense of dynamics and characteristics: first type of friendship, relatively small in numbers and organized around intimacy which they term “real friendship” and second type of practice of friendship, which was during the analysis termed “social friendship” since it is oriented mostly around satisfaction of social needs. This type of relationship is perceived as covering the missing link between the real friendship and relationship of acquaintanceship which is perceived as socially more distant.

Real friendship is found to be a complex social relationship which is considered significant for its foundation on personal choice. However, although based on personal choice, it is the relationship which at the same time mostly evolves from the prolonged social time which two individuals spent together. From this it follows that although real friendship is founded on personal choice it often stems from institutionalized environments within which young people in late modernity spend large quantities of shared social time with other individuals. Shared social time enables the formation of trust and knowledge of the other person which further leads to intimacy, seen as the most important content of friendship. This enables the formation of other characteristics of the real friendship, which were during the analysis divided into normative ones, or the ones which guide behaviour within friendship and the substantial ones, which form the content of the friendship. Shared social link is also found as important within real friendship. Since real friendship was within this research found to be a complex relationship whose conditions of formation require large investments of one’s time and effort and whose maintenance requires balancing between potentially contradictory ways of behaviour, it was not surprising that it was found to be mostly perceived as limited in numbers. Second type of practice of friendship termed social friendship differs in its social organization from real friendship. In this kind of practice of friendship the organizational emphasis in relationship is not on the content of the relationship, but on the benefit gained from the association, such as the socializing per se on in certain contexts. For this reason this type of practice was termed social friendship.

The experience of durability of friendship in late modernity is, again, found to be linked to the type of friendship. While real friendship is experienced by most as a tie of a durable nature able to resist structural fluctuations of late modernity, social friendship is not necessarily seen as such. Furthermore, in social friendship the emphasis is often precisely on its fleeting character. In this sense, social conditions of late modernity favor forming of social friendships, while at the same time they are the ones to also dissolve easier due to their fleeting nature. At the same time, social conditions of late modernity can potentially tamper

with the conditions necessary for the formation and maintenance of real friendship. However, personal agency is often considered the crucial intervening condition which decides whether the friendship will be maintained or dissolved. This is regarded within the context of the individualization in late modernity. Emerging adults generally do not lose faith in the durability of real friendships even in the face of unfavourable structural conditions of late modernity. In these conditions they find online maintenance of friendship particularly helpful. However, in practice structural constraints sometimes prevail over the individual agency when it comes to the maintenance of real friendship. This is the potential field of uncertainty within the area of real friendships.

Further, it was discovered that partiality as a way of relating is indeed practiced in late modernity in the sense of most respondents having friendship relationships covering only part of their needs or interests. However, respondents mostly report their satisfaction with this kind of relating, using in the manner of compensation; satisfying different kind of needs within different friendships. Further, respondents complain about the uncritical use of the word 'friend' but they attribute this to the lack of specific designation for the practice of social friendship they notice and to the need of the protective practice when it comes to acquaintanceship. Further, the difference between the perception of friendships in smaller and those in bigger social settings was found by the respondents who have the experience of both.

Relocation of intimacy to familial and therapeutic spheres was not found in the form proposed in the disposition. Instead expectations of particular kinds of supports were found to be allocated within particular kinds of relationships. Friendship was found to be covering only limited range of support. Feelings of loneliness existing in spite of satisfying friendships were instead linked to the empty spots outside of range of friendship support.

To summarize, in this research friendship among emerging adults in late modernity in Croatia was in general found to be a complex not unified phenomenon, whose characteristics and functions depend on its type of social practice. It was also found to be a highly specialized social phenomenon which emerging adults successfully master reflexively.

**Keywords:** *friendship, personal relationships, late modernity*

## Table of contents

1 INTRODUCTION	12
2 OVERVIEW OF THE THEORETICAL BACKGROUND	16
2.1 Friendship throughout history	16
2.2 Relating and friendship in late modernity	26
2.2.1 Late modernity in general	26
2.2.2 Self in late modernity	33
2.2.3 Relating in late modernity	36
2.2.4 Sociological theories on contemporary friendships	43
3 RESEARCH FRAMEWORK	49
3.1 Main thesis and research questions	49
3.2 Methodology	53
3.2.1 Interviews	53
3.2.2 Methodological issues during research	57
3.2.3 Focus groups	59
3.2.4 Analysis of the data	61
3.3 Study limitations	65
3.4 Scientific relevance of the proposed research topic	67
3.5 Context of the research: emerging adults in late modernity in Croatia	69
4 PRACTICES OF FRIENDSHIP IN LATE MODERNITY	87
4.1 Phenomenology of real friendship	92
4.1.1 Experience of the social formation of friendship	94
4.1.2 Characteristics of real friendship; maintenance of friendship	111
4.1.3 Summary: Real friendship as social relation	161
4.2 Social friendships	165
4.2.1 Features of social friendship as opposed to real friendship	167
4.2.2 Types of social friendships	174
5 REMODULATION OF FRIENDSHIP IN LATE MODERNITY	182
5.1 Durability of friendships	182
5.2 Partiality of late modern friendships	192
5.3 Linguistic 'emptying ' of the word 'friend'	199
5.4 Mediating friendships; friendship and technology in late modernity	204

5.4.1 Practicality of the online space of flows	206
5.4.2 The other side of the online space of flows	216
5.5 Dynamic aspect of friendships in late modernity	223
5.5.1 Dynamic aspect of social friendship in late modernity	223
5.5.1.1 Principle of momentary instrumentality organizing friendships	224
5.5.1.2 Lack of effort or time organizing friendships	230
5.5.1.3 Plurality of experiences organizing friendships	236
5.5.1.4 Social friendships as the area of increased disposability	242
5.5.2 Dynamic aspect of real friendships in late modernity	246
5.5.2.1 Scarcity of time as a threat to real friendship	246
5.5.2.2 Diversification of life-trajectories as threat to real friendship	257
5.6 Perceived difference between friendships in smaller and bigger social settings	262
6 FRIENDSHIP AND SUPPORT	272
6.1 Support in friendship and other contexts	272
6.2 Empty spots within friendship support	289
7 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	295
8 BIBLIOGRAPHY	305
INDEX	328
APPENDIX A: The questionnaire	335
APPENDIX B: Practices of friendship; partiality of late modern friendships; perceived difference between friendships in smaller and bigger social settings; friendship and support MAXQDA code system	339
APPENDIX C: Mediating friendships: friendships and technology MAXQDA code system	345
APPENDIX D: Dynamic aspect of friendships in late modernity, linguistic 'emptying' of the word 'friend' MAXQDA code system	347
APPENDIX E: Postmaterial orientation add-on code system	350
Nove oblike razmerij in njihove posledice: prijateljstvo med mladimi v pozni moderni (daljši povzetek v slovenskem jeziku)	352

# 1 INTRODUCTION

This dissertation is concerned with analysis of friendship in contemporary socio-historical context.

Friendship is a personal relation with a link to social not easily observed. This may be the reason why it has not been the main focus of sociological theories. Social sciences have instead focused either on individuals or groups, with the exception of relationship studies that put emphasis on social roles, such as the structural tradition of family sociology (Blumstein and Kollock 1988). However, in recent two decades, in the light of the modernity's impact on personal relations, field of intimacy has awoken new interest in sociology (Bauman 2003, 2006, 2009; Beck 1992; Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002; 2006; Budgeon 2006; Fischer 1982; Giddens 1990, 1991, 1992; Heaphy 2007; Illouz 2010; 2011; Jamieson 1998; 1999; Pahl 2000; Wellman 1979; 1998; 2001). Challenges that processes of postmodern social conditions present to individuals, more precisely effects of late globalization and “institutionalized” individualization in terms of further disintegration of previously existing social forms (Bauman 2009; Beck and Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002; Giddens 1990;1991;1992), are claimed to be reflected also in the domain of personal relationships. However, most of these studies have focused on types of romantic involvement, such as love partnerships or marriages. Friendship is often only mentioned together with other types of relationships, and thus its closer examination in the light of contemporary socio-historical conditions is usually very narrow. Furthermore, theoretical discourses on contemporary intimate relationships, even the most influential ones such as Giddens's theory on pure relationships, are rarely accompanied by empirical data. This has awoken my sociological interest in friendship. Seeing how contemporary sociological theories of intimacy give strong yet often contradictory statements about the state of personal relations in late modernity, I wanted to research them personally.

Personal relations are generally rarely dealt with within the field of sociology and are in the late modernity often thought to reside in the “private“ area, which is the part of the wider continuing and accepted distinction between the “private“ and the “public“ (O'Connor 1998). Due to this distinction, they are left to disciplines which are supposed to deal with the area of the “private“, such as psychology and psychotherapeutic discourses. When relationships are viewed from this perspective, certain disregard for the historical and cultural conditions of their formation and maintenance is present. This further means that there is often disregard for

the answer to the question why they are structured the way they are. As Adams noted, personal relationships do not happen in vacuum (Adams 1998). The perspective which views personal relationships as isolated from their context can be regarded as one of the consequences of the individualization in which, as Beck has famously put it, socially produced contradictories are often reduced to the individual level (Beck 1992). The same can be said about socially produced conditions. In this case, socially embedded relationships are viewed as socially disembedded and dependent only upon personal characteristics of the participants involved, which was something also often encountered in friendship discourses within this research. However, without addressing the social context within which contemporary friendships are formed, it is hard to completely grasp the challenges their form presents.

Often in everyday life, while I was talking to my friends and acquaintances, I noticed how the subject of friendship and the problems associated with it would very often come up as the topic of conversation, almost as frequent as love problems. Friendship relations were often the area with multiple processes of negotiations, implications of which often spilled over to other areas of my friends' life: to identity, discourses about other personal relationships or even decisions about one's life trajectory. Difficulties encountered in contemporary friendships among young adults appeared so often in those informal talks that it seemed indicative not only of the centrality of friendships in lives of contemporary young adults, but also of its social nature; if so many young adults used areas of friendship as an area of negotiation then the organization of contemporary friendship had a certain social pattern which could be researched. Furthermore, in my emerging adult age I have also encountered some of those experiences with friendships that also transferred to the way I thought about myself, relationships and the trajectory of my life. So, the decision to pursue this topic was also partly of subjective nature and I tried to be aware of the possible implications of this throughout the research.

Friendships are often depicted as central in lives of young people in popular cultural imaginary and this seems to be indicative of its importance in contemporary social world. This is in contradiction with concept of friendship as described by historians in previous historical periods. Even if friendship existed in some forms in historical periods before modernity, it seems that its centrality in everyday social life as we experience it today is a modern phenomenon. This centrality is most obvious if contemporary popular culture is observed. Friendship plays a particularly central role in contemporary TV-shows – the turn of

the century has witnessed the emergence of TV-shows centered around friendship such as Beverly Hills 90120, Roswell, Dawson's creek and Friends, the last one literally based on the idea of friendship as something which replaces family in lives of young adults in late modernity. This idea – of family being the potential new “family of choice” has also entered the sociological discourse (Roseneil and Budgeon 2004). Furthermore, new developments in communication through the internet such as is social network Facebook which today is globally widespread, has as its main idea precisely 'befriending' of people. All of this points to the widespread centrality of friendship in late modernity.

However, it seems that popular culture often offers more idealized versions of friendships. Namely, when meeting for coffees where talks of friendship occurred, there was often lot of negative discourse about contemporary friendships present. They were often accompanied by the claim that “friendship is not what is used to be“. From these conversations I would often get the sense that friendships today are the area of uncertainty; complaints about their non-binding nature or the lack of support within them were often present. Such statements also fostered my interest on the subject. What does this mean? If friendships were not 'what they used to be', what are they like today? Are they really increasingly ephemeral or do they endure? Can this be linked to the context of late modernity and how? How much support does one get from it and is this support sufficient? These are some of the questions I have tried to answer in my dissertation.

The initial proposal of the research included in it both young adults and adolescents (aged 15-24). However, as proposed by one of the members of the committee, the subject of the research was wide, and so the sample was subsequently narrowed down to emerging adults (aged 20-30). It was assumed that young people of this age are both young enough to have been socialized in conditions of late modernity and old enough to be able to describe this processes reflexively.

The dissertation begins with an overview of the friendship throughout history, with a particular emphasis on the contemporary historical period of late modernity within which friendships were researched. It continues with the examination of sociological theories regarding friendship. Further, it moves onto research questions generated from theory and some empirical indications, then the methodology used and scientific relevance of the proposed research topic, which constitute research framework.

It then moves to the findings of the research. These consist first of an overview of practices of friendship in the 21st century. This part explores types of friendship existing among postmaterialistically oriented young adults in late modernity in Croatia and can be regarded as static overview of friendship practices in this period in Croatia. The following part of the dissertation, remodulation of friendship in late modernity, is concerned with the overview of dynamic processes linked to late modernity which help constitute different kinds of friendships. How do different types of friendships come to forming in the social conditions of late modernity? How do they behave under different traits of late modernity such as increased mobility, technologization, pluralisation of life styles or exploration of life-trajectories? In which cases do they continue to be supportive and in which do they become increasingly frail? All these themes are researched in this part of dissertation. The last part of dissertation is concerned with the role of friendship as the supportive relationship in lives of young adults in late modernity. Dissertation finishes with presentation of the findings in the context of the proposed research questions and the discussion of its implications.



## 2 OVERVIEW OF THE THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

### 2.1 Friendship throughout history

Despite being viewed as strictly modern phenomenon, friendship as an affective relationship existed in various forms throughout human history. However, social forms in which friendship existed were thought of differently in different historical periods; they included public as well as private relationships, relationships based on social status as ones on personal choices, utilitarian and non-utilitarian ones based on loyalty. Thus, in order to better grasp the essence of contemporary friendship, first it is useful to understand essences of friendships in different historical times throughout history and also its change over the course of human history.

Friendship in a civic form similar to modern one already existed in the classical world of Ancient Greece. It existed as a private relationship based on personal choice, as opposed to ascribed relationships based on social status and family (Konstan 1997). However, Konstan notes that it differentiated from modern friendship in the sense that it was focused on the virtue of a friend and not on his unique characteristics and that the revelation of personal intimacies was not the prerequisite for a relationship (Konstan 1997). It was defined by mutual goodwill of friends and the readiness of a friend to help out in times of need (Konstan 1997). Thus, while public friendship established for political purposes and international alliances did exist in Ancient Greece, friendship as a voluntary private relation also existed (Konstan 1997).

One of the main sources on the nature of friendship in classical world is Aristotle's *Nicomachean ethics* in which he thoroughly analyzed it. He considered a friendship to be a necessity in life and valued it as "the highest form of justice" (Aristotle 1992, 1155a). He distinguished between three kinds of friendship: friendship based on utility, friendship based on pleasure and the one based on virtue (Aristotle 1992, 1156a). While friendships based on utility and pleasure were for Aristotle relationships where motivation to be in a relationship comes from the gain obtained from the relationship, friendship based on virtue was the only kind of friendship which was seen as existing solely for the sake of "the other person himself" (Aristotle 1992, 1156a –1157a). Consequently, the first two are easily dissolvable since the relationship is based on the gain from it and when the gain stops it ceases to exist, while the third kind is long lasting since it is intrinsically motivated (Aristotle 1992, 1156a). Thus,

although he acknowledged the existence of all three forms, he considered only the relationship based on virtue to be a real friendship. This kind of friendship is, however, possible only between men of virtue, because to wish other well without benefiting from it, argues Aristotle, one has to be a person of virtue himself (Aristotel 1992, 1157a). This kind of friendship includes the trust that friends would never do injustice to each other and it thus takes time to develop, since persons included have to be proved trustworthy (Aristotel 1992, 1157a). Although Aristotle's emphasis upon virtue as precondition for friendship is indeed different from the contemporary notion of friendship, in other matters it is in accordance with it, which will be shown later in research. He is also coming closer to the contemporary conception of friendship with the discussion on the problem of the dissolution of friendship, concluding that it remains unclear whether one should keep friendship when friends change, since they no longer approve of the same things (Aristotel 1992). Sandra Lynch claims that Aristotle emphasizes similarity as precondition for good friendship and that this view is also abstract from the perspective of modern friendships, since the experience of modern individual is much more fragmented and differentiated than the one of the ancient individual (Lynch 2005, 166). This will further be researched in the conceptualization of contemporary friendships. It can also be argued that Aristotle's conception of friendship was, unlike modern friendships, still tied to social class, since he argues that the precondition of friendship is the equality of persons and thus lack of equality poses a problem for friendship, which, however, can be replaced by more affection less equal friend gives to the other (Aristotel 1992).

In Hellenistic period friendship was also considered to be a private relationship based on loyalty and devotion (Konstan 1997). However, the term “friendship“ was also sometimes used in political sense; it meant close advisors of the king, but also in this case it withheld the connotation of devotion (Konstan 1997).

In Ancient Rome, friendship was also cherished as a private relationship, based on mutual affection of friends (Konstan 1997). However, friendship was also used for a wide range of other social practices such as the political instrumental use, patronage and/or in the sense of guest-friends who were invited to one's home (Konstan 1997). There was even the possibility of friendship between persons of different social positions, although historians vary in their analyses in terms of to what extent this was practiced, but it nevertheless served for fostering a sense of moral egalitarianism (Konstan 1997). The most valuable work on friendship from the Roman time is Cicero's *De Amicitia*. Cicero regards friendship in similar manner as Aristotle; he thinks that true friendship is rare, but also as necessary in life and defines it as a

relationship based on mutual good-will and affection, instead of being based on calculations (Cicero 2005). Thus, true friendship is possible only between men of virtue (Cicero 2005). Furthermore, a friend is, for Cicero, “another self”, meaning that one should also act towards a friend as he acts towards himself (Cicero 2005, 25; Lynch 2005). As we shall see later, Cicero also approximates contemporary discourse on friendship in analyzing how it takes time to establish friendship, since it takes time to test the trustworthiness of a friend (Cicero 2005). He also places value upon sincerity in friendship and argues against the flattery in it (Cicero 2005). For him the equality is also a necessary element in friendship (Cicero 2005). Cicero also distinguishes between types of friendship though not as concise as Aristotle does. However, he discusses other kinds of friendships, not just true friendships; political friendships and ordinary friendships which can be based on calculations (Cicero 2005). His vision resembles Aristotle's vision of friendship when he argues that friendships of utility are potentially short-lasting, since losing the benefits relationship gives also deems relationship unnecessary (Cicero 2005). Unlike true friendships, political and ordinary friendships are potentially not long-lasting, since for true friendships one should do everything in his power to keep them for life (Cicero 2005). However, he sees political ambitions and friendship as contradictory, since human nature finds it hard to resist the temptations of political functions (Cicero 2005). In all these accounts of friendship, Cicero very much comes closer to the contemporary notion of friendship, as will be shown later. However, Cicero diverges both from Aristotle and the modern notion of friendship in placing one's loyalty to the State in front of one's loyalty to one's friend (Cicero 2005).

From the period of Antiquity to the Renaissance period there is a lack of discourses on friendship as civic relationship, since such relationship which put human relationship into focus did not fit into the Christian doctrine of the divine order (Oschema 2005). Christianity deemphasized the value of friendship in emphasizing one's relation to God as the most important relationship in human life. Friendship in the early Middle Ages was influenced by Christianity, in the sense that it was conceived acceptable insofar as it was a spiritual union which also included God (James and Kent 2009; Oschema 2005). The notion of a friendship established within the Christian discourses was based on universal love or *agape* (Oschema 2005). Friendship also existed in the Middle Ages in the form of “brotherhoods”. These were friendships between males regulated by codes of honour which had more of a public character, based on ritualized common activities of symbolic value, such as shared meals or public displays of certain gestures such as kisses or hugs (Durrant 2005; Oschema 2005).

The discourse on friendship in more profane sense started to emerge in late medieval texts of the 12th century, but it did not fully come into being in this sense until the Renaissance period (James and Kent 2009; Oschema 2005). In early modern England, however, non-kin personal relations are recorded to exist, but they were regarded in terms of locality-bound neighbourhoods, guided by the Christian norm of love towards one's neighbours (Durrant 2005; Oschema 2005; Tadmor 2005). They were different from the modern friendship in the level of personal agency included in their formation, since they were in a way pre-given instead of chosen. This does not mean that the ties which could be interpreted as friendships in the modern sense did not occasionally exist (Durrant 2005). However, they were generally unrecognized as such and virtually non-existent in the public discourse.

It took the following three centuries to shape the concept of friendship more in line with its contemporary meaning.

Around the 16th century in Britain, the culture of “comradeship“ existed, organized around recreational drinking practices of men which ignored the usual hierarchical social rules of distance between men of different rank (Shephard 2005). In this aspect, these relationships were similar to modern friendship and were in this sense subversive for the historical period they existed in (Shephard 2005). However, relations formed in this way were not continuous in the sense of modern friendship, but had a more circumstantial and fleeting nature, based on a collective activity of group drinking and not around mutual intimate exploration as modern friendships (Shephard 2005). Female friendship was also present. However, female friendships were formed in less visible forms, mainly because of the general political invisibility of women and due to the fact that female friendships were seen as more dangerous and potentially subversive to social order in promoting female identity as oriented towards itself instead of towards what was at the time seen as the primary function of women – marriage (Gowing 2005). Women's friendships were mostly based on social status in cases of aristocracy and on neighbourhood-bonds in cases of lower social ranks, instead of on voluntary choice outside of the social stratum as contemporary friendships (Gowing 2005). In this sense, friendships in this period were embedded deeply within social structure. Moreover, friendship around 15th and 16th century in general often appeared in the form of an “alliance“ or “patron–benefited“ relationship which had political and public social connotations (James and Kent 2009; Pahl 2000).

However, in the Renaissance period, the ideas of civic friendships contained in the writings of Cicero and Aristotle started to emerge in translations of their writings and started to expand with the invention of the movable type and the spread of literacy, and vernacular literature (James and Kent 2009). These translations spread over Europe and started to influence the possibilities of different types of friendships (James and Kent 2009). From the 1300s to the 1600s there is an abundant pool of evidence in the forms of letters and personal diaries which enquired into and discussed the nature of friendship, as also depicted friendships in portraits – not only in the aristocratic circles but also in the ones of artisans or laymen (James and Kent 2009). The practices of friendship recorded to have existed in this period are various, ranging from patronages and alliances to the ones constituted of people from different social ranks, although also in the social stratum of that period the latter ones were still mostly thought as inconceivable (James and Kent 2009).

Michael de Montaigne emphasized the inclination of man to friendship due to his social nature in his account of friendship. He emphasized personal choice in friendship as a relationship chosen voluntarily (Montaigne 2006). He claimed that his account of friendship was more valuable than the ones described by classical authors such as Aristotle, since they described friendships which contain other characteristics than mutual affection, which Montaigne saw as less valuable ones (Montaigne 2006). Thus Montaigne differentiated between two types of friendships; ordinary ones and special ones, as was his friendship with Boeme de Etienne, which he described (Montaigne 2006). Ordinary friendships were for Montaigne less secure and they were not based on uniqueness of the person, while true friendship was based on the particularity of a friend (Montaigne 2006). He listed further important characteristics of true friendship: communication, equality, and alignment in behaviour and interests (Montaigne 2006). When all these demands were placed upon true friendship, Montaigne considered it to be a rare relationship (Montaigne 2006). As it will be shown later, these characteristics of friendship described by Montaigne are in accordance with contemporary notion of a true friend. However, Montaigne also emphasized the willingness to do anything for a friend, even if what he asked is in contradiction with social norms (Montaigne 2006). This is where he differentiates from more contemporary accounts of friendship. It can further be said that Montaigne viewed friendship as some kind of a subversive relation, with a place in individual hierarchy even higher than society. This can be regarded as the advent of individualism which started to emerge in the Renaissance period and in which individual and his relations are starting to prevail in value on behalf of the social

stratum. However, Montaigne further claimed that although one is ready to do everything for a real friend, real friends would never ask one another to do immoral things. Thus he, too, linked friendship with morality, as did Aristotle and similarly to him, he indirectly seemed to be implying that virtue was also a characteristic of a true friendship. He proclaimed friend to be a half of one's soul and claimed true friends share detailed knowledge of each other and everything else (Montaigne 2006). There is no fear of breaking such a friendship since duration is also a necessary ingredient for a real friendship – Montaigne dismissed all shorter relationships as acquaintanceship (Montaigne 2006).

In her commentary on Montaigne, Sandra Lynch states that Montaigne idealized friendship and that this conception misrecognized the separateness of friends (Lynch 2005, 34). While this is indeed true when compared to contemporary notion of friendship, it can be noted that perhaps precisely this difference in perspectives can be recognized as the remnant of the traditional collective discourse which still echoes through Montaigne's writings, and contemporary perspective of Sandra Lynch in which individual autonomy is highly valued. Nevertheless, individualistic tendencies which started to emerge can be recognized in Montaigne's writings. His ideas also spread throughout Europe during the Renaissance period, influencing the newly emerging discourse on friendship (James and Kent 2005). As it was shown before, such a way of thinking was unlikely in more traditional perspectives on relations.

As Ferdinand Tönnies showed, for such a way of thinking to emerge different type of community needed to come into existence; the social organization which was characterized by stronger differentiation of labour, which recognized individual will and which was able to put it in front of the society (Tönnies 1955). Furthermore, in pre-modern setting, potential friends were more a kind of allies based on necessity instead of affinities and were in direct opposition to strangers, who were always on the verge of becoming potential enemies (Silver 1990; Giddens 1990). Trust in pre-modern communities was anchored in localized networks, which mainly were not intimate in the sense of self-disclosure, but relied on each other based on kinship and codes of honour (Giddens 1990). Intimacy in the modern sense of self-disclosure is a modern phenomenon, while intimacy in pre-modern times was mostly based on familiarity and mutual interdependence (Giddens 1990; Jamieson 1998; Olicker 1998). In terms of integration of the individual into the society, Pescosolido and Rubin argue that that historical period was typically characterized by networks with high level of integration, which formed in concentric circles, meaning that the smaller circle was also part of the bigger circle

and the tolerance for difference was minimal, resulting in the higher levels of social regulation (Pescosolido and Rubin 2000). In opposition to this, modern type of intimacy puts the individual into focus and thus it was highly unlikely to happen within pre-modern cultures with emphasized collective element in which such focus would potentially have subversive effect on traditional authority and community (Oliker 1998; Tönnies 1955).

In the 17th and the 18th century changes in social organization of European societies started to occur on the wider level. Newly risen monarchies started to found scientific universities and to encourage fine arts, which lead to questioning the assumptions underlying ideas about the society, particularly the Christian ones (Garrioch 2009). Literacy rose and with it new ideas of friendship were disseminated even more throughout Europe, particularly translations of Cicero's *De amicitia* (Garrioch 2009). While in 17th century economic survival was still the primary theme underlying everyday life due to insecure production conditions still very much under the influence of weather and environment conditions, in the 18th century, urban centres grew rapidly with the emergence of middle class and the consumer industry centered around them (Garrioch 2009). During the 18th and the 19th century there were massive economic, social and familial transitions which created conditions necessary for relationships of choice to emerge possible, by spreading the cultural ethos of the individual (Oliker 1998). Thus in the 18th century there was a growing sentimentality of friendship through literary depictions of intimate disclosure among friends (Garrioch 2009). Friendship was increasingly viewed in a secular manner, since there was a growing dissatisfaction with religious representations of a relationship (Garrioch 2009). Ideas about friendship evolved in this way. However, there were still limitations due to which friendship was different than the contemporary one. For one, friendship among people of different social rank and different sexes was still deemed impossible (Garrioch 2009). However, discussions about those questions evolved and friendship was increasingly used for a variety of purposes in the sense of negotiating the individual's position in the society; it was often used within the context of possible social acceptance for people on the margins of society or of lower social rank and within the context of discussing women's demands for equality with men (Garrioch 2009).

This period is in sociology recognized as the start of the modernity which is a historical phase associated with philosophical and political consequences of multiple revolutions in the 18th century, the most important one being the Enlightenment phase and followed by scientific, consumer and industrial revolution (Misa 2003). It meant great social transition on all scales – increased urbanization and industrialization, secularization, rise of the nation-states and their

military forces, development of bureaucracies, judicial and educational systems, commercial markets and the rise of occupational specialization (Cohen 2006; Inglehart 1997). On the level of principles guiding social life, there was a shift towards rationality, progress and belief in human capacity for self-determination and autonomy as new principles guiding social life, instead of the old ones based on the divine order and intervention, both on personal level and on the level of the community.

What did these social transitions mean for personal relations, in particularly friendship?

Social conditions which made the thriving of the relationships of choice possible emerged (Tönnies 1955). While caution was the main ingredient of personal relationships outside of immediate local surroundings such as family in pre-modern times, the evolution of commercial market freed personal relationships of associations based on necessity and fostered the emergence of personal relations based on trust (Silver 1990). With emergence of cultural markets, there was no longer a need for patronage among the artists and people of lower rank which also lessened the need for relationships based on necessity (Garrioch 2009).

Silver argued that friendships as relationships built entirely on voluntaristic principle and not being defined in terms of social statuses are exclusively a modern phenomenon: "Friendship is an ideal arena for the highly individualized conception of personal agency that is central to modern notions of personal freedom." (Norton 1976; Silver 1989; Turner 1976) "Normatively, friendship is grounded in the unique and irreplaceable qualities of partners, defined and valued independently of their place in public systems of kinship, power, utility and esteem, and of any publicly defined status." (Silver 1990, 1476) With the appearance of commercial markets personal interests shifted to this social area, and thus daily lives and personal relations were freed from interest, while attitude towards strangers became one of indifference instead of enmity, which is precisely what made potential cooperation with others possible, argued Silver (Silver 1990). He built on Smith, who further argued that new form of friendship was based on sympathy, which is the new basis of social order replacing traditional social structures (Smith in Silver 1990). Social transition which enabled the emergence of friendship in the modern sense is located within 18th century (Oliker 1998; Silver 1990). In the 18th century increasing urbanization and industrialization lead to the emergence of strong urban centres in which new forms of associations, such as friendly societies, working class unions, discussion groups, coffee bars, fostered different kind of political and social beliefs and accordingly, different thinking about sociability (Brodie and Caine 2009). Those



societies, however, operated first and foremost as brotherhoods or comradeship and offered support either in this sense or on the instrumental level, and thus were more like unions than intimate friendships (Brodie and Caine 2009). Intimate friendship started to emerge first among the middle class citizens, while the working class still functioned within the discourse of the neighbourhood instead of the one of friendship which, although serving as a web of support in times of trouble, operated on principles of proximity and familiarity and not on intimate self-disclosure (Brodie and Caine 2009). Furthermore, intimate self-disclosure was avoided since it was not considered appropriate to meddle in neighbourhood's privacy (Brodie and Caine 2009). In the 18th and 19th century most discussions of friendship were indeed focused on the middle and upper middle-classes (Brodie and Caine 2009). In the cross-class cases friendship was still used as a form of protection of the person of the lower rank, while among the upper social classes friendship was used in instrumental sense of the affirmation of one's status (Brodie and Caine 2009). However, in the Victorian period, due to separation of sexes and distance of men from the domestic spheres, women friendships blossomed, since women friends were able to offer each other greater support than men (Brodie and Caine 2009). Male friendships also emerged in this period, since young men who dealt with the separation from family found the need of close friendship with another male friend (Brodie and Caine 2009). Furthermore, throughout the nineteenth century the discussion of friendship was fostered by new political ideals which used the discourse on friendship to foster ideas of democracy and general relations among people in society (Brodie and Caine 2009). Also, depiction of friendships of the intimate kind became a prominent theme in literature, especially in Britain and the USA, with the growing importance of sentiment and emotions in friendship and even of romanticizing and sometimes eroticizing of friendship relations (Brodie and Caine 2009). In this context, on the turn of the centuries a group with particularly revolutionary discourse on friendship arose. That was the Bloomsbury group, consisting of intellectuals who discussed and wrote about friendship in terms of mutual emotional and psychological exploration within it (Brodie and Caine 2009). They also designated their approach to relationships as modern in order to differentiate themselves from their Victorian contemporaries (Brodie and Caine 2009). However, by the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century, the working-class had also started to get familiar with the ideas of friendship. Various journals and also the growing socialist movement, had spread the ideas of relationships based on equality through all parts of society (Brodie and Caine 2009).

From the systemic perspective, argues Luhmann, for the formation of intimate relationships it was first necessary for the society as a system to become complex enough to more effectively regulate interdependencies between different forms of social life – impersonal and personal– and to be able to filter potential disturbances (Luhmann 1986). Speaking from the systemic level, Giddens also argues that relationships based on personal choice gained momentum with the emergence of modernity and that they can be located within the context of a wider change of the nature of trust at the transition of modernity (Giddens 1990). In modernity the separation of time and space lifted social relations out of local context and restructured them across indefinite spans of time–space (Giddens 1990, 21). Thus, trust can no longer be anchored in localized kinship networks, but shifts instead towards abstract systems and symbolic tokens, which have the ability to provide insurance of fulfilling the expectations and obligations across time–space (Giddens 1990). Commercial markets for which Enlightenment thinkers claim to have liberated the area of personal relations from interest (Silver 1990), might be regarded as one of such abstract systems.

In the first half of the 20th century, intimate friendships started to become the source of new sociability based on choice, especially in growing urban settings in which they were often used for protection against loneliness (Peel 2009). Also, as a relationship based on personal choice, it represented a new possibility of freedom for individuals to pursue their own choices (Peel 2009). There was a growing importance of friendship for the youth cultures in the 1920s and 1930s, promoted by popular culture, which took over the shaping of discourses on friendship away from literature and philosophy (Peel 2009). Also, the growing body of psychological literature on child development also begun to stress the importance of friendship relations in human development and life (Peel 2009). However, the structural constraints placed on friendships, in terms of social class and gender, were still present. Female friendships at the beginning of the 20th century were often tossed aside in the service of pursue of heterosexual relationships and were often used for the instrumental purpose of increasing one's heterosexual attractiveness (Peel 2009; Oliker 1998). At the same time, the fear of homosexual inclinations among men prevented male friendships from emphasizing intimacy and instead male friendships were often carefully collectively organized in contexts of male-only brotherhoods and clubs (Peel 2009). From Kinsey's research on male sexual experience it is evident that among working-class the culture of male friendship which included touching was more widespread, due to lesser fear of homosexual inclinations (Peer 2009). Nevertheless, friendship was further growing in significance in the 20th century,

which was further fostered by the betterment of the life conditions and the affluence that accompanied increasing industrialization (Peel 2009; Oliker 1998). The spread of communication technology, such as telephone, fostered the establishment of friendship networks (Peel 2009). The importance of using friends even in instrumental purposes was also explored, which is evident from Dale Carnegie's bestseller in the 1960s in the US, "How to win friends and influence people", which was the first widespread self-help book on the topic of friendship (Peel 2009).

Thus social conditions of the 20th century can be considered to have finally freed friendship from the constraints of social structures and enabled the spreading of new forms of friendship organized around personal agency.

## **2.2 Relating and friendship in late modernity**

### **2.2.1 Late modernity in general**

In order to understand relationships in late modernity, it is first necessary to understand the social mechanisms at work in late modernity.

The theoretical framework in which individual's relations in contemporary society are placed is based on the writings of authors Anthony Giddens, Zygmunt Bauman and Ulrich Beck. The three authors claim that society has not yet reached a phase beyond modernity, but that it is still in the phase of modernity, albeit one of a different kind (Giddens 1990; Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002; Bauman 2000). Giddens calls this phase "late modernity" (Giddens 1990), Beck calls it "second modernity" (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002) and Bauman terms it "liquid modernity" (Bauman 2000). For the purposes of this study, Giddens's term "late" will be used, although the work of all three theoreticians is used to build theoretical framework within which personal relations in late modernity are observed.

What does the concept of "late modernity" mean?

Giddens claims that society is currently undergoing the phase of late modernity in which the consequences of modernity are being "radicalized" (Beck 1994, 3; Giddens 1990, 3; 1994, 57). Consequences of this radicalization are evident in further phenomena which permeate contemporary society.

Technology has dramatically altered the way in which modern society functions. Technology and principles based on instrumentality are key distinctive features of modernity in opposition to premodern society (Misa 2003; Weber in Inglehart 1997). In early modernity, technology increased mobility and productivity and has helped the spread of scientific way of thinking (Inglehart 1997). However, the price of this was also paid in the form of dismantling the traditional communities and their pre-given meanings (Inglehart 1997). Thus, already in modernity, technology with its systems and networks enmeshed with daily routine of social actors, becoming the “infrastructure of daily life“(Misa 2003, 11). In late modernity, this technologization of everyday life is further radicalized.

Late modernity is different from early modernity in the extent to which the everyday experience is mediated through digitalized technology environments (Gergen 2000, Nie 2001). It was already in modernity that expert systems removed social relations from their immediate contexts and one could no longer rely on immediate surroundings for everyday functioning, but had to rely more on abstract systems (Giddens 1990), in terms of everyday functioning. These systems are, however, in the age of globalization, interconnected with global systems on a daily basis (Giddens 1990, Beck 1994). This relation gets even more radicalized in recent years, as individuals are increasingly dependent on digitalized technology such as the Internet or smartphones for their everyday functioning (Gergen 2000; Turkle 2011). Technologization of everyday life further fosters disembedding of social relations out of their local contexts (Giddens 1990). Moreover, fast modes of transportation have become a part of everyday life and thus mobility has increased on the global level (Beck 1994; Gergen 2000). Due to increased mobility and mediation of experience through digitalized environments life led by social actors is in late modernity increasingly exposed to various social contexts and spent outside of single geographical locality. Giddens takes this argument even further by arguing that the level of time-space distanciation in late modernity is so intensive that “self“ and “society“ practically become interrelated in the global context for the first time in human history (Giddens 1991, 32).

Abovementioned structural social changes lead to the experience of time and space different than in early modernity. First change in the social experience of time and space already happened at the advent of the modernity, in the sense of the invention of transportation and communication technologies which altered the experience of time and space (Bauman 2000; Giddens 1987; 1990; Harvey 1989; Rosa and Scheuerman 2009; Urry 2009). Time started to be viewed in linear terms, it started to be rationalized and commodified (Bauman 2000;

Giddens 1987; Harvey 1989; Urry 2009). At the same time, due to the invention and growing spread of the transportation technologies, space started to be more available to those with means of using the transportation (Bauman 2000). All of this lead to the experience of social acceleration (Harvey 1989; Rosa 2009; Rosa and Scheuerman 2009). This time-space shift is such a radically new social experience that some theorists pinpoint it as the beginning of modernity (Bauman 2000, 112; Giddens 1990, 16). Second shift in time-space experience, however, is argued to have happened in the last three decades with the rapid development of communication technologies in terms of globalized networks (Giddens 1990; Harvey 1989; Rosa and Scheuerman 2009). With the emergence of the interconnected global networks the conjunction of the global and local social worlds on everyday basis has become the hallmark of late modernity. Anthony Giddens calls this the “disembedding of social systems“, meaning that social institutions are disembedded from the local social context and linked to globalised relations (Giddens 1990, 17). It was already in the first modernity that the everyday life started to be organized through the trust in expert systems in the sense of professional or technical expertise systems which organized living environments (Giddens 1990). In late modernity, however, those systems become increasingly disembedded due to globalization.

Thus, the late modernity is characterized by the radical separation of time from space (Bauman 2000, Giddens 1990). The emergence of the global computer networks has lessened the importance of space since any space can be reached at any time (Bauman 2000, Rosa and Scheuerman 2009). This possibility of instantaneity is precisely the reason of shift in the experience of the time which has become dominant over the space (Rosa and Scheurman 2009). Within them, the principles of simultaneity and instantaneity have become dominant over principles of duration (Bauman 2000; Rosa and Scheuerman 2009; Urry 2009). David Harvey argues that this is then experienced as “time-space compression” in which the speedup of the pace of life overcoming space barriers is such that the space seems to collapse upon social actor (Harvey 1989, 240). Different authors used here differ slightly in their explanation of the implications of the changed nature of experience of time and space in late modernity, as they also contribute the changes in time and space to different causes. However, they are in consensus that the experience of the time-space has radically changed in late modernity. One of the implications of this is the experience of increased acceleration of time, both on the individual and social levels (Rosa and Scheuerman 2009).

This leads to further implications. In comparison with life in pre-modern setting, the nature of risk has changed. While in some areas of life such as health management risk is reduced, at

the same time new, more global and potentially high consequence risks are present (Giddens 1990; 1991). Due to the interconnectedness of social contexts of living with global ones on daily basis, risks are becoming global (Beck 1992). Due to everyday mediation of experience through technology, the awareness of global risks has also become heightened. However, in spite of risks that have been globalized, dealing with the consequences of those risks due to the dismantling of collective sociabilities has increasingly become individualized (Beck 1992; Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002). The nature of risk has also changed. In pre-modern periods, type of risk one was exposed to was *a priori* given; it was associated with ascribed characteristics such as social class or community in which one was born (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002; Beck 1992, 53). In opposition to that, risk in late modernity is elusive, “somehow universal and unspecific“, as Beck notes (Beck 1992, 53). Those kinds of elusive risks also seem to increasingly escape the institutions which are supposed to govern them (Beck 1992;1994). This is on one hand connected to the global spread of industrial production, but also to the simultaneous institutional and market deregulation on a global level, in the face of which certain nation-states often have only limited power of action (Beck 1992; Habermas 2001). This leads to further consequences such as deregulation of job markets and the spill over of economic insecurities from global to local social contexts.

Private life in modernity, and even more in late modernity, thus becomes structured by institutions which take the place of traditions (Beck 1992; Giddens 1990). Instead of traditional guiding norms, faith or guidances in form of practices, individuals have to rely on institutionalized biographies (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002). However, trust in institutions does not have the same quality as trust developed within collective communities in pre-modern settings. While traditional communities were full of constraints, they, on the other hand, were a reliable source of psychological support (Giddens 1990). However, modern institutions may provide trust in everyday functioning but they do little on the level of the ontological security of individual or concrete answers to individual problems (Giddens 1990; 1991). Furthermore, unlike traditions which offered guidelines for the ways of living, abstract systems or experts offer multiple choices and guidelines that are not fixed (Giddens 1991, 74). Also, individual situations and biographies become institutionally dependent but the feeling of connection to the social becomes blurred, so they appear individualized (Beck 1992, 134; Giddens 1991).

However, in late modernity the nature of this institutionalization further changes, since individuals are no longer bound to local institutions, but become a part of global networks

(Beck 1992). The implications of this is that institutions increasingly determine the course of one's biography, regardless of the local context (Beck 1992). Moreover, increasing reflexivization of social knowledge occurs and institutions become mediators between reflexively gained knowledge about social practices and social practices themselves, in the form of scientific or public criticism of social practices (Beck 1992). This is a part of wider turn towards reflexivity in modernity.

Modernity is generally the starting point of new reflexivity in the sense that tradition is increasingly open to scrutiny and questioning. Reflexivity was in the pre-modern traditional societies integrated within the time-space organisation of the community by means of tradition (Giddens 1990). Unlike the reflexivity of the first order, meaning the sense of reflexive monitoring of one's action, an inherent characteristic of human activity, the reflexivity of second modernity means constant revision of social practices (Giddens 1990). Furthermore, due to globalization and digital interconnectedness, individuals are on the everyday basis exposed to new practices and knowledge, potentially different from their local ones, which also leads to further examination of one's own life in the light of gained knowledge about other ways of living. This means that reflexivity is on the everyday basis inherently bound with everyday actions of individuals; it is extended to one's self (Giddens 1991; 1992, 29). This, among other things, means that social forms and practices are to a large extent open to scrutiny (Giddens 1990). Social forms and practices are to a large extent open to scrutiny, meaning that there are no authorities or social practices which are excluded from questioning, and further resulting in social forms being in the constant state of fluctuation, since for them to become continuous it would require conditions of repetition and unquestioning (Bauman 2000; Giddens 1994). Thus reflexivity in the sense of questioning of social forms and authorities consequently leads to the disembedding of social forms. While modernity also disembedded traditional social forms, it still re-embedded people in industrial social forms (Bauman 2000). This meant collective social identities of industrial society or early modernity such as class consciousness, gender and family roles, which were unlike traditional social forms, not ascribed by birth, but were nonetheless relatively fixed categories with corresponding norms of behaviour (Bauman 2000; Beck 1992). However, late modernity is characterized by the dissolution of fixed social identities or institutions (Bauman 2000; Beck 1992). This is what Bauman calls “disembedding without re-embedding” (Bauman 2000, 33). It means that social institutions are pluralising and changing so quickly that they rarely acquire fixed position or acquire it for a relatively short period within one's lifetime

(Bauman 2000; Rosa 2009). Society of late modernity is the one of post-traditional order, meaning that traditions are not followed anymore, since they would require “doing things as one did them yesterday“, which is uncharacteristic for the pluralisation of lifestyles in contemporary society (Giddens 1994, 71). This process of dissolution of traditional social forms is precisely why Zygmunt Bauman calls late modernity “liquid“, in opposition to the first modernity or the “solid“one – since social forms of first modernity are starting to disintegrate and when they re-appear, they disappear again before having the strength to “solidify“ (Bauman 2000).

However, Beck argues that this “disembedding“ does not mean that previous social forms are replaced by void, but are instead replaced by a new type of life handling; individual himself should decide how to master his own life; what his biography, identity, social networks, commitments and convictions should look like (Beck 1994, 14). This, in other words, means that individuals in late modernity live individualized lives.

Individualization is not a tendency which is characteristic only for modernity, since there are traces of individualization in every historical period (Beck 1992, 127; Giddens 1991, 75; Howard 2007, 10; Honneth 2004). Tendency towards individualization was also grasped by early sociological theorists, such as Weber, Durkheim and Simmel, however, those theories mainly deal with characteristics associated with the shift from traditional to industrial society and thus, even if they have some similar characteristics, do not depict the character of the contemporary individualization (Beck 1994, 7; Howard 2007, 11). More precisely, individualization in late modernity means different things than in previous historical periods. For Ulrich Beck and Elisabeth Gernsheim-Beck individualization in late modernity has twofold meaning: first and foremost it means dissolution of traditional identities such as class, cultural or gendered identities (Beck 1992; Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002, 2 ). Those categories, however, still exist, but they are somehow emptied of their traditional meaning and it is yet unclear what they are to become in the future; Ulrich Beck calls them “zombie categories“ (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002, 204) . This means that people are freed from the bonds of tradition and are increasingly expected to lead “a life on one's own“ (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002, 57). This means that individuals are actively shaping basic parameters and choices linked to their life trajectories. Paradoxically, at the same time, the lives on one's own, freed of traditional constraints become increasingly dependent on institutions and, because of this and market dependence, individualized biographies become increasingly standardized (Beck 1992). This is however not explicitly felt on the personal level, as the



existences become individualized, individuals become the centre of their own lives (Beck 1992; Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002; Honneth 2004). This, however, also means that they appear to be the ones responsible for their failures; while in previous historical periods such failures could be attributed to external forces such as God or faith in some external forces, today they appear as personal failures (Beck 1992; Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002). This also means that inequalities are individualized and, besides that, the ways in which someone deals with individualization of biographies are also felt as something which is not dependent on external social structures. In other words, the view that individuals have of the world is entirely in terms of their own ego (Beck 1992, 135). Moreover, one's ego becomes the centre of one's life planning, or as Ulrich Beck puts it, "a vigorous model of action of everyday life is demanded...in order for one to survive, an ego-centred world view must be developed...for the purpose of shaping an individual biography" (Beck 1992, 135). One's biography becomes a "do-it-yourself" biography, but due to insecurities of social conditions of late modernity can also easily become a "breakdown biography" (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002,3). Freedom to choose becomes an obligation in late modernity. Social actors in late modernity have to make choices and bear responsibility for them, which in the age characterized by infinite choices, becomes increasingly difficult (Bauman 2009; Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2001). To depict the insecurities coming with this kind of living, Beck vividly uses Sartre's term, claiming that "people are condemned to individualization" (Beck 1994, 14).

In other words, individualization of late modernity means that the relation between the individual and the social is changed in a way that individual becomes "the reproduction unit of the social in the life world" (Beck 1992, 90). This, however, does not mean that social risks become extinct. Social inequality extends to late modernity, but its consequences appear individualized (Bauman 2009; Beck 1992, 98). Individuals are thus forced to find personal biographical answers to questions which are intrinsically social, or as Ulrich Beck puts it, "biographical solutions of systemic contradictions" (Beck 1992, 137).

The process of individualization is also reflected in the change in values. While in the first phase of modernization the evolvement of the rationalization of authority reflected in growing of secular-rational values was present, in the second, post-industrial phase of modernity, there is growing of expressive values, associated with the emancipation from authority (Inglehart and Wenzel 2005). While on the one hand, the aforementioned reflexivity promotes this way of thinking, in which nothing is excluded from the questioning, on the other hand, as already mentioned, individuals are increasingly oriented towards their own lives and this manifests

itself in the expressive quality of living. Individuals strive to express themselves through their private lives, and that is how identity becomes connected with everyday living decisions. Ronald Inglehart argues that in the first phase of modernization (which is analogous to the first modernity) individuals are mostly oriented towards material and physical security, while in the second phase they start to be oriented towards individual self-expression and the quality of the lives, which he names the “postmaterialist“ values (Inglehart 1997, 28). Inglehart argues that growing segments of society have realized that the price of instrumental rationality as the guiding principle of social life is too high and that the related values and priorities are in decline (Inglehart 1997, 23). In Ulrich Beck's terms it could be said that techno-scientific rationality failed faced with growing risks associated with industrialization and the development of science, which instead of warning about risks, becomes involved in their creation (Beck 1992, 59). This also accounts for realization that risks stemming from global industry which are spreading to nature are also a threat to society (Beck 1992). It could be said that changes in values are associated with aforementioned reflexivity as important characteristic of modern individuals.

The way in which a late modern individual perceives the world and himself is inextricably embedded in the context of these social changes.

### 2.2.2 Self in late modernity

Social conditions are in late modernity also reflected in the ways in which individuals perceive themselves and organize their self. In late modernity main characteristics of individual identity are no longer anchored in collective social categories, which are being increasingly dismantled. Thus while in traditional societies they were fixed from birth and pre-ascribed, in first modernity they were connected with social classes associated with industrialization, in late modernity individual is increasingly left to decide for himself (Bauman and Vecchi 2004; Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002; Giddens 1991; Honneth 2004). This has twofold consequences. On the one hand, pluralisation of choices also offers increased possibilities of self-determination (Gergen 2000; Giddens 1991; Honneth 2004). On the other hand, this means that the responsibility for one's life is shifted entirely onto the individuals, meaning that they become responsible for both their successes and also their failures (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002; Giddens 1991). So the individual is forced to

develop the “trajectory” of his self or, in other words, to start to reflexively monitor his self and to negotiate with himself the conditions of his living in terms of narrative self-identity (Giddens 1991, 14). This task can sometimes be so intimidating that the individual can become oriented towards survival and can develop certain “survival strategies” in the midst of everyday biography risks he can encounter (Giddens 1991, 173; Howard 2006, 19–20).

Furthermore, previously described individualization in late modernity further implies the ultimate lack of the rites of passages existing in traditional societies. This means that passages from one phase of life to another which were previously socially or institutionally given are left unattended and it is either upon the individual to search for their markers or they are placed in the abstract systems such as bureaucracies which can sometimes make them devoid of meaning (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002; Giddens 1991). In this context, individual self-actualisation becomes increasingly meaningful and it is sometimes even argued that access to means of self-actualization is nowadays the guiding principle of social inequality as opposed to social class in first modernity (Giddens 1991; Elliott 1992; Howard 2007). On the other hand, it is also argued that it is precisely the democratization of means of self-actualization which is characteristic for late modernity (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002; Honneth 2004).

Thus it follows from this that the individual in late modernity is an increasingly reflexive being, in the sense that he constantly questions himself or herself about the way of living his or her life (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002; Giddens 1991). Individuals of late modernity, in the words of Anthony Giddens, live lives which are “reflexively organised in terms of flows of social and psychological information about possible ways of life” (Giddens 1991, 14). The self becomes a reflexive project on everyday basis, meaning that the everyday's handling of questions how to live becomes associated with one's identity (Giddens 1991; 1992; 1994). As mentioned before, an individual becomes the focus of his own life. This, furthermore, has profound implications in the domains of moral and ethics.

Specifically, individualization in late modernity is also evident in the phenomenon of individualization of morality. This phenomenon has a twofold nature. Individuals of late modernity do not want to be passive receivers of moral guidance anymore, but they want to actively participate in the forming of moral values; to actively co-create them (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002). Related to this, there is an emergence of the new kind of ethics which is less oriented towards society and more towards oneself. This kind of ethics is based on the principle of the “duty to oneself” or “the responsibility to oneself” and is different from the

traditional kind of ethics was oriented around moral obligations towards others (Bauman 2008, 53; Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002, 37). This can be regarded as the morality of authenticity, current in late modernity, which excludes any universal moral criteria and is considered to reside in the realm of intimate relationships, argues Giddens (Giddens 1991). Bauman also notes the shift towards individualization of morality in terms of the absence of any universal rules and deciding if one should be moral towards others and what it exactly means is placed on the contemporary individual (Bauman 2008). While Bauman's view is inclining towards perspective which sees this as a decline in values, Beck and Beck-Gernsheim protest against such a simplistic perspective and prefer to call this a change in values (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002). Bauman, however, argues that the morality oriented towards oneself without any universal guidance puts the individual in the state of uncertainty since the freedom of deciding on the range of one's moral responsibility towards others is overwhelming (Bauman 2008). As he puts it: "The concepts of responsibility and responsible choice, which used to reside in the semantic field of ethical duty and moral concern for the Other, have moved or have been shifted to the realm of self-fulfilment and calculation of risks. In the process, the Other as the trigger, the target, and the yardstick for a responsibility accepted, assumed and fulfilled has all but disappeared from view, having been elbowed by the actor's own self" (Bauman 2008, 52). Bauman sees the Other as the "collateral victim" of this individualization of ethics; the responsibility towards the Other succumbs to one's own interests and calculations (Bauman 2008, 53–56). Beck and Beck-Gernsheim are, however, more optimistic towards the new kind of morality, arguing that its results are sometimes surprising in the sense of gluing the values together, previously unthinkable to be put together, such as "egoism and altruism, self-realization and active compassion, self-realization AS act of compassion" (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002, 159). The question is does this shift in values somehow reflects in the way of organizing the relationships with others in late modernity?

The multiplicity of choices is also something the self in high modernity becomes aware of. The high levels of exposure of one's self to other kinds of experiences not personally experienced is also typical for the globally interconnected self of late modernity. It is argued that the self in the first modernity has already started to be exposed to the increased mediation of experience through books and other printed media (Gergen 2000; Giddens 1991). Later in the phase of industrialization, some social theorists of the self argued that the self in modernity, under the pressures of rationalization and industrial standardization, together with

the utilitarian principles of capitalism, has become increasingly narcissistic (Lasch 1986) or increasingly oriented towards others in the sense that it does not have the stable core, but is dependent on others for his self-definition (Riesman 1965).

This process is further radicalized in late modernity. Due to the interconnection to global digitalized and abstract systems which flood the everyday life of the individual, his or her perception of the world is altered. He or she has the possibility of constantly exploring different social experiences. Thus the everyday experience in late modernity becomes radically mediated (Gergen 2000; Giddens 1991). All of this leads to the phenomenon of the “pluralisation of life-worlds” (Berger in Giddens 1991, 83). This can lead to potentially conflicting situation in which practices in one part of social actor's life can be at odds with practices from the other part (Giddens 1991). The saturation of the self with multiple realities stemming from mediated experiences in late modernity is argued to lead to the state in which self is split into multiple selves in line with the social context in which it finds itself at certain moment (Gergen 2000; Stivers 2004).

Furthermore, the changed nature of trust also has profound implications on the level of the organization of the self. Trust is no longer found in local tightly-bound environments, and the abstract systems are offering trust only in the sense of the reliability of everyday functioning (Giddens 1990). However, since trust is a pre-condition for the ontological security of the individual, it has to be searched for elsewhere, which implies the increasing significance of personal relationships (Giddens 1990; 1991).

These experiences that constitute the structuring of individual self in late modernity potentially have implications on the ways in which individual relates to others or perceives relationships.

### 2.2.3 Relating in late modernity

The dissolvment of traditional social organizations of life and aforementioned changes in some aspects of the self bring into the forefront the new ways of relating in late modernity. Particularly important in this sense is friendship, as a relationship with a potential of re-embedding the individual into the society, but which at the same time differs from pre-modern relations of embeddedness in terms of the lack of obligatory or ascribed nature.

Thus, in late modernity it is not only their individual biographies that individuals must create, but also they have to actively create the architecture of their social links and networks (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002, 23). Since forms of spatially-condensed community in the traditional form are disappearing, the construction and maintenance of the architecture of one's personal ties is, in late modernity, increasingly a matter of personal agency (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002; Pahl and Spencer 2004; Roseneil and Budgeon 2004; Wellman, Carrington and Hall 1988). In other words, individual needs to be active in order to obtain the trust and psychological well-being coming from relationships (Giddens 1990; Wellman, Carrington and Hall 1988). In late modernity, the emphasis is on the active engagement and the element of personal choice in structuring one's relationships. This occurs in two ways. First comes the decision linked to the formation of relationships or in other words, making the decision with whom to form the locus of one's personal community (Castells 2001; Giddens 1991; 1992; Pahl and Spencer 2004). What comes second is the question of individual will in maintaining the relationships which manifests itself in active involvement and continuous work on their maintenance (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002; Wellman 1998). This has possible twofold outcome; one of self-determination in forming of relationships and other of easier fragmentation of networks (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002; Wellman, Carrington and Hall 1988). In other words, since relationships are increasingly freed of constraints of imposed by traditional social institutions they are, at the same time, full of emerging opportunities in terms of new forms of relating, and full of new uncertainty and risks which were not present in traditional relationships (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002; 2006; Giddens 1991; 1992)

A particularly influencing notion of relationships in late modernity has been Giddens's concept of "pure relationship" (Giddens 1991; 1992). This concept is embedded in the wider social context of the restructuring of intimacy in late modernity, and the process which Giddens calls "democratization of intimacy" (Giddens 1992, 188). This means that there is an increasing emphasis on autonomy and equal opportunities for parties involved in personal relationships.

Pure relationship is a relationship which is no longer anchored in external structures such as societal norms or social class, but is instead "free-floating" (Giddens 1991, 89). It is entered upon personal choice and maintained for its own sake - it depends fundamentally on satisfaction or rewards which come from the relationship itself (Giddens 1992, 58). It is mutual and rewarding for both partners. This, however, is achieved through constant

monitoring of the relationship and one's role in such a relationship linked to reflexivity in the form of questioning whether the relationship is the right one for the individual, which is again related to reflexive project of the self (Giddens 1991). This happens mainly in romantic partnerships and marriages, but is also evident in friendships or relationships between parents and children (Giddens 1990; 1991, 98). One of the interests of this research is to see whether this conceptual framework can indeed be applied on the contemporary friendships.

Giddens is, however, criticized for portraying an overly simplified picture of modern relationships; Lynn Jamieson states that empirical data shows that friendships are also sometimes pursued out of necessity instead of a choice and also can arise from other kinds of intimacy instead of self-disclosure (Jamieson 1998). He is also criticized precisely since he presents an overly optimistic and simplified picture of modern relationships in the sense that he interprets them as liberating, and in that, fails to acknowledge the full extent of their frailty caused by this liberation (Bauman 1993; Bauman and Vecchi 2004; Heaphy 2007). Bauman notes that this aspect of not being bound by the pure relationship in the form of anything else than a pure choice makes commitment in the traditional sense look like something which should be avoided at all costs and makes the relationship increasingly insecure: "Therefore you are bound, but your partner is free to go, and no kind of bond that may keep you in place is enough to make sure they won't" (Bauman 2003, 90).

Pure relationship is formed through the establishment of trust, which in this case has to be gained, in opposition to the relationships in more traditional communities in which trust was pre-given (Giddens 1991). Trust is, in pure relationships, built through mutual intimacy in the form of self-disclosure, since it grants the knowledge that the other is committed and benevolent towards oneself but also makes it possible to predict other person's behaviour in certain situations (Giddens 1991, 96). Commitment is, argues Giddens, precisely what replaces former external anchors in pure relationships (Giddens 1991). Commitment is exercised through a personal choice combined with the effort of making the relationship work in spite of difficulties it might encounter (Giddens 1991).

Furthermore, intimacy in a pure relationship is closely related to the reflexivity of the self, since pure relationship is closely linked with the project of the self, negotiated through simultaneous development of intimacy and self-exploration (Giddens 1991, 1992). Such process, argues Giddens, helps create "shared histories" that are bounding in a way different than sharing similar social positions (Giddens 1991, 97; 1992, 138).

However, there is a double-edged feel to pure relationships, Giddens notes; while they on the one side the increased possibility for intimacy and self-development is provided, on the other side they lack the obligatory nature and therefore are characterized by increased sense of insecurity (Giddens 1991, 12; 1992, 137). Bauman further criticizes the quality of Giddens's pure relationship precisely on this account; they are “until further notice“ in the sense of lasting only as long as it is convenient for the parties involved (Bauman 2003, 90). This points towards the lack of any ethical obligation and therefore can be linked with the rhetoric of consumerism, in the sense that the friendships are measured by the volume of pleasure they are likely to offer in the “value for money“ terms (Bauman 2003, 75). Bauman considers society in late modernity to be consumeristic, in which, in Freud's terms, pleasure principle prevails over the reality principle, which is also included in the aforementioned shift of the moral responsibility from social tasks to individualized one – each individual is left to decide on the limits of his responsibility for the other human being, as well as to decide how much of personal welfare he is willing to sacrifice for the sake of fulfilling the moral responsibility to the Other (Bauman 2008, 51). However, this is problematic on the basis of lack of any universal responsibility towards the other; if the only guiding schema is one's own satisfaction, does that not imply a disintegrative effect on the relationship as the basis of sociability?

And indeed, it seems that Giddens's notion of pure relationship as based on mutual trust instead of external anchors is somehow flawed precisely because of this aspect of its frailty; Giddens himself defines trust as “a confidence in a reliability of a person or a system“ (Giddens 1990, 34). However, if a relationship lasts only as long as each partner gets satisfaction from it, it seems that it is not very reliable in the sense of the other partner being there tomorrow – what if tomorrow the other side decides that he or she ceases to find the relationship satisfying? This kind of prospect does seem to place certain aspect of unpredictability and uncertainty upon modern relationships. Zygmunt Bauman also argues that trust is not something which is fostered in the contemporary society in general; while normative regulation is dismantled, consumeristic logic does not foster the care towards the other, but only the care for oneself, and popular culture generally promotes evolutionistic survival logic (Bauman 2008). Thus Bauman raises the issue of ethics as something which is at stake in contemporary relationships, building on Immanuel Levinas's argument that morality is something which is pre-reflexive and that reflexivity as a starting point of morality- evident in question “Why should I be moral towards the other?“ is not a starting



point of morality, but the sign of its demise (Bauman 2008, 62). The aforementioned shift from responsibility towards others to responsibility to oneself is what Bauman sees as problematic in the relationships in liquid modern society (Bauman 2008, 52-53).

In accordance with Bauman's view of ethics in relationships there are some other critiques of Giddens's pure relationship, which critique Giddens for basing his characterization of modern relations on the uncritical assessment of therapeutic discourse of modernity which is not ideologically empty but is instead a symptom of the infecting tide of individualistic neo-liberalism in late modernity (Bryant and Jary 1997, 93). Giddens is also criticized for overstating the agency and rationality of actors in relationships (Heaphy 2007; Mestrovic 1998), and for failing to acknowledge that individuals constructing their relationships in the manner of calculating whether the relationship is worthy to invest in are much closer to calculative and gaming agents than to ones oriented towards commitment (Mestrovic 1998, 85). Those critiques of the concept of pure relationship are, in my opinion, not only applicable to the contemporary domain of friendship, but they also help to capture its ambivalence, which are in Giddens's optimistic concept not addressed to their full extent.

Lynn Jamieson criticizes Giddens's notion of "pure relationship" for portraying too idealistic picture of contemporary relationships and claiming that practices of friendships in contemporary society are not always based solely on choice but sometimes also on necessity (Jamieson 1998). Jamieson claims Giddens's intimate relationship to be an "idealized version of personal life which gains ground previously dominated by a particular idealized version of 'the family'" (Jamieson 1998, 2). Everyday circumstances in people's lives in late modernity are often far from the simplistic and clear picture of circumstances from which "pure relationships", thriving on disembeddedness and intimacy, could evolve, she argues (Jamieson 1998). She agrees with Giddens that friendship has a better chance of exhibiting the characteristics of pure relationship than marriage or parenthood, but argues that there are still structural constraints which in practice often move it far from this ideal (Jamieson 1998, 105).

In addition to that, it can also be questioned if pure relationships, and particularly friendships, perhaps seem increasingly insecure because the expectations of them are heightened? Personal relations are claimed to have become the main locus of one's search for ontological security (Giddens 1991; Luhmann 1998). Could it be suggested that this kind of strain put on those relationships is at odd with their frail nature because of their voluntary nature? Do they

feel as more insecure because of the lack of their embeddedness into the external social anchors? How does this influence the relationship?

The aforementioned multiplicity of selves in late modernity is also said to influence personal relationships. It was already Simmel who claimed that the modern people were too “uniquely individualized“ to understand each other completely, and, consequently, the modern friendships tend to selectively cover only a part of the personality of the individual (Simmel 1950). Giddens also points in this direction by stating that the “mobile nature of self-identity does not necessarily sit easily with the demands of pure relationship“ (Giddens 1992, 140). Van den Berg recognizes the consequences of the erosion of the boundaries between social groups and their multiplication by arguing that people belong to multiple secondary groups rather than to few more personal ones as in traditional societies (Van den Berg in Stivers 2004). Since these larger groups are only able to relate to one part of the one's self, as opposed to smaller personal ones which relate to the whole self, the psychological consequence of this social condition is that a modern individual has as many selves as the groups to which he belongs to (Van den Berg in Stivers 2004, 58). The consequences which this has for the relationships are recognized in relationships being based on only one part of one's self, and being named fractional (Gergen 2000, 179). This way of relating is by some theorists also seen as more superficial and shallow (Lasch 1986; Stivers 2004). Bauman argues that such relationships are more easily prone to collapse (Bauman 2000; 2003; Bauman and Vecchi 2004). He calls this type of relationships “connections“ or “virtual“ relationships, which are, unlike committed relationships, based precisely on gain calculations of each individual and his/her subjective needs, and are thus easily entered and easily dissolved (Bauman 2003, xii). In accordance with this, Štulhofer and Miladinov argue that intimacy has in contemporary society lost its meaning of deep self-disclosure which is also potentially risky and painful, since the “terror of intimacy“ in modern culture leads to inflation of intimacy, and since it turns into the general communication pattern of more shallow self-disclosure and so, in fact, it loses its value (Štulhofer and Miladinov 2005, 10). Or, as Beck notices, “The palette of contacts grows larger, broader and more colourful. But their multiplicity makes them more fleeting, more easily dominated by facades. In the proclaimed interest in each other, any thought of something more is immediately refused. Even intimacies can be exchanged like this, fleetingly, almost like handshakes“ (Beck 1992, 114). Whether contemporary relationships, and which exactly, are really felt as something which is oriented towards shallowness and fleetingness is also a question I plan to address.

Another feature of the relationships in late modernity which is important to mention is the decrease in their dependence on physical proximity due to the radical change in technological structuring of the everyday life in late modernity as opposed to lives in traditional societies or even in the period of early industrial modernity (Allan 1998; Castells 2001; 2003; Gergen 2000; Giddens 1991; Wellman 1998; Wellman and Wortley 1990). Personal networks are increasingly becoming based on personal choice and not on proximity (Castells 2001; Giddens 1991; Feld and Carter 1998; Gergen 2000). When it comes to friendships, however, many social theorists argue that friendships today are still somewhat structurally constrained in terms of social classes, religion, gender etc., although they appear to be formed in voluntaristic terms (Allan 1998; Jamieson 1998; O'Connor 1998; Feld and Carter 1998). Friendship is indeed based on choice in the sense that it is chosen voluntarily, but the pool of people from which the choice is made is generally determined by social structure in terms of the increased probability of meeting people with same educational or class backgrounds (Allan 1998). Thus, it is inevitably embedded in the context of social structures in this sense as well. In this dissertation, though, I am mostly interested in the embeddedness of friendship in socio-historical context through the experience of constraints and opportunities which structural changes of late modernity place upon friendships, than in structural social constraints in terms of class or gender.

It also has to be mentioned that the increased mobility in late modernity definitely offers new possibilities for relating based on a personal choice (Castells 2003; Giddens 1991; Wellman 1979). What are the implications of this kind of associating for friendships? Is the emphasis on choice and potential alternatives in some way changing the ways of relating in late modern individuals? Built upon this, the role of the technological communication in forming and maintaining distant friendship also becomes an important question. This is a part of a wider debate regarding the general implications of this kind of communication (Castells 2003).

Given all the aforementioned social conditions, it is safe to assume that definitions and meanings of friendship have been adapted to suit them. Thus, it is my intention to question the meaning of friendship for individuals today. The question of how the label 'friend' is used is left largely unanswered in present research on friendships within sociology (Pahl and Spencer 2004). This is what I plan to research. What is the meaning of friendship as a social relationship for a contemporary individual? Is this meaning a source of security or insecurity?

## 2.2.4 Sociological theories on contemporary friendships

Friendship has only recently come into focus of sociology. Together with other personal relationships, it has mostly been overlooked in sociology which mostly dealt with macro-structures of society, and left friendship for social psychologists and philosophers which resulted in narrow field of material on the subject of friendship in sociology (Adams and Allan 1998; Blumstein and Kollock 1988; Budgeon 2006; Pahl 2000). However, there is a strong need to form a bridge between the micro-context of individuals' unique experiences and the sociology's focus on social structure in today's sociology (Pescosolido and Rubin 2000). In recent decades, as the aforementioned theories of reflexive individualization of German and Anglo-Saxon theoreticians (Bauman 2003; 2009; Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002; Giddens 1990; 1991) gained prominence in sociology, personal relations in social contexts have also come into focus in the work of some authors (Adams and Allan 1998; Bauman 2003; Budgeon 2006; Jamieson 1998; Pahl 2000; Pescosolido and Rubin 2000).

The main emphasis in the perspective from which social theory regards friendship lies on social embeddedness of personal relationships. This means that their embeddedness into certain socio-historical structures is examined, and that they are regarded as determined by these structures to some extent. In this sense, this approach is different from psychological approach to friendship in the sense that it is concerned with dyadic characteristics of formation, maintenance and ending of a friendship, without taking into account the socio-historical context in which the relationship happens. Social theory has also within recent decades taken interest in personal relations in the form of networks within the arising field of the network theory (Granovetter 1973; Pescosolido and Rubin 2000; Wellman 1979; Wellman 2001). However, this field has become more interested in the structure and the form of the friendship than in its content (Pahl and Spencer 2004; Pescosolido and Levy 2002). In this dissertation, the emphasis will be both on the content; the subjective meaning which friendship has for individuals in late modernity, and the form it takes; types of friendship, both of which will be linked with macro-structures of the contemporary socio-historical period.

Friendship, as well as other personal relationships, is thus in sociology seen as something which does not happen in isolation, but always has a social context of a certain level; whether on the personal, network, community or societal level (Adams and Allan 1998, 5–12). How

these contexts shape practices of friendship is then the focus of sociological research on friendship.

It can be said that the exploration of friendship in modernity from a sociological perspective has started with the writings of Georg Simmel and his analysis of the “dyad“ as a sociological unit (Simmel 1950, 126– 128). The specificity of dyad as a sociological unit is that it does not have a supra-individual structure usually characteristic for a group, but that it instead exists solely based on a mutual personal interdependence (Simmel 1950). This also means that the dyadic relationship exhibits higher level of fragility than the group ones, since quitting the relationship of one of the participants dissolves the whole relationship. This further means that dyadic relationship depends upon immediate interaction and intimacy, which further leads to it being based on personal characteristics of participants or in other words, the individual-exclusive content is the vehicle of the relation itself (Simmel 1950, 126). That in fact is the specificity of the intimate relationships, argues Simmel (Simmel 1950). In other words, friendship is a relationship based on the “totality of the person“ (Simmel 1950, 325). Friendship is in fact, argues Simmel, more able to connect people in their wholeness than a romantic relationships or marriages, due to the lack of sensuality and thus the resulting concentration on the other parts of personality which might be suppressed in erotic relationship (Simmel 1950, 325). However, further analysis of friendship leads Simmel to conclude that intimacy of this kind is rare in the modern society, because of its increased differentiation (Simmel 1950, 325). In Simmel's words:

Besides, except for their earliest years, personalities are perhaps too uniquely individualized to allow full reciprocity of understanding and receptivity, which always, after all, requires much creative imagination and much divination which is oriented only toward the other. It would seem , for all these reasons, the modern way of feeling tends more heavily toward differentiated friendships, which cover only one side of the personality, without playing into other aspects of it. (Simmel 1950, 326)

The result is the development of a special type of differentiated friendships, argues Simmel, in which one is connected to one friend in terms of affection, with other in terms of intellectual affinities and with the third in terms of the shared experiences (Simmel 1950, 326). In other words, it can be said that Simmel argues that modernity favours differentiated friendships in which one only relates to other partially; in terms of only one's part of one's self with particular interests or affections, while the other parts remain outside of a relation and are prone to relating with someone else. Some contemporary social theorists also notice that

individual is in late modernity forming relationships in a partial manner (Gergen 2000; Stivers 2004). One of the intentions of this research is also to see whether contemporary friendship puts an emphasis on the plurality in this sense.

Within sociological perspective which regards friendships as embedded in certain socio-historical structures and according to this analyzes contemporary friendships, two different interpretative orientations can be identified. Both of these perspectives distinguish between socio-historical contexts of pre-modern and modern society, but differ in their interpretation of the contemporary friendships.

One perspective puts emphasis on the integrative function of friendships in the contemporary society in which traditional personal relations are dissolving, while the other, precisely the opposite, puts emphasis on disintegrating effects which the culture of today's hyper-individualism fostered by capitalism has on personal relationships, friendships included.

The aforementioned argument of modernity fostering relationships based on choice is a central point of the first perspective. On the systemic level, complex differentiation of social relations was needed in order to make intimate relations governed by personal choice possible. Modern society, argues Niklas Luhmann, is the system of a complexity which thus creates a need for the world which is intimate and close, and thus the contemporary search for intimacy (Luhmann 1986). The first sociological perspective on friendships in late modernity argues in favour of the importance of the integrative function of friendship in modern social forms of living where traditional forms of support are deteriorating (Pahl 2000; Roseneil and Budgeon 2004). Friends are seen as the key social actors in provision of support in such social context (Giddens 1991; Pahl 2000; Delanty 2010). Delanty argues that friendship is without fleetingness which characterizes other postmodern communities (Delanty 2010). Ray Pahl even goes as far as claiming that friendships can be regarded as “a metaphor for an enduring twenty-first-century morality” (Pahl 2000, 12). Furthermore, Roseneil and Budgeon argue that, in the context of lacking social support in a traditional sense, friendships are in individualized everyday existences of late modernity sometimes regarded as “families of choice” (Roseneil and Budgeon 2004). In opposition to determining one's identity within determinants of one locally-bound social group, friendships also serve as the main confirmation of one's identity in late modernity (Giddens 1991; O'Connor 1998; Pahl 2000). To sum up, the mentioned social theorists put an emphasis on friendship's potentially integrative function in the contemporary social living.

In opposition to this, there is a second perspective which can be identified within sociology of personal relations in late modernity, which puts an emphasis on friendship frailty in the contemporary society. From this perspective, it is argued that the capitalistic modalities of contemporary social life in fact have an opposite effect on personal relationships than the effect of fostering morality or solidarity. It is argued that consumerist ethic that predominates late modern societies has emptied personal relationships of their meaning since it fosters the worldview which evaluates everything in terms of its potential usability for personal gain (Bauman 2003;2008; Oliker 1998). Thus, social environments in late modernity are in this theoretical perspective in opposition to the first one, seen as promoting precisely the instrumental use of friendship (Anderson 2001; Bauman 2003; 2008; Oliker 1998). Friendship in late modernity is also said to be weakening, which is due to privatization as the part of the general weakening of social bonds and the consequences of the individualization processes (or privatization) and increased mobility (Anderson 2001; Bauman 2003; Putnam 2000).

It is also interesting to note friendships within the context of contemporary social networks theory and research. Building on Simmel's analysis of the differentiation and cohesion in different types of societies, Pescosolido and Rubin accordingly portray different kinds of networks characteristic for each type of society (Pescosolido and Rubin 2000). During the period of modernity, typical networks were formed of circles which intersect, meaning that the individual is the point of intersection of different groups. This means that social circles do not overlap and can be chosen, which accounts for more strongly individualized personality (Pescosolido and Rubin 2000). Contemporary type of social network is however, due to increased mobility, a deregulated labor market, practices of capitalism and variation in family practices in late modernity, characterized by individuals standing outside the social circles and simultaneously connected to multiple different circles, but also often only temporarily and in a fleeting manner (Pescosolido and Rubin 2000; Wellman, Carrington and Hall 1988). These kinds of networks are then greater in numbers and more diverse (Giddens 1990; Granovetter 1973; Pescosolido and Rubin 2000; Wellman 1979; Wellman, Carrington and Hall 1988). However, they are at the same time fairly more insecure and more prone to fragmentation (Pescosolido and Rubin 2000; Wellman, Carrington and Hall 1988). Social network theorists consequently argue against the “loss of community“. They claim instead that the community has only changed its spatial and social organization and is now organized in terms of networks, instead in terms of a spatially condensed shape of traditional communities

(Pescosolido and Rubin 2000; Wellman 1979; Wellman, Carrington and Hall 1988; Wellman 1998). Nevertheless, intimate relations are, although they are now personally organized and spatially dispersed, still personally meaningful (Giddens 1990; Pahl and Spencer 2004; Wellman 1998). As Delanty argues, postmodern communities are no longer locality-bound, closed and based on unity and identity, but are, in contrast, disperse, open and based on reflexivity and a personal choice (Delanty 2010). Friendship can thus be regarded as a building block of personal community in late modernity in which individual reflexively organizes his or her ties in accordance with his or her self-determination.

However, it can be said that this shift in the form of community has indeed to some extent made personal communities, as Zygmunt Bauman claims, a social form which is prone to flux instead to stability and offers qualitatively different form of security than traditional social forms (Bauman 2003; 2009).

Namely, the question regarding the implications of the support coming from actively constructed personal relationships is left somewhat open. From the fact that people in Western society no longer live in tightly- bounded permanent communities, but in more disperse, sparsely-knit networks in constant flux, Wellman concludes that people can no longer resort to one group of locally bound people for various kinds of support, but must maintain differentiated ties in order to get different kinds of support (Wellman 1979; Wellman 1998, Wellman and Wortley 1990). Contemporary networks of personal relationships are in flux throughout one's lifetime and in space. In terms of support which people get from community or individual ties this means, in Wellman's picturesque analogy, that people can no longer "drop at general store for support, but instead must shop at specialized boutiques for needed resources. They search for support in relationships which they work hard to maintain. We need to know the consequences of people having such insecure sources of supply " (Wellman 1998, 96). This surely impacts not only the ways of asking for support, but also the way of structuring of relationships and leads to further evidence that the organization of personal relationships in late modernity is different than in pre-modern or early modern settings. Ambivalence in personal relationships of late modernity is recognized in the work of many social theorists (Bauman 2003; 2009; Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002; 2006; Jamieson 1998; Giddens 1990, 1991, 1992; Pahl 2000). However, the way in which they interpret it and the extent to which they perceive it is different. It is thus my intention to question the experience of ambivalence in contemporary friendships in my work. How strong are today's friendships



in the face of contemporary social conditions? And furthermore, what amount of support can friendships, as relationships based on personal choice, offer and to what degree?

When it comes to the types of contemporary friendships, Pahl and Spencer differentiate among different “friendship repertoires“ of contemporary adults and find six different types of personal communities; friend-like, where individuals have more friends than family members in their personal networks and a wide range of types of friends, friend-enveloped, in which friends outnumber family members but a family is still central to the individual, family-like, in which a family outnumbers friends although friends are also important, family-dependent in which family is central while friends are used only for sociability and fun, partner-based in which the focus of the individual personal network is on a partner, and professional based, in which the focus is on professional relations (Spencer and Pahl 2004, 211). Although they identify different types of organizing the personal social communities in late modernity, they admit that the meaning of the notion 'friend' for contemporary individuals is largely left unattended in their study, as well as in other sociological studies (Spencer and Pahl 2004). It is also my intention to attend to this meaning in my research.

### **3 RESEARCH FRAMEWORK**

#### **3.1 Main thesis and research questions**

The main focus of the dissertation is placed upon contextual analysis of friendship in late modernity. The intent behind the dissertation is to understand friendship as a form of relating which is to least possible degree subjected to societal regulations, but nevertheless still exists within certain socially constructed boundaries (Allan 1998). Furthermore, the intent is to understand friendship as a relationship which is inevitably placed within the social context of certain historical time-period. This focus is further to be deepened by including the subjective meaning of friendship for individuals in late modernity. In this way the intent is to link the changes in macro-structures of society on the advent of late modernity with micro-structures as reflected in the personal experiences of the respondents.

Friendship is a relationship influenced by external factors which are not controlled by individual, but nevertheless exhibit the influence over his or her experience of friendship (Allan 1998). Apart from the standard social categories such as gender, ethnicity, class or age, this influence is also constituted within the meaning ascribed to friendship by the individuals. This meaning becomes evident in the form of solidarities contained in friendships in certain context contains and the exchange which is expected from it (Allan 1998). In this sense, friendship can be observed as a field of emotions, expectations and interactions shaped by collective knowledge and ideals shared by members of certain social group (Kaplan 2006, 1). However, which ideals, expectations, emotions and interactions those are in late modernity remains somewhat unclear. For this reason the phenomenology of friendship as a social relation should be developed, to serve as a starting point of the analysis of dynamic aspects of friendship in the context of late modernity.

The starting point of the research is previously described theoretical framework which denotes a change in the structuring of personal relationships in late modernity. Drawing on this, one can pose a question whether close relationships outside of familial domain are in late modernity and in which way remodulated – what does it mean for friendship to function in terms of partiality and increased fluidity?

Furthermore, research questions are built around the empirical indications that friendship ties in late modernity generally show increasing ambivalence, in the sense that people tend to feel lonely in spite of having friendship relations (McPherson, Brashers and Smith-Lovin 2006).

In the case of the younger people, there were also some indications of loneliness in spite of existing friendship relations with friends (Rener 2000). In addition to this, a large body of contemporary theoretical sociology is concerned with the way individualization (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2001), technologization (Stivers 2004) or modern ethics, consumerism and fluidity of globalized world (Bauman 2000; 2003; 2006; 2009) influences personal relations in terms of the growing feelings of uncertainty. Together with this there is evidence of democratization of relationships, not only regarding friendship ones, but also the ones with parents (Giddens 1990; Ule et al. 2000). This was taken as a sign of the prospective new forms of relationships being developed.

These developments are interpreted as characterized by ambivalency in friendship relations; at the same time they may serve as potential field for experimentation with new forms of relating, but also as potential field of uncertainty due to their questionable durability. In this sense, although friendship relations may at the same time provide new opportunities for one's own self-exploration through them, they may at the same time prove to be less consistent and provide individual with the decreased sense of security. The recognition of this may further influence ways in which individuals structure their intimate lives in terms of the „social“ in opposition to the “intimate“. My question is did relationships in late modernity become more social, while “real“ intimacy is reallocated to other spheres of social life which feel more secure or durable? Drawing upon the concept of intimacy as something which is a prerequisite for meaningful relationship (Schnarch in Štulhofer and Miladinov 2004), it is possible that this remodulation of intimate non-familial ties such as friendships is connected to the feelings of loneliness experienced in late modernity .

The main question of my doctoral dissertation is, then, *if friendship relations in late modernity undergo a process of remodulation which can then further be connected to feelings of loneliness.*

From this thesis, several research questions were developed:

***1. How do individuals in late modernity experience friendship relations in terms of durability of bonds?***

The proposed increased democratization of personal relations in late modernity (Giddens 1990; 1992; Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002) brings new prospective risks of easier dissolution of the bonds. One of them is the constant wavering as a part of the wider

proposed flux of social forms in late modernity (Bauman 2003;2009). Friendship relations, as relations based on social structure to a lesser degree, might be especially prone to this. It is thus the question whether, because of this, individuals of late modernity tend to experience the field of personal non-familial relations as increased field of uncertainty. *Does modern friendship become liquefied in the sense that it is experienced as easily dissolvable and thus more subjected to fragmentation or does it have a more subversive character in terms of the resistance of fluctuations? Are friendships in late modernity experienced in the sense of increased disposability or are they still considered to be of more enduring nature?* These questions will be researched within the dissertation.

In the original disposition, a research question focusing on the new ways of relating in terms of blurred lines between friendship and sexual relations was also included. However, at the test phase of the research this lead did not prove to be significant in the friendship experiences of emerging adults and was thus and due to the width of the study, left out of the further research.

## ***2. Do friendship relations in late modernity become increasingly partial in their nature?***

As individuals are, in the context of late modernity, increasingly subjected to a multitude of experiences on everyday basis due to their participation in an increasing number of culturally diverse environments and constant technological mediation of experience (Gergen 2000), they also increasingly have to deal with those experiences by themselves. *The aim was also to explore if, due to this kind of multitude of environments to which an individual is subjected on a daily basis, he enters friendly relationships in a partial manner, investing different part of one's self into different relations.* Investing fully in a single relationship in the context of their frailty and constantly changing social environment of late modernity may be experienced as too demanding. The intention was also to explore *if this kind of nature of modern friendships causes individuals to feel that they are not being entirely understood in a single relationship.*

## ***3. Are friendship relations in late modernity remodulated in terms of reallocation of true intimacy to other spheres such as familial or therapeutic spheres?***

The assumption behind this question is that, in the context of uncertainty related to personal relationships in late modernity and also due to proposed partiality in friend relationships, individuals relate to others with more precaution. True intimacy in relationships is defined as a relation which requires not only revelation of banal secrets, but also total self-disclosure in

front of the other person, which can have consequences to one's definition of oneself both in his or her own eyes and in the eyes of the other (Schnarch in Štulhofer and Miladinov 2004, 7). In the social context of the increased frailty of relationships (Bauman 2003; 2009) too much self-disclosure can be perceived as risky or too demanding: as something which has the potential to lower the pleasure of a relationship and cause its possible ending. It is then possible that individuals try to protect both relationships and themselves by using relationships only for socializing or by leaving out parts which are perceived as non-pleasurable. The intent was to explore if, for this reason, young individuals tend to reallocate intimacy to spheres which are not so easily dissolvable or are felt as less demanding and perceived as safer in the sense of durability, such as familial relationships. Proposed democratisation of parent-child relationship in the sense of increased equality between parents and children (Giddens 1992) is taken as something which could also contribute to the increased sense of safety in familial relations. Contemporary parenting styles, oriented towards flexibility and negotiation, could thus provide a potentially safe place in comparison to potentially uncertain relationships with non-familial others (Rener 2002). Psychotherapy is another relationship area worth researching as a potential sphere for reallocation of intimacy from uncertain personal relationships in late modernity. It is assumed that this is another kind of relationship which can be felt as more resistant to “fluidity“ of late modernity and thus more safe to invest in emotionally. The rise of the therapeutic culture in late modernity (Bellah et al 1986) is taken as the possible symptom of this.

The proposed compensation for the increased uncertainty of bonds is forming relationships of a more sociable nature thought of in terms of networks (Bauman 2003; Beck 1992.). The initial assumption was that these kinds of relationships do not provide a satisfying arena for real self-disclosure, due to their more social character. *Does the increasing shift towards social character of friendship pose another reason for the transference of intimacy to relationship spheres other than friendship?*

#### ***4. Are pervasive feelings of loneliness in late modernity connected to the proposed remodulation of friendships?***

Drawing upon Young's definition of loneliness in which loneliness is defined as the absence or the perceived absence of satisfying social relationships (Young in Rosedale 2007, 205) or a loss of meaning in interpersonal relationships (Stuewe-Portnoff in Rosedale 2007, 206) , it can be proposed that feelings of loneliness and estrangement which are felt in spite of social

bonds in late modernity (Bellah et al 1986; Renner 2000; Dumm 2009; Stivers 2004) are related to the proposed remodulation of friendship.

Remodulated friendship relations which are structured on the basis of sociability or partiality as described above might not be satisfying sources of meaningfulness. *I intend to research whether feelings of loneliness in late modernity are indeed linked to these new forms of friendships.*

## **3.2 Methodology**

The research was conducted using qualitative research techniques in the form of personal interviews in the first stage of research and focus groups in the later stage of research. In the disposition of doctoral dissertation both quantitative and qualitative methods were intended to be used. However, since quantitative survey did not work due to financial reasons and since the initial idea was to assess how friendship functions in late modernity, it was subsequently decided that the focus should be placed on the qualitative methods. The qualitative methods allowed the investigation of dynamic behaviour of friendship in late modernity, meaning it enabled the assessment of how friendship functions in encounter with social conditions of late modernity.

### **3.2.1 Interviews**

In the first part of research fifty personal face-to-face interviews with 50 respondents were made. The snowball method was used as a sampling method. Friends or acquaintances of mine were used for finding respondents for the interviews. Those were their friends or acquaintances, the ones that fitted the criteria demographically. While respondents were chosen purposely on the basis of demographic criteria, they were chosen randomly by my friends or acquaintances. In other words, there was no emphasis on particular experience with friendships. Within the sample, the ratio of female-male was 50:50; 25 females and 25 males.

Initially, the research was to be done on the sample of young people between 15 to 24 years of age. However, following the recommendation of the member of the committee regarding the sample being too wide, since it included both adolescents and young adults with different

construction of friendship which would further widen an already wide subject of research, it was later decided to instead research the population of the age between 20 and 30 years. Thus it can be said that sampling has been purposive to some extent. Furthermore, the research design was constructed within the theoretical framework of the concept of late modernity, corresponding to the population of young adults in post-industrial societies. This further means that it was expected that the respondents were of postmaterial orientation in values (Inglehart 1997). The youth in postindustrial societies is characterized by a prolonged period of transition to adulthood (Cote 2000; Arnett 2004). This happens due to the lack of markers in the form of external guidance and internal resources available for maturing, but also due to the insecure economic context of late modernity conditioned by the deregulation of the labor market, which manifests itself as job instability (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2001; Cote and Allahar 1996; Cote 2004; Mulder 2009). There is also a steep rise in the age when people enter into marriage and parenthood due to the prolonged education (Arnett 2004). One of the manifestations of shift in value orientation in post-industrial societies from material to postmaterial is the emphasis on self-actualization (Inglehart 1997). This also shifts the focus onto oneself, instead on historical markers of adulthood such as marriage and parenthood, and thus further extends the transition to adulthood (Arnett 2004; Inglehart 1997). All of these changes constitute a new life phase, which emerges in late modernity, and exhibits both characteristics typical for youth and adulthood (Arnett 2004). It typically lasts from the late teens to the late twenties (Arnett 2004). Young people in this life phase exhibit both characteristics typical for the youth, such as the dependency on their parents, but also ones typical for the adult phase, such as living alone or starting of serious partnerships. However, this can no longer be considered to be the period of 'high adolescence' since young people in this age exercise much more autonomy from parental control and exhibit exploration to a further extent than typical adolescents (Arnett 2004). This period is in sociological literature usually referred to as 'youth adults' (Ule 1996). However, since its definition and age varies across the various literature, I decided to use Arnett's concept of "emerging adulthood" (Arnett 2004). Namely, this concept more precisely captures the nature of this life phase, since, as Arnett argues, the term 'young adulthood' implies that an early stage of adulthood has been reached (Arnett 2004). This is, however, not the case for young people of this age in late modernity since they have not made the transitions which were historically associated with such status, and they tend to see themselves as being between adolescence and adulthood (Arnett 2004).

The period of emerging adulthood is particularly prolonged in Croatia. This occurs for two reasons; 1) Croatian cultural context, which is generally characterized by a late acquisition of autonomy from parent home. Namely, Croatia belongs to so-called “Southern Europe“ or “familistic“ regime, in which parents are generally expected to provide for their children who leave home for independent living, instead of the state, as in social-democratic regimes or the children alone as in neo-liberal ones (Mulder 2009). It is thus safe to assume that prolonged financial dependency on the parental home adds to delayed autonomy in financial terms and thus to delayed independency in general.

2) Particularity of the Croatian context of modernization; Croatia is a country which is, due to its historical conditions, only partly modernized (Tomić-Koludrović and Petrić 2007b). This will be discussed further in more detail, for now it suffices to mention the implications it has for sampling; it results in greater economic insecurities and thus the tendency of emerging adults to be dependent on their parents longer throughout their emerging adulthood phase. That Croatian emerging adults were indeed specific in this sense emerged very early in the course of the interviews; most of the respondents still live with their parents and are unemployed and thus financially dependent on their parents, even if they are already in the phase of emerging adulthood and they usually do show significant autonomy from their parents in other parts of their life, such as regarding the decision-making.

It was decided that respondents chosen should have current residency in the Croatian capital, Zagreb, for at least two years, although the city of their origin does not have to be Zagreb. Namely, if the interest was in emerging adults with postmaterialist value orientation, this implied above described prolonged period of transition to adulthood. Prolonged transition to adulthood was most easily identified by the prolonged period of education, meaning following tertiary education. One of the particularities of Croatia is that the biggest university with most faculties is located in Zagreb and thus many emerging adults pursuing tertiary education come to Zagreb to study. Coming to Zagreb is then the stage of their life marked by the leaving of parental household in the city of origin and thus signifies the transition to adulthood for this group of emerging adults. Furthermore, in terms of modernization, Zagreb is economically the most modernized part of Croatia, as will be shown later. Being the biggest urban centre, it further holds the highest level of cultural modernization in Croatia. Thus, it was assumed that the emerging adults living in Zagreb, or who have come to Zagreb to pursue tertiary education would be most probable to fit the criteria of postmaterialistic value orientation. Furthermore, emerging adults whose residency in Zagreb lasted for at least two years were chosen. This



ensured that the respondents have spent at least a few years in social conditions of late modernity and have thus been affected by its conditions. For this reason, only respondents from 20 years onwards were included in the sample. However, to verify this, the questions which tested the extent of their postmaterialistic orientation were included at the end of the questionnaire. This kind of purposive sampling was done in order to ensure that the respondents were indeed the ones to which theoretical framework of late modernity could be applied.

Also, due to the city of origin within the sample 21 respondents were from Zagreb, 5 from the neighbourhood of Zagreb (villages near or satellite cities of Zagreb) but who spend their daily life in Zagreb and others were respondents who live in Zagreb for at least two years, but are from other places of origin: 3 from Sisak, 3 from Varaždin, 2 from Koprivnica, 2 from Rijeka, 3 from Cavtat, 1 from Dubrovnik, 1 from Split, 1 from Makarska, 1 from Zadar, 3 from Slavonski Brod and 4 from various villages in Croatia.

The questionnaire for the interview was designed in the semi-structured manner, meaning that the questions were outlined but were not strictly followed in the sense of their order. Instead, if certain theme relevant for the subject of research represented itself during the interview, it was further pursued. Since friendship is a complex subject of research, influenced also by personal experiences of a vast range, such a questionnaire design was required to ensure that any experience which emerged and was considered relevant for the subject of the research could be freely pursued. Furthermore, the order of the questions was not linear even in the interview guide, due to the sensitivity of certain questions, such as the ones concerning support or empty spots of friendship support. These were then placed later in the interview since it was assumed that they would be better answered after some rapport has already been established (Maykut and Morehouse 1994). The questionnaire sought to address the phenomenology of friendship in terms of characteristics a relationship should have in order to be called a friendship. It also examined the differences between the practice of friendship and its ideal, focusing on Jamieson's assumption that in reality friendships are much more mixed practices than the ideal of pure relationship (Jamieson 1998). The durability of friendship was also explored, through the discourse, and later in the interview, through personal experiences. Respondents' experience with partiality of friendship was also explored. The difference between a love relationship and friendships was examined, in order to see if romantic involvement had any influence on remodulation of a friendship. However, this question was later abandoned since its results showed no relevance for the subject of the research. The

difference between the familial relations and friendship was also explored, in order to better understand the phenomenology of friendship as voluntaristic relation. The mutual influence of internet communication technologies and friendship forming and maintaining were explored, as were also the differences between friendships in different life phases and (for those from smaller places of origin) differences between friendships in different settings according to their size. Influence of the structural obligations in terms of job, college or familial obligations on friendships were explored. In the last part of the interview, the locations of various types of support were explored within the context of friends and family. The meaning which friendship has for a respondent and the influence of his or her experiences on it was also explored, hoping they will show the possible areas of strength and areas of frailty of the contemporary friendship. At the end of the questionnaire an add-on was added, with questions checking postmaterialistic orientation of the respondent. This will in more details be elaborated further.

### 3.2.2 Methodological issues during research

Early in the interviews, already in the test phase, I noticed that respondents talk about friendships in two different ways. One way of talking about friendships was from their own personal experience, while the other one, more distanced from their personal experience, was a discourse about friendship. What stroke me as problematic was that there was no obvious relation between the personal experience and the discourse in which my respondents talked about friendships. At first, I thought that the respondents used discourses as a projective technique and expressed what they thought were socially less acceptable feelings and experiences through discourses. However, what excluded this possibility was the way in which personal experiences and discourses did not match. For example, some respondents who reported having mostly positive personal experiences with friendships and generally saw their friendships as positive and meaningful, still expressed a negative perceptions of contemporary friendships when they started talking at the level of the discourse. Thus, I felt that the problem which emerged was epistemological in its nature.

In addition, it was the manifestation of a wider epistemological issue in exploring friendship as a social relationship. More precisely, the meaning and discourses of friendship are linked to both personal experience and social practices of friendship. However, on the level of personal

experience, thinking about friendship is influenced by individual characteristics, such as the worldview of the respondent. This then to some extent influences the respondent's expectations of friendships. This is why the patterns of thinking of the respondents were at first hard to isolate. Secondly, both particular experiences with friendship and the reaction which certain individual had on those experiences were another factor which made recognizing universal principles of friendship as relationships challenging. Furthermore, friendships are culturally strongly accentuated as individualized relationships dependable only on personal characteristics of the participants, and this view often emerged in the answers of the respondents. This is precisely why friendship is a phenomenon with social or cultural dimensions that are hard to capture. Graham Allan also notices that friendships are dependent both upon normative conventions attached to friendship and personal circumstances in which individuals construct their relations (Allan 1998). So the problem which presented itself was: how was one to be entangled from the other? And how was this missing link between experiences and the discourse to be interpreted? This was the biggest methodological issue I encountered during my research.

In establishing a methodological framework of analysis and in solving this methodological problem, I found useful Ann Swidler's distinction between discourses and practices (Swidler 2005, 83– 84). Swidler, building on Bourdieu and Sudnow, sees culture as something which is hard to observe directly in the minds of particular social actors (Swidler 2005). This was also something I encountered in my research; it seemed that the link between the respondents' ideas about friendship and their action was not always linear or clear. Swidler solves this methodological problem by differentiating between practices and discourses. Practices are considered to be everyday routines of social actors which are automatic in the sense that they are done spontaneously and are taken-for-granted, with a focus mostly on physical and habitual (Swidler 2005). Building on Levi-Strauss, practices are complemented by discourses which “permit attention to meaning without having to focus on whether particular actors believe, think, or act on any specific ideas“(Swidler 2005, 84). I thus decided to build the analysis of my research on the methodological distinction between the discourse on friendship and the personal experience of friendship. Different kinds of addressing friendship on the level of the discourse, I assumed, were then more oriented towards cultural practices than personal experience, and thus they did not necessarily always match one another. This was the methodological framework within which I built my analysis of the interviews, and this introduced the idea of using focus groups as a method of triangulation. I assumed that the

group nature of the focus groups as a research method would put the emphasis on discourses instead of on personal experiences.

### 3.2.3 Focus groups

During the analysis of the interviews some themes and phenomena emerged which were identified as important, but were not explained to a sufficient degree. Thus the need for focus groups as the method of triangulation was further emphasized. Methodological triangulation – or the use of multiple methods – secures an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon being studied (Denzin and Lincoln 2005). As Denzin notes, “the flaws of one method are often the strengths of another; and by combining methods, observers can achieve the best of each while overcoming their unique deficiencies” (Denzin in Mathison 1998, 14). Furthermore, Bloor and al. suggest that focus groups can be used at the end of the study to allow participants to comment on preliminary analysis which can then be used to extend and deepen the initial analysis (Bloor et al. 2001). Since I felt that the properties and conditions of certain phenomena regarding the types of friendship and their dynamics were not explained to a sufficient degree by interviews, I decided to use the same participants from interviews in focus groups also. This, I assumed, would add to the validity of the study through triangulation (Denzin and Lincoln 2005; Golafshani 2003; Mathison 1998; Stake 2010). However, I also assumed that this would give me the opportunity of assessing the same phenomenon from different dimension. Namely, it was my assumption that these two different methods of research would emphasize different dimensions of the same phenomena; that respondents would talk differently about a friendship in the group context than in the interview settings. I assumed that the group interaction in focus groups would foster discourses about friendships, which emerged only sporadically during the interviews in which the emphasis was on the personal experience. Also, I assumed that through discourses emerging in focus groups I would be able to better explore how social conditions of late modernity impact the dynamic aspect of friendship.

Respondents who initially participated in the interviews were subsequently asked if they were interested to participate in the focus groups. Respondents were chosen by the criteria that the analysis of their interviews was rich in data relevant for the topics left unclear after the initial analysis. However, the rate of refusal was more high than expected, which could be attributed

to two factors; 1. Respondents volunteered for the interview and the focus groups were subsequent part of the research which lowered the motivation for the further help with the research, which could openly be sensed in some of the respondents. 2. There were some respondents who rejected participation on the claim of not to feel comfortable enough to speak in group settings in general.

The composition of the focus groups was initially guided by the assumption that it was best to choose respondents who reported similar experiences in interviews in order to make sure that they would openly talk about them in group setting. However, this assumption proved to be faulty in the first two focus groups and proved once again that there was no linear relationship between practices and discourses of friendship; namely, while the first group was comprised of people with positive experiences they had negative discourses on friendships and openly discussed them, the second group comprised of those with some negative experiences who in the group setting mostly talked positively in terms of discourses of friendship. Thus in the choice of composition of subsequently three focus groups the initial guiding principle was abandoned and the richness of the data in previous interviews, particularly regarding the discourses on friendship, was further used only.

In small-scale research, three to five focus groups are seen as sufficient in allowing access to a variety of perspectives to emerge (Tonkiss 2012). Thus five focus groups were held. Smaller focus groups are easier to facilitate and are considered more appropriate when it comes to topics which are potentially sensitive (Bloor et al 2001; Denscombe 2010; Holloway and Wheeler 2010; Morgan 1998). Thus it was decided that focus groups held should be small in size. Smaller focus groups also seemed more appropriate due to the initial sample size of 50 respondents, the availability of the respondents which was lower than in the first phase and subsequently, the problems experienced in coordinating meeting scheduled which proved to take more time than anticipated, while the research time-frame was limited. Thus the size of the group settled on was three to five respondents. This is considered appropriate if the level of engagement of each individual participant in the group is high (Bloor et al 2001; Morgan 1998). Since the participants were chosen on the richness of the data stemming from the interviews in the first stage of the research, which already presupposes a certain level of extraversion, this was the case here. Three focus groups thus comprised of four participants, one comprised of five and one of three participants. Regarding the gender, focus groups were comprised as follows; two males and three females (first focus group), two males and two females (second focus groups), all female respondents (third focus group), two males and one

female (fourth focus group), two males and two females (fifth focus group). Focus groups were assembled with the idea of gender balance. However, since more males than females denied participation in focus groups, the third group evolved into all-female group, due to the fact that no male participants were eligible at the time when the focus group was scheduled. However, the main difference noted between this focus group and the mixed gender ones was not related to topics, but to the style of the discussion; in all female focus group discussions lasted significantly longer since female participants talked out each subject more thoroughly while in mixed gender groups consensus was reached more quickly.

The questionnaire for the focus groups was divided in two parts. In the first part the respondents were given the concepts which were initially gathered from the interviews under the phenomenology of friendship. They were then asked what each of the concepts meant for them in friendship. Once the consensus around the meaning was established, they were asked to further elaborate how important each characteristic was for friendship and how they dynamically function in the friendship process. The intention was to use group interaction in focus groups to put identified components of friendship in relation in order to see how they behave dynamically in the process of friendship making and maintaining. If the respondents had problems identifying the meaning than they were asked to associate with what comes to mind when they think about a certain term, this was taken as a starting point for the discussion about the meaning in friendship. Next, the respondents were presented with the themes which emerged from the analysis of discourses on friendship in the interviews and were asked to express their opinion about these themes.

### 3.2.4 Analysis of the data

The analysis started with the intention of capturing the essence of certain types of relationship – of real friendship – phenomenologically. The intention behind making of phenomenology of friendship as a social relation was foremost to grasp the essence of the experience of friendship in later modernity and then to put it into the sociological context.

The phenomenology as a method of investigation is best suited when the common or shared experiences of several individuals need to be understood, in order to develop a deeper understanding of the features of a certain phenomenon (Creswell 2007). However, phenomenology is not solely a description, but also an interpretative process in which the

researcher makes an interpretation of the meaning of the phenomenon (Creswell 2007). Thus, the themes which emerged as main features of friendship in late modernity were first gathered from the interviews and were then taken as experiential standpoints which compose the relation of friendship, to which interpretative assessments were added in order to better tie those meanings to social contexts. For the same reason, they were put into the context of other theoretical and empirical findings. The discourses that emerged from the interviews were also presented as themes to the respondents in the focus groups and analyzed in the same manner. The findings from the focus groups were analyzed by the method of a whole group analysis, in which the group is the unit of analysis and is treated in the same way as a unit of individual data (Ritchie et al 2003). The analysis of the focus group was conducted through initial manual coding and were then compared with the codes from different focus groups and common codes between focus groups were recognized.

Coding was generally done in three steps, suggested by Strauss and Corbin (Strauss and Corbin 1998). During the initial overview of the interviews, open coding was one. In the open coding, concepts were first marked and then grouped into categories. After the open coding, axial coding was done in order to establish relationships between categories. In the static overview of the practices of friendship coding was done without causal linking in terms of properties of categories, while dynamic analysis of social processes of friendship in late modernity was driven by the causal linking of conditions with consequences among concepts<sup>1</sup>. The idea was, as Strauss and Corbin suggest, to relate the structure with the process in order to obtain the complexity of social reality (Strauss and Corbin 1998, 127). The last process of selective coding was done only after the analysis of the focus groups and their integration with findings from the interviews.

Namely, the findings from the focus groups differentiated from the findings from the interviews. During the analysis, it was noticed that focus groups did indeed provide richer data in the form of discourses about friendships, while in the interviews they emerged only sporadically. Not only were the respondents more oriented towards discourses in the way they talked about friendships, but this method of research, because of its group setting, allowed the deeper exploration of these discourses. During the analysis it seemed that interviews and focus groups, as Mathison argues regarding the usage of mixed methods, did indeed “tap different domains of knowing”(Mathison 1998, 14). This is also what Mathison warns about,

---

<sup>1</sup> See Appendices: Appendix A gives an overview of the static analysis while Appendix B gives an overview of the dynamic analysis.

that triangulation does not necessarily produce convergent findings, but instead often produces inconsistencies, which are then to be used as the window to the complexity of the social phenomenon studied in the sense of building a stronger theory (Mathison 1998). And it indeed felt that the dimensions of certain types of friendships and their dynamics, which were left unaccentuated in the analysis of the interviews, came into new focus with the data from the focus groups.

Thus, with the codes from focus groups I returned to the analysis of interviews and tried to see which additional dimensions were added and which initial codes needed refining or reconsidering even, in order to build a stronger theory. This was done in MAXQDA (See Appendices). The findings from both methods were put into interplay which gave a more clear picture of the dimensions of the phenomenon of friendship as a social relation. With this the process of analysis was finished.

There is another issue which needs to be addressed within the context of this research and which concerns gender differences. Namely, although the subject of research of this dissertation was not related to gender differences within friendships, it should nevertheless be mentioned. The conclusions about the issue of gender differences in friendship are unclear in the literature available on the subject; early research studies show differences in friendship styles of same-sex friendships of different genders. Namely, while both genders are found to value intimacy in terms of self-disclosure within best friendships, male respondents' styles of friendships maintenance consisted of activity-doing almost as twice more often than women's friendships, which preferred to talk with their friends three times more often than men (Caldwell and Peplau 1982, 727). Other research also suggested men's friendships to be instrumental, e.g. grounded in activity-doing rather than talk (Aukett et al. in Canary, Emmers-Sommer and Faulkner 1997; Elkins and Peterson 1993). Further, female respondents were found to rate their same-sex friendships more positively than male respondents (Veniegas and Peplau 1997). However, it has to be noted that those studies were done on the small-scale undergraduate samples, and are thus not representative of population but can be used only as potentially indicative of general tendencies. Furthermore, latter analysis of some of these studies argued that differences were in those studies overemphasized and that expressivity and self-disclosure are more characteristics of men's same-sex friendships than earlier research would suggest (Inman in Canary, Emmers-Sommer and Faulkner 1997). Thus, to begin with, the starting point for the evaluation of the potential gender differences in friendships is somewhat unclear.



In the first phase of this study no difference was found in the ways in which male and female respondents assessed friendships, particular intimacy. Both female and male respondents named self-disclosure as important characteristic of friendship. It was only later in the first two focus groups that male respondents had objections to the term ‘intimacy’, noting that it “sounds gay”, but those same respondents nevertheless agreed that self-disclosure was important constituent of friendship, both in previous interviews and in that very focus group. The need to publicly distance themselves from the designation ‘intimacy’ can be interpreted within the context of the leftovers of the patriarchal social structures in Croatia, which are in the public discourse present also within the sample of postmaterialistically oriented emerging adults. That they are related more to one’s self-perception in the public than to private opinions is evident from the fact that they only emerged in the group setting. However, since those same respondents emphasized the need for self-disclosure in friendships, both in interviews and focus groups, this can also be attributed to the different notion that some male respondents ascribe to the designation ‘intimacy’, meaning physical intimacy and the one that I have ascribed to the concept in this study, meaning intimacy in the sense of self-disclosure. Nevertheless, in this study male respondents reported the need for self-disclosure in friendships in the same amount as female respondents. However, it has to be noted that this study only dealt with qualitative aspects of friendship and not quantitative. In other words, or for example in the case of self-disclosure, it only assessed whether self-disclosure was considered important and not how frequent friends engage in self-disclosure. Since some of the previous studies found the main difference between males and females in friendship patterns to be the frequency of self-disclosure (Caldwell and Peplau 1982), the orientation of this study towards general phenomenology of friendship and not towards quantitative frequency of certain aspects of this phenomenology could also be the reason that the results in this study did not yield differences between male and female respondents in terms of self-disclosure. There is also a further possible explanation for the lack of differences in friendship characteristics between genders in this study. Namely, the respondents in the sample were postmaterialistically oriented emerging adults and gender attitudes in terms of gender equality are one of the main markers of the most modernized societies (Inglehart and Norris, 2003; Inglehart and Welzel 2005). Since this generation was partly raised by generation which grew up in less modernized context, it would be logical to expect that some traditional socialization patterns and consequently attitudes, including gender-related ones, are also to be found within it. However, this would nevertheless be the group for which it would be safe to assume that

these patterns are minimal. This is then the second possible explanation for the lack of the gender differences in the perception of friendships found within this study.

### **3.3 Study limitations**

Findings of the qualitative studies are by its nature not generalizable in the manner of in which the generalisation is conceived of in quantitative paradigm. Since the sample in this research is non-representative and demographically purposive, although within these criteria respondents were gathered randomly by snowball method, the findings are not generalisable on the wider population. Rather, they describe the experience and perceptions of friendship of the group of emerging adults finishing or having finished tertiary education in Croatia in late modernity. They are not generalizable on the population of other age-groups or lifestyles, who may have other ways of structuring of friendships, due to variations in demographic variables and general context of relating.

However, they can be generalized in the manner of the qualitative research tradition, particularly in relation to the term which some authors deem as the type of the generalizability which is appropriate for the qualitative research tradition called “transferability“, meaning that the findings can be transferable to other similar social contexts (Gobo 2008; Lincoln and Guba 1985). In the context of this research, this means that transferability of these findings is to some extent possible to the experience of friendship of emerging adults following or having finished tertiary education in other countries which are in the phase of late modernity. Namely, since social structures which guide social practices of friendship in late modernity are universal across countries in the phase of late modernity and since sampling principle was guided by this universality, e.g. emerging adults which are characterized by similar life-orientations in all of the late modern countries, it can be expected that there would be some similarity in the experience and types of friendships found in those contexts also, particularly regarding the qualitative nature of the research which sought to build a model of functioning of friendship as existing in late modernity. It is, of course, reasonable to expect some particularities as manifested in variations of a particular context, for example, it would be safe to assume that social contexts in which conditions of late modernity have progressed more, thereby also influencing time-space organization within which social relationships are built, would put a different emphasis different types of friendships. However, it is also safe to

assume that social conditions governing both contexts are similar enough that the strategies of action in management of one's personal network would also be similar.

However, all of this is contained within the concept of the “transferability“ as thought of in the qualitative tradition, since the ability to use it is correlated with the level of “fittingness“, which is defined as the degree of congruence between the context which was initially researched and another context on which the findings should subsequently be applied; if two contexts are sufficiently “congruent“, then the knowledge from the first one might be applied in the second one (Lincoln and Guba 1985; Gobo 2008).

In this sense, then, and by checking of congruence of every context within which findings want to be applied, these findings can serve as the initial point for the wider understanding of the phenomenon. They are, however, not conclusive and generalisations about the wider population cannot be inferred from them, as this is the inevitable limitation of the purposive sampling.

Second limitation of the study is related to the used sampling procedure. Namely, due to the course of the sampling through snowball method it has occurred in around five cases that the initial respondent which I have interviewed would after the interview offer his or her friend or friends as the next respondent/s, only to have a friend refuse to participate in the research on account of the topic which was by friend perceived as too uncertain or private to talk about it to an unknown person. From this it can be inferred that when it comes to sensitive topics such as intimate relationships this kind of sampling possibly tends to exclude certain part of the population. I would assume that this is the part of the population whose self exhibits higher levels of introversion, at least when it comes to sensitive topics. This however, does not exclude the possibility that this introversion is a general trait of the self of the respondents who refused to participate, particularly when it is noted that most of my respondents show at least average level of social extroversion due to their reports on their social life which could be assessed from the interviews. This, however, speaks for the possible bias in the findings, in the sense that the experience and challenges of friendship in the late modernity could be different for more introverted emerging adults than the ones described in this study. There were some respondents in my sample who either themselves reported introversion as their important character trait or it was sensed during their description of their social life, arguing against this limitation. However, this possibility of sample bias is something which I see as necessary to be considered in the context of the possible limitations of the findings.

There is also the limit of this research regarding the conceptual types of friendship built in this research. Namely, when the focus of the research is the phenomenon of such complexity as friendship, consisting both of personal and social, there is a limit which social researcher inevitably faces. All the possible variations of the conditions within which my respondents formed, maintained and ended friendships were explored in this research. However, since friendship relationship is, except to social, also subject to variations in personal experiences which inevitably also influence the ways in which person forms and maintains friendships, to say that all the possible variations of friendship types have been captured within research of this scope would be careless to say the least. They rather describe the types of friendships found within this dissertation should be regarded as primarily those which arise from strategies of action influenced by cultural conditions of late modernity, not excluding the possibility of variations on account of one's personal experiences with friendships. In other words, types of friendships assessed within this dissertation should be regarded in terms of Weberian ideal types, which serve as orientation point in describing of social reality of late modernity, which can in practice be slightly modified according to variations in personal terms. It is suggested that research findings are perceived in this context.

### **3.4 Scientific relevance of the proposed research topic**

The scientific relevance of the proposed research topic is to be found in its contribution to understanding the informal personal relationships in late modernity, beyond the realm of romantic partnerships. First, there is a lack of empirical verification of theoretical descriptions of the field of intimacy in late modernity, embedded in theories about the period of late modernity in works of Giddens, Beck and Beck-Gernsheim and Bauman (Giddens 1990; 1991; Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2001; Buman 2003; 2009). There seems to be the missing link between sociological theories about personal relationship in late modernity and their lived versions. One of the intentions of this research is to contribute to the formation of this link.

In addition, as already mentioned, friendship is a relationship which is somewhat disregarded in the field of sociology (Adams and Allan 1998; Blumstein and Kollock 1988; Pahl 2000). It has been assessed within some research on personal networks in terms of the structure (Granovetter 1973; Fischer 1982; Pescosolido and Rubin 2000; Wellman 1979; 1998; 2001;

2002). However, its meaning and its content in contemporary society are still left somewhat unassessed in contemporary sociology (Pahl and Spencer 2004; Pescosolido and Levy 2002). It is the intent of this study to address these issues. This intent should be regarded in the context of a wider need for bridging the micro-context of personal experiences and sociology's focus on social structure in contemporary sociology (Pescosolido and Rubin 2000).

While the meaning of friendship is left somewhat untackled in sociological writings on friendship, it is, at the same time, argued that its importance is rising against the backdrop of the final dissolution of traditional collective social forms in late modernity (Jamieson 1998; Pahl 2000). This renders the meaning it has for contemporary individuals significant. It also requires in-depth research of the functioning of friendship in terms of both opportunities and challenges which it is faced within social conditions of late modernity as important. As for the strength of the sociological analysis of friendship and other personal relationships in comparison with other approaches, it can be located in the addressing of socio- historical conditions to which it is subjected to in certain socio-historical period. This kind of approach offers increasing understanding of both challenges and opportunities with which personal relationships are faced within contemporary society. The analysis of structural underpinnings of the formation, maintenance and dissolution of friendship is in this study combined with the phenomenological analysis of friendship. The combination of these two kinds of analyses simultaneously addresses the content of friendship, its meaning and its structural variations.

The strength of this approach lies in recognizing that fluctuations in personal experiences are linked to the macro-level of social structures, which, in today's world in which globalization is lived locally, should be especially emphasized. Namely, as Beck puts it, the individual is in such conditions often forced to cope on a personal level with what are in fact socially, and in late modernity also globally, produced risks (Beck 1992). This can be transferred to the field of the research of personal relations. It can be suggested that it is useful to address personal relationships sociologically in order to understand to which extent the individualized challenges within them could in fact be linked to a wider social changes.

Furthermore, in this dissertation friendship is proposed to integrate the individual into the society in a different way than structurally more embedded relationships. Thus, its potentiality for social integration should be treated with special significance. The interest in the link between the individual and the society in the light of modernity has existed in sociology from

the beginnings of sociological thoughts to contemporary theories (Bellah et al 1986; Durkheim in Emirbayer 2003; Pescosolido and Levy 2002; Putnam 2000; Simmel 2001; Tönnies 1955). The assessment of this link in the context of friendship is then also important in the context of this wider sociological interest.

### **3.5 Context of the research: emerging adults in late modernity in Croatia**

It is important to note that the initial research questions of the research are based on the theoretical framework constructed mostly on the basis of British and American authors. This further means that they contain the assumptions which are, to some extent, based on foreign social context. Since the research was done in Croatia, it was necessary to assess whether the Croatian social context is subject to some particularities. Namely, Great Britain and the USA to some extent differ from Croatia in the level of their modernization. Tomić Koludrović and Petrić argue that Croatia has only partly undergone the process of the second modernization (Tomić Koludrović and Petrić 2007b). Thus, it was necessary to first determine to what extent the respondents in this research share the experience of undergoing the transition to adulthood under the social conditions of late modernity.

According to Tomić Koludrović and Petrić Croatia is a country currently undergoing two simultaneous modernizations, the first one trying to finish the processes of establishing the functioning of the institutions of the modern state, and the second one simultaneously trying to catch-up with social changes related to globalization and accession into the European Union (Tomić Koludrović and Petrić 2007b).

Why this is so can be understood if looking at socio-historical context of the development of Croatian society. Namely, Croatia was part of a Socialist Federalist Republic of Yugoslavia from 1945 to 1991. Yugoslavia, due to its socialist orientation, allowed first modernization, in terms of shift from the pre-industrial to industrial forms of social organization, to happen only partially. Namely, while some features of modernization, such as industrialization and urbanisation, were allowed and encouraged, others, such as individualism or market-property system, were denied (Colic-Peskier in Tomić Koludrović and Petrić 2007b; Tomić Koludrović et al 2012). Yugoslavia was, however, considered to be the most liberal communist country (Rizman 2006). This was largely due to Tito's politics of open-kind of socialism which was not closed to certain form of modernizing influences, such as Western

cultural products and Croatia's diaspora and tourism (Tomić Koludrović and Petrić 2007b; Tomić-Koludrović et al 2012). Accordingly, the research on the Croatian youth in the 1980s shows significant amount of postmaterialist values present (Tomić Koludrović and Petrić 2007a). At the same time, however, Tomić Koludrović and Petrić argue that socialist government exhibited some forms of pre-modern elements which prevented the process of first modernization to be undergone completely (Tomić Koludrović and Petrić 2007b).

In the 1990s, Croatia's transition period from the federalist country of socialistic orientation towards democracy and capitalism was marked by the Independence War and afterwards, by post-war circumstances which created a social context of economic regression and prevailing instability of social institutions. It was also largely marked by Croatian privatization process which was, although formally legal, led by political and private interests. Starting from the assumption that the government was the owner of the previously socially owned properties, the model of privatization was lead by the government via “case-by-case” method. The Privatization Act, which was supposed to regulate it, granted the Croatian government a wide and non-transparent authorization over previously socially owned properties (Štulhofer 1998). In this process, ruling politically fit elites became owners of the previously socially owned properties (Tomić Koludrović and Petrić 2007a). Thus, transitional period was characterized by robbing most population of social ownership which they helped to build (Spajić-Vrkaš and Ilišin 2005). This, together with the post-war period of low level of economic activity, resulted in deep economic regression (Brunnbauer 2000; Ilišin 2007). Furthermore, exposure to globalizing influences which are normally characteristic for the shift from industrial to post-industrial society, occurred in Croatia simultaneously with the process of nation-building, which is typical for the shift from pre-industrial to industrial phase. Retraditionalization, both in the public sphere, in terms of the attempts of repression of the civic sphere, state of law, public opinion and in the private sphere, in terms of the retraditionalization of the gender roles and fostering of the national and religious sentiments, was also initiated by the ruling elites (Tomić-Koludrović et al 2012; Brunnbauer 2000). Considering that in Croatia both two modernization processes have occurred simultaneously, accompanied by consequences of the war and the attempt of retraditionalization, it is not surprising that the research on the values of the youth in 1990s showed that there was a shift in the direction of materialist values replacing postmaterial ones (Tomić-Koludrović 2007a; Tomić-Koludrović et al 2012). However, grounding of Tomić Koludrović– and Petrić’s claim that this is the particularity of only Croatian social context is unclear. Namely, it is unclear why this wouldn’t also be the

case with other countries which have undergone the transition from socialist to democratic government and capitalistic types of societal organization.

Further, the implications of this particular social and economic context of Croatia for this research are debatable. Namely, contemporary Croatian society, which has in the meantime entered European Union, does show some particularities in terms of local economic insecurities leftover from the privatization and post-war period, together with these insecurities adding up on already low level of country's economic stability and the social context which partly continues from the 1990s. It can thus be expected that such economic and social conditions of living will be reflected in the values of young people in Croatia. However, simultaneously with this, emerging adults in Croatia have already from the 1990s been exposed to what Anthony Giddens's lifting of social relations out of local context (Giddens 1991) or to what Manuel Castells terms "space of flows", (Castells et al 2007) which are global circuits of interaction, in the context of Croatia organized primarily by global communication network. Thus it can be safe to assume that emerging adults in Croatia were, along with their local social context, also subjected to the global one, and it is thus debatable to what extent they would differ from their counterparts in other modernized countries.

What does characterize their counterparts in other modernized countries? Lives of young people in late modernity are in general characterized by the dissolution of all big ideologies and instead turn towards one's private life (Ule 1988; 2004). This is consistent with the aforementioned individualization occurring in late modernity (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002). It can also be associated with the existence of youth "subcultures" or "counter-cultures" and the loss of interest in the political sphere (Ule and Renner 2001). Values of subcultures, such as self-expression and individual freedom in choosing a lifestyle have grown into the public consciousness (Ule 2004, 353). This shift in values is in late modernity evident in the growing aspirations towards self-realization, in the change of gender roles, in the pluralisation of types of families, the individualization of life orientations, the discovery of spirituality outside of orthodox religions, the aesthetization of life and the high evaluation of personal experiences (Ule 2004, 355). In young people's lives this shift has for some time already been evident also in the turn from the public sphere towards the private life, with the emphasis on the quality of everyday life and personal relationships (Ule 2004). However, what seems as disintegration of values or morale, claims Ule, is in fact the emergence of new



values/morale, in the shaping of which individuals want to have an active role regarding the creation of their life (Ule 2004, 355/356).

This shift in values follows the change which socioeconomic shift from the pre-industrial to industrial, and later from the industrial to post-industrial society brings with itself, according to Ronald Inglehart (Inglehart 1997; Inglehart and Wenzel 2005). Inglehart's analysis of the forty-three societies in the form of the national level-data demonstrated that there are two dimensions in which more modernized societies differ from the less modernized ones; the dimension of polarization between traditional versus secular-rational values and survival versus self-expression values (Inglehart 1997; Inglehart and Wenzel 2005). This shift happens during two phases; in the first modernization, rationalization of authority happens, which is reflected in the growing of secular-rational values, while the process of the second modernization is characterized by the emancipation from authority reflected in the growing of expressive values (Inglehart and Wenzel 2005). Thus accordingly, in the first phase of modernization values are mostly orientated around survival in terms of material and physical security, the so called "materialist values", while in the second one, they start to be oriented towards the individual self-expression and the quality of life, termed "postmaterialist" values (Inglehart 1997, 28; Inglehart and Wenzel 2005). The shift from the materialistic towards expressive values occurs in those birth cohorts that have grown up in the conditions in which they can take survival for granted (Inglehart and Wenzel 2005).

Research of Tomić Koludrović and Leburic shows that at the turn of the century the youth in Croatia shows similarities with youth of post-industrialized countries at the level of expressive means, while differences appear in the terms of underlying values, goals and behaviour (Tomić Koludrović and Leburic 2001). Young people in Croatia were, at the turn of the century, similar to the German youth after the Second World War, a "sceptical generation", which lived in the post-war circumstances; politically apathetic and oriented towards their private lives (Tomić Koludrović and Leburic 2001; Tomić-Koludrović et al 2012). Furthermore, having undergone insecurities of the 1990s, young people in Croatia were sceptical when it comes to the modernization processes (Tomić Koludrović and Leburic 2001). From this it can be noted that, although Croatian youth also shows increased orientation towards their private lives, causes of this phenomenon can only partially be attributed to the globalization influences. One of the hallmarks of the individualization process is the feeling of having to rely on oneself. Among Croatian youth there is also a prevalent sense of having to rely on one's own strengths (Spajić-Vrkaš and Ilišin 2005). These

processes, although similar to the processes of individualization which the youth in more modernized countries is undergoing, can be attributed to the different set of conditions. Namely, the loss of faith in the functioning of public institutions and the feeling of having to rely on oneself can only partly be attributed to the globalizing influences in terms of the general loss of faith in politics. Since the consequences of the local context cannot be disregarded, it is also safe to assume that the loss of the faith in institutions is a consequence of the nature of transition and widespread corruption in Croatia.

The period of the young age is generally prolonged in late modernity due to already mentioned conditions (Cote 2000; Arnett 2004; Mulder 2009). The period of the young age in Croatia is also prolonged, but this can again be linked to special socio-historical context to which Croatia was exposed to. Its “familistic” cultural context, together with post-transitional conditions of economic instability forces young people to be increasingly dependent on their parents often because of the lack of other options (Tomić-Koludrović and Leburic 2001; Mulder 2009). Furthermore, the principle of seniority still prevails in the world of work and career (Spajić-Vrkaš and Ilišin 2005, 46). It also seems that young people in Croatia are more religious than in the 1980s, and that there is an increase in national values from 1980s (Spajić-Vrkaš and Ilišin 2005, 21-22). Both of these phenomena can be attributed to the attempted re-traditionalization in the post-war circumstances, which was fostered by the ruling elites. At the same time, Croatian youth remains open towards values of cosmopolitanism, pluralism and interculturalism (Spajić-Vrkaš and Ilišin 2005, 22). Thus, it can be inferred from this that the values of young people in Croatia, in which they often show the mixture of values typical for both less modernized and more modernized societies, reflect contradictory influences which their social context is comprised of.

Thus, even though today Croatia is culturally open to the modernizing influences, traditional influences evoked in the 1990s still continue to be influential in public discourse. Furthermore, economic insecurities from transitional period continue to contemporary times and have been rendered even more difficult by the influence of the global recession. Croatian economy is characterized by large foreign debt and low export, which makes the economy weak (Tomić Koludrović and Petrić 2007a). Croatian society is also plagued by high rates of unemployment, number currently being at 371 987 (Statistika Hrvatski zavod za zapošljavanje, 1.5. 2013.). This is 18.5 % of the labour force and is, when compared to other European countries, second highest rate of unemployment after Spain (Eurostat, 1.5. 2013.). Young people in Croatia are thus often faced with faint prospects regarding their future. Of all

of the unemployed in Croatia, almost 30% or 107 366 are of the age cohort between 20 and 30 years of age (Statistika Hrvatski zavod za zapošljavanje, 1.5. 2013.). This puts emerging adults in Croatia in especially vulnerable economic position, particularly since they are often without previous work experience and this makes it even harder for them to even acquire the first employment and consequently, gain autonomy. Consequently, frustration and apathy arise among young people, stemming from the perception of not being able to change things (Spajić-Vrkaš and Ilišin 2005, 23).

Ronald Inglehart argues that the level of modernization of every society can be located on a global map of cross-cultural variation by assessing the values of the already mentioned two dimensions: traditional versus secular-rational values and survival versus self-expression values (Inglehart 1997; Inglehart and Wenzel 2005). However, since Croatia is a country with specific situation of two simultaneous modernizations occurring, Tomić Koludrović and Petrić argue that this often results in the elements of two modernities being contained within one and the same person (Tomić Koludrović and Petrić 2007b). Thus it was my purpose to use basics of Inglehart's two dimensions to verify if respondents were indeed of postmaterialistic orientation.

Furthermore, different parts of Croatia exhibit different levels of modernization (Tomić-Koludrović et al 2012). Economic indicators indeed show that in terms of economic development there is a great difference between the capital of the country and other regions. Namely, the city of Zagreb has GDP per capita of 24 700 USD, which is followed by only 17 085 USD per capita in the Istarska County, and by app. 10 000 USD in most of other counties (Bruto domaći proizvod za Republiku Hrvatsku te prostorne jedinice za statistiku 2. i 3. razine za razdoblje 2000–2010, 2013). This is the consequence of the centralization processes occurring already for two decades, with the side implications on the cultural development. So Zagreb is by far the most developed urban centre in Croatia and it bears more resemblance to its European counterparts in more modernized countries than to most rural parts of Croatia.

For this reason, the sample was chosen due to the current residency in Zagreb. The rationale behind this was, as already mentioned, the idea that young adults in Zagreb have, at least for some time, experienced life in social conditions which are most similar to those of late modernity, considering the particularities of different levels of modernizations within different parts of the Croatian society. This was questioned by the add-on questionnaire at the end of each interview. The findings of the add-on in questionnaire were in accordance with

this assumption about the sample. Most of the respondents show the characteristics of mostly postmaterialistically oriented youth, apart from a few characteristics which are particularities of the Croatian context:

1. The respondents find most important things in life being relationships in the sense of friends, family and love relationships, followed by self-actualization and health:

Friends are important to me, career is important, how to say...because now I do what I love, this biology, so my life revolves around it, so of course it is important to me...and love relationship is important to me. But if I wouldn't be in a love relationship...I mean, I am not the type who thinks that it is important to be in a love relationship and like, marry, find a job, have kids...more important to me is that the person self-actualizes, whether it is through job or through family. (Respondent 27, 2012)

This is in line with the postmaterialistic shift happening in late modernity, which moves emphasis from big ideologies towards more particular and practical values, most notable being increased sensitivity for the subjective quality of the everyday life, interpersonal relationships and expressive values (Ule 1988; Inglehart and Wenzel 2005). This kind of orientation towards private life is expressed in the answers of most respondents:

... I don't know, family, if you have one, it's important, if you don't, you can live without it. Friends, again, some people don't have them and they're still alive....other things are all relative, in my opinion. I find friends important...and it is important that I have a job one day which won't depress the hell out of me. That is not as much related to this as to the career you love...and love is also important. (Respondent 10, 2011)

Material values are indeed rarely mentioned by the respondents as an answer to this question. They are sometimes mentioned, but not as the goal-unto-itself. Instead, they are mentioned in the sense of the satisfaction of one's basic existential needs: "Relationships. Relationships and experiences, as many different experiences. Money is not important to me, family is important...family is important. Regardless of that I don't have good relations with my family, it's important. I wouldn't put it on the first place, but it would be in the first five. Money is not important, only to that extent that it satisfies existential needs." (Respondent 41, 2012)

The latter way of talking about material values is somewhat untypical for postmaterialist generation, which by its very definition, should take its fulfilled survival needs for granted (Inglehart and Wenzel 2005). They can, however, be taken as the reflection of the on-going

economic crisis which is deeply felt in Croatia, especially in the lives of young people: “The most important is...definitely, personal, personal selfactualization, that is the key. That is the basis. Money...money is important to that extent to which it secures your survival. And whether the amount of that money is gonna be bigger or smaller, that is completely irrelevant, completely. To be healthy and to do the job you love, that is the most important thing.” (Respondent 19, 2012)

Thus, even if the security around the basic existential needs is mentioned as one of the most important things in life, it is usually mentioned together with the need for self-fulfilment, health and fulfilling interpersonal relations, which is typical for postmaterialist orientation.

#### Level of traditional vs. secular-rational

Two attitudes were taken to be indicative of the respondent's location on the traditional vs. secular-rational Inglehart's scale (Inglehart and Wenzel 2005). The assumption behind this was that postmaterialistically oriented emerging adult should see women as equally capable as men, and should also consider institutionally organized religion as unimportant in their lives.

2. Most of the respondents don't find religion important in their lives. Some of them mention spirituality, self-fulfilment or there are universal guiding principles important instead.

Religion was chosen as one of the indicators of the respondent's postmaterial orientation. First, Inglehart and Wenzel consider religion as the main factor on their traditional vs. secular/rational scale, which predicts many other attitudes which are reflective of one's position on traditional vs. secular/rational scale (Inglehart and Wenzel 2005). The secular/rational dimension of the scale is indicative of the achievement of the first level of modernization, i.e. rationalization of authority (Inglehart and Wenzel 2005). Furthermore, the shift towards non-institutionalized forms of spirituality in which the individual has more active role is indicative of postmaterial orientation of the individual (Ule 2004). Croatia is historically and culturally very much shaped by the Catholic religion. In the contemporary Croatian society this is still so (Ramet and Matić 2007). The number of reported Catholics is still high in contemporary Croatian society (86, 28% according to the 2011 census<sup>2</sup>). Precisely for this reason it was assumed that if the majority of the respondents would prove to be non-religious in this kind of cultural context, it would then definitely mean tapping into non-traditionally oriented part of the population. And indeed, most of the respondents claim to be

---

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.dzs.hr/Hrv/censuses/census2011/results/htm/H01\\_01\\_12/H01\\_01\\_12.html](http://www.dzs.hr/Hrv/censuses/census2011/results/htm/H01_01_12/H01_01_12.html)

non-religious in the sense of the organized traditional religion. Those who report spirituality as important in their lives, emphasize it outside of institutional frame of any kind: “Maybe more some kind of spirituality, but religion ....no. Especially not institutionalized.” (Respondent 20, 2012)

There is a minority of the respondents who are religious (8/50), which is not surprising even among postmaterialistic oriented population given the circumstances of the cultural context. This is in line with the revised theory of modernization of Inglehart and Wenzel, who argue that the increased level of modernization does not exclude the persistence of traditional cultural values such as the religious ones, since cultural heritage of a certain country is also a factor in the trajectory of the modernization it will follow (Inglehart and Wenzel 2005).

However, it is interesting to note that among the respondents who reported to be believers, only three of them are also practical believers. Others are believers in the sense of following the Catholic principles and either have disappointed themselves in religion and stopped attending religious practices or do not attend religious services or disagree with institutional propositions of Catholic Church: “To me, it was far more important before, but in one moment...I loved to say like, God has abandoned me, but God doesn't abandon, I abandoned him...like, but let's say until three years ago, very much. But not in some 'Glas koncil' <sup>3</sup> way....but like, some support, big comfort, believing in all that.” (Respondent 15, 2012)

Thus one gets the sense that even with young adults who report as Catholics, the religious practice is something that they shape according to their needs and much less according to the criteria or obligations of institutionalized religion:

...It is not important that it is church, but I find it important...I mean, I will force my children to go to church, but I will go there only if I need it...so that I don't have a general opinion on that, it depends on situation.

But you are a believer.

When I go home [meaning Cavtat where she is from, which she frequently mentions during the interview under „going home“], I am. [laughter]

And otherwise?

Otherwise...like, if it's a good priest I listen, if it's not I don't. (Respondent 24, 2012)

---

<sup>3</sup> Croatian Church publication

This is in accordance with the active approach in shaping one's life which young people take in late modernity (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002; Ule 2004). Thus the high degree of reflexivity which even young Catholics show when talking about the propositions of institutional religion, can also be regarded as the postmaterialistic movement towards un-institutionalized spirituality, even within the context of culturally inherited religious practice:

Do you personally find religion important in life?

Now not as before...I mean, before. It's not like it was too important, but I gave it a little more attention...now not anymore.

That means you are a believer?

Yes, but I am at odds with church. (Respondent 16, 2013)

The overall answers which show that most of the respondents are either not religious in terms of an organized orthodox religion or, if they are, show a high degree of reflexivity about it, can also be seen as a part of the shift from traditional towards secular/rational dimension of values, which has already happened in this segment of the population, i.e. highly educated young urban one. It can be assumed that the minority of religious cases among postmaterialistically oriented young adults are reflections of both the Christian cultural background to which Croatia belongs to or of a different level of modernizations within only one person, which is something typical for Croatia due to the complexity of its socio-cultural context and simultaneous modernizations.

3. Most of the respondents also think that women are equally capable as men. The perception towards gender equality is one of the main indicators of the level of modernization, agrarian nations being the most traditional in these accounts, while postindustrial societies are most egalitarian (Inglehart 1997; Inglehart and Norris 2003). That Croatia was one of the two most Western oriented countries of the former Yugoslavia had its impact also on the attitudes towards gender roles, together with the socialist countries policy which promoted women's equality in terms of full employment (Brajdić Vuković et al 2003; Brunnbauer 2000). However, promoting equality in terms of employment was not accompanied by promoting equality in terms of attitudes towards gender roles, and thus patriarchal values persisted and were especially highlighted during the attempt of re-traditionalization in the transition period of the 1990s (Brajdić Vuković et al 2003; Brunnbauer 2000). Patriarchal i.e. traditional values regarding gender roles and equality persist still today, with Croatia being the mixture of

traditional and non-traditional values (Brajdić Vuković et al 2003). Mostly they persist within the segments of population of the older age, of lower education, of higher level of religiosity, of male sex, within the ones who have unemployed mother and a more rural place of residence at fourteen (Brajdić Vuković et al 2003). Younger generations within post-industrial societies are shown to be far more egalitarian in their attitudes towards gender relations than their parents and grandparents (Inglehart and Norris 2003). Thus, it was expected that my respondents, being of a younger age cohort with the higher level of education and the experience of urban place of residence, would mostly hold non-traditional attitudes in this area. This was confirmed, with most respondents (42 of 50) thinking that women are equally capable as men: “I don't think I'd even divide it by genders, or race, or anything...person is a person.” (Respondent 9, 2011) Or, as other respondent notes: “Both have their better and worse sides, so when it levels I'd say they're equal...” (Respondent 23, 2012). However, there were some respondents (6 of 50) who stated that women are not as capable as men in terms of physical labour although they all generally consider that women are equally capable as men:

Do you think that women are equally capable as men?

What kind of question is that at all? [laughs]

[I laugh] Answer...

They're mentally capable...and now the fact that there are physical differences in the strength and other things...I mean, ok, contemporary life, but in the construction sites where there is hard manual labour men are the ones who work... (Respondent 30, 2012)

However, when probed, these attitudes do not seem to have traditional underpinnings regarding the gender roles:

Do you think that women are equally capable as men?

Absolutely. There are things in which they aren't, like, you know, probably there are some jobs which men will do better, it will be easier for them to do it.

Ok, which jobs?

Physical ones.

Ok, but the rest, yes?

But I think that if there is a woman who wants to build, she will build. (Respondent 19, Zagreb)



There were also the respondents who showed reflexivity regarding gender inequality, even the male ones: “Why, of course they are capable. Although there is this misapprehension that they aren't.” (Respondent 49, Zagreb)

In general, most respondents consider women equally capable as men and are thus personally located within the secular-rational dimension of societal development.

### Material vs. postmaterial

The following two questions assess the self-expressive versus the materialistic orientation in life and things which the emerging adult considers most important regarding her or his future career. These questions were chosen to show the emerging adult's placement on the scale of the survival vs. self-expression values (material vs. postmaterial). Here it was my assumption that postmaterially oriented emerging adult should emphasize his self-actualization, both in life generally and in the context of his or her future or a current job.

4. Most respondents (38 of 50) value personal fulfilment more than money: “Personal fulfilment obviously [laughs] I mean, when I found that job in foreign trade with only a high school degree and then I left it...It was very hard to give up those 5000-6000 HRK a month that I was making then [laughs] but I still gave it up because it was more important to fulfil my own wishes. I mean, it is perfectly clear to me that with this current profession I'll make 3000-3500 HRK a month...” (Respondent 27, 2012)

This is in congruence with the postmaterialistic orientation in which survival is taken for granted and is, accordingly, not emphasized (Inglehart 1997, 46).

However, some respondents (12 of 50) do show concern for the materialistic conditions of life: “I don't know...personal fulfilment is more important, but it's no use if you're as poor as a mouse [laughs]” (Respondent 21, 2012)

Those respondents emphasize money as something which is necessary for survival: “Personal fulfilment, of course, but...money is important in the sense of paying one's bills and eating. I don't know if that's a materialistic way of thinking [laughs] ...but I had plenty of opportunities in life to see that it is literally necessary, because if you get ill or you want to continue education, doing volunteering work won't help you in that or offer you possibilities of some kind, regardless of how fond you are of it [laughs]” (Respondent 1, 2011)

These kinds of opinions often come from the respondents whose life conditions foster them to think about survival in materialistic terms, such as this respondent who is in a desperate need of a job: “Frankly, I need a job. To have a job would currently be my fulfilment.” (Respondent 8, 2011)

Thus, it can be said that a more materialistic orientation of certain respondents is a reflection of their insecure economic position within the context of the insecure current economic situation in Croatia.

5. However, when it comes to their (future) employment, most of the respondents consider self-actualization prospects, dynamics of the job and good relations at the workplace as most important aspects of their (future) jobs: “Most important to me is that it's not...that a job doesn't become like, a torture. That's the most important...because if a job is a torture oh my God...what's important, what's important...work environment is also important. Because, like, if you work with loads of assholes, then probably you do not see the job as that interesting for you” (Respondent 49, 27, Zagreb); “Most important is the certain possibility of learning, let's say it like that. Ok, the possibility of development...if you have enough knowledge, progress will come sooner or later. The possibility of learning, let's say, and good human relations, that is also important.” (Respondent 37, 2012)

This is in congruence with the research throughout Europe, which shows that today the expectations of young people regarding their job are similar to expectations they have from their free time; that it gives them excitement, meaning and the opportunity for self-development (Kohli 1994 in Ule 2004).

The altruistic component of the job is also mentioned by some respondents, as is the belief that the job is not an end-unto-itself, but that it serves a bigger social purpose:

That it succeeds in covering many of my interests at the same time...

In what sense?

From the most strictly professional, that means, law, to more narrow direction within law...or some other interests which are not solely in law.

And the salary? [...]

I think that a kind of average...the more I think, the average is good enough for me because I would definitely dedicate myself more to the quality of life than my career...absolutely. (Respondent 28, 2012)

This is in congruence with the postmaterialistic shift in values, in which a job does not serve only instrumental purposes.

However, the respondents often show materialistic concerns regarding a job which is not in congruence with the postmaterialistic orientation. They seem to be concerned with survival far more than it is typical for the postmaterialistically oriented youth: “Mmm ok, materialistic security which I currently don't have covered, like...security, not necessarily wealth of great extent but security and possibility to rely on it for my life...” (Respondent 47, 2012)

This seems to be the reflection of the Croatian post-transitional economic uncertainties, since an undertone of fatalism, stemming from the condition of economic insecurities in Croatia, can be sensed in answers of many respondents: “...career, to get a job, like, that would be a career (laughs sarcastically), like, let's define career...actually [to have] an apartment, a car, that is not even meant by a career. The career here would mean to survive, have something to eat and move out of the parental home...that would already be a 'wow' (laughs sarcastically). And you can expect that only when you're 40.” (Respondent 1, 2011)

The emerging adults in Croatia are thus to some extent forced to think in terms of the survival, and this is reflected in financial expectations of the future or current job, which often include the perception of the average salary as a special accomplishment: “...to do what I love to do. And to have a pay check which enables me to live. Not to live in a cardboard box, but normally. I don't have to be rich or have a house with a pool...but to do what I love and have a normal salary.” (Respondent 29, 2012)

[Important in my future employment is]...first to have one. First to have one...and secondly, that the level of the paycheck is such that I can live from it. And here I don't talk about travelling around the world, I talk about paying the rent and putting the food on the table...I can demand from a job that it provides new knowledge, and that I self-actualize through it, and that I progress through it...but I can't put it on the first place if those other things, I mean, I don't have a job – how can I demand to progress if I don't have it?...How can I demand self-actualization at work if I work for a minimum wage? (Respondent 8, 2011)

This kind of reasoning reflects the economic insecurities that plague the lives of young people in Croatia. Consistent with this, the quantitative research on young people in Croatia shows that the increase in postmaterialist values of self-actualization regarding one's work is still accompanied with the emphasis on the instrumental values (Spajić-Vrkaš and Ilišin 2005, 22; Tomić-Koludrović and Petrić 2007).

In the light of the contemporary recession developments around the world, it is, however, questionable if this kind of reasoning reflects only post-transitional economic insecurities in Croatia, or if it is becoming a reflection of the global economic circumstances. Inglehart notes that it is expected that survival values arise in the periods of low-term fluctuations such as the economic downturn (Inglehart 1997, 46). However, since the economic insecurity seems to have been pervading the Western society in the last few years, due to the changes which are long-term more than short-term, such as the deregulation of the global market and the long-term shift of production to the East, it is questionable if in these conditions the divide between the postmaterialistic and materialistic orientation in terms of survival versus self-expression can remain viable. Namely, in these conditions it is often the young people who cannot secure basic economic existential needs and thus it would be reasonable to expect that they express survival concerns, even in more modernized countries.

### Generalised trust

The generalised trust is the key component of the social capital. It increases the potential readiness of people to cooperate with each other beyond the boundaries of face-to-face interaction and people who they personally know (Stolle 2002). In the social sphere, it fosters acts of tolerance and promotes the acceptance of others (Stolle 2002). I took this concept as an indicator of the general social openness of Croatian emerging adults and in faith they have in the Croatian society. I consider this important as the culturally influenced mental context within which thinking about friendship is placed.

6. When it comes to the generalised trust, more respondents consider being careful (29 of 50) in dealings with other people more necessary than to trust them: “Always careful. (...) Man is man’s wolf [laughs]“ (Respondent 22, 2012)

This is in congruence with the findings of the national survey in 2009 in Croatia which showed that the age cohort of young adults (19-30) was characterized by the low level of the generalised trust, with only 20.9% of them agreeing that “most people can be trusted“ (Tomić

Koludrović et al 2012, 78). It is however argued that no simple explanation is due here, both since it would require a more detailed empirical survey and due to the societies with different socio-historical context, such as Austrian and Hungarian, also have low levels of generalised trust (Tomić Koludrović et al 2012). However, it is proposed that this opinion arises both from the socialization in the war circumstances, followed by the limited life chances within the post-transitional period and the nature of the capitalist practices associated with the risk society (Tomić Koludrović et al 2012, 79). In such mental context influenced by the cultural one, it is not surprising that young people show a turn towards the private sphere (Spajić-Vrkaš and Ilišin 2005; Tomić-Koludrović and Leburić 2001; Tomić-Koludrović et al 2012). Thus, it can be assumed that in such a social context private relationships gain on their significance.

### Reliance on themselves and the others

In late modernity, individuals are forced to “take life into their own hands“ (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002, 3). This stressing of one's own responsibility for oneself is the general component of the process of individualization. It is what Beck and Beck-Gernsheim perceive as the responsibility for oneself and one's life, which is in late modernity almost compulsive (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002, 157). On the other hand, it is also the logical step in the world in which no connection proves to be as resilient as the one to oneself. Thus, it was my intention to explore if emerging adults are indeed thinking in individualizing terms; if they think that people should rely on themselves can they expect help from others.

7. When asked if one should rely on himself or herself or depend on others, most of my respondents stress the importance of relying on oneself, even if they are not unoptimistic about getting help from other people. This mixture of attitudes is however, very diverse. There are those respondents who balance between relying on oneself and expecting the help from the others: “It's good like, in everything, to know that you can rely only on yourself. But that shouldn't be the starting point” (Respondent 19, 2012); “I think they should start from themselves and then, when they're ok with themselves, then go towards others. In other words, the idea is that if you are not ok with yourself, you cannot help others...But you need others.” (Respondent 12, 27, Varaždin/Zagreb) Then there are others, who put an emphasis on expectations of help from the others: “I think they should expect help from others...in other words, it is impossible that someone can do everything on his own in life, and help from other people can mean a lot.” (Respondent 25, 2012)

There are also those respondents who are not very optimistic in their expectations of the help from the others, but don't exclude the possibility: "I don't know, I have the feeling...because it's like, the 21st century, neoliberal capitalism, everyone looks its own, everyone tramples on everyone, competition, and like...I suppose that lot of people absolutely looks its own, and then on the other hand you witness some things where people help other people so I don't...so I'd maybe say that one has to rely on others, definitely, but always has to look after oneself." (Respondent 16, 2013) There are also those respondents who see relying on oneself as the only option: "They should mostly rely on themselves." (Respondent 45, 2012)

The particular opinion which the respondent has on the subject can be assumed to be conditioned by particularities of the personal experience with the more subtle details of the part of the Croatian society from which the respondent comes from. Furthermore, it is possible that such a mixture of attitudes about reliance on oneself versus expecting the help from others reflects both the individualization processes and collectivistic tendencies simultaneously present in the Croatian society. Namely, multiple research studies have shown that individualization of Croatian youth is a process plagued with ambiguities. While Croatian youth showed postmaterialist values already in the 1980s, the tendency towards individualization was in 1990s, due to aforementioned social conditions, again starting to be replaced by more collectivistic ones (Leburić and Tomić Koludrović 1996). At the end of the 1990s, however, young people started to exhibit individualistic tendencies again, and in the 2000s they are even more close to the individualized young adults in more modernized countries (Tomić Koludrović et al 2012). However, in the Croatian context, these individualistic tendencies seem to go hand in hand with the collectivistic ones, remnant from the period of socialism and the previous , which are still very high (Tomić-Koludrović 2007a).

To sum it up, can it be considered that the respondents are living in the social conditions of late modernity?

Although the attitudes of the respondents do reflect the particularities of the Croatian social context with the emphasis on the bigger concern regarding the survival values than expected from the postmaterial orientation, most of their answers indeed pointed towards the postmaterialist value orientation. I have taken this as the indication that in emerging adults currently living in Zagreb and either having finished tertiary education or currently pursuing it, I was indeed tapping into the segment of the Croatian youth which lives under the

conditions of late modernity. Thus I found it safe to assume that this part of the population was indeed susceptible to social processes of late modernity in general, and consequently, also to those in the area of relating.

## 4 PRACTICES OF FRIENDSHIP IN LATE MODERNITY

What I have already noticed early in the interviews was that a lot of respondents talked differently about friendship when they talked on the level of the discourse, and when they talked from their own experience. It became almost a rule that respondents would talk positively about their own friendships, but when the conversation was brought to the level of discourse, most of them had different and some of them even negative views on contemporary friendships. What this difference could be accounted for was one of the main challenging issues I faced during the analysis of data.

What helped me in resolving this dilemma was Ann Swidler's methodological toolbox, which on the epistemological level, linked individual action with cultural practices and again with the level of the discourse. Namely, Ann Swidler proposed that people use culture actively, instead of passively (Swidler 2001; 2005). It is not possible to treat culture as some abstract thing in people's minds; rather it is embedded into their organized actions (Swidler 2005, 85). Furthermore, people are not cultural dopes and the relationship between the individual action and culture is not as simple as in the story of culture shaping individual action. Rather, individuals choose tools among what culture gives them and use them to achieve their own goals, thus re-creating culture (Swidler 2001; 2005). This then constitutes a move from the view of culture as something static towards a theoretic notion of cultural practices (Swidler 2005). As Swidler puts it, "practices can be the routines of individual actors, inscribed in the ways they use their bodies, in their habits, in their taken-for-granted sense of space, dress, food, musical taste- in the social routines they know so well as to be able to improvise spontaneously without a second thought" (Sudnow 1978; Bourdieu 1976, 1984 in Swidler 2005, 83-84). Swidler also notes that "practices can also be trans-personal, imbedded in the routines organizations use to process people and things, in the taken-for-granted criteria that separate one category of person or event from another – 'art' from what is not art" (Becker 1982 in Swidler 2005, 84). However, she also argues that it is important to note that "whether 'practices refer to individual habits or organizational routines, a focus on practices shifts attention away from what may or may not go in actors' consciousness – their ideas or value commitments –and toward the unconscious or automatic activities embedded in taken-for-granted routines" (Swidler 2005, 84). Practices are thus not consciously chosen actions but operate more on a routine basis, which means they are usually un-thought, unconscious and automatic, which is also why they are usually hard to find in the minds of the actors (Swidler



2005, 83). This is why practices are best found on the impersonal level of “discourse“, since it permits meanings which constitute a cultural system to arise and without the focus put on the actor's actions since there is often discrepancy between beliefs and actions (Swidler 2005,84). This, I found also, is how the discrepancy in the friendship discourses of my respondents could be different from their actual experiences.

I thus found that the strategy of differentiating between different types of friends was something most of my respondents automatically did while talking about friendship. I decided to view this as the strategy of action linked to social conditions of late modernity; to the area of increased systemic differentiation (Luhmann 1986), of distancing of time and space (Giddens 1991), and thus of life spent in different localities and in condition of pluralisation of life-worlds (Castells 2001; Feld and Carter 1998; Gergen 2000; Wellman 1998). In such social conditions in which one's life is tied to different social contexts in different times and is rarely organized around one locality, this differentiation becomes a cultural practice. Since the late modern individual does not have sufficient amount of time or energy to socialize equally with everyone he or she meets, thus she or he differentiates among different types of relationships according to their temporal or spatial organization or the field around which they are organized.

Research questions I have posed in my disposition regarded friendship as an undimensional phenomenon, and this notion of friendship proved to be too simplistic for more complex social reality in late modernity. I did not find any evidence that Croatian emerging adults channel intimacy to different spheres such as familial or therapeutic ones, but have instead found that they differentiate between at least two kinds of friendships and then channel intimacy into only one of them. At least, two kinds of friendship relations I propose are ideal types and can in reality have certain variations, due to friendship practices being not only social, but also personal practices.

However, in regard to social practices of friendship, it was very early in the course of research that it became evident that my initial vision of friendships as undimensional phenomenon was too simple. My respondents usually differentiated between at least two ideal types of friendships, sometimes automatically, but also sometimes very consciously: “I have certain categories; I have friends organized in drawers. It is like a little drawer-unit, it has categories in drawer-units, first, second and third...[...] you know like, how much is someone important to you, how much someone will screw you over and you will give him or her another chance

because he/she is in the first drawer. Rarely transfers between the drawers happen...” (Respondent 15, 2012).

The first and relatively small area of friendships in terms of quantity is regarded as “real” or “close” friendship and differentiated from other areas of friendships, which are not perceived as “real” or “close”. Since most of my respondents unconsciously used the term “real”, I decided to use the term too, since it emphasized the difference between the characteristics and expectations of two types of friendships which I felt was often done automatically during interviews:

That which you've mentioned, that you have some friends which satisfy one needs, and others for other, what does it look like?

Well, I have some which satisfy all of them.

Ok, those are the best ones?

Yes, yes.

Mmhm...ok, and this second category?

This second, well, you go for coffee with them occasionally, you meet, you go out...I also share everything with them, but don't expect anything. From the close ones I expect. (Respondent 20, 2012)

Two types of friendships do portray different levels of social closeness which the respondents experience in them. The first type is considered ‘close’ friendship since it is closer to private than to public area of one's life. It is organized around the field of intimacy and specially attended to. The second type is seen as socially more far than ‘close’ friendship, since it is not organized around intimacy. Intimacy is, furthermore, mostly kept outside this second circle of friends, since the organization of the relationship lacks preconditions for its emergence. Spatial terms which were often used to describe it were: 'superficial', 'not as deep', 'non-close', all terms which designate the lesser level of engagement in relationship. They also seemed to be oriented towards the socializing aspect, rather than around the intimacy within relationship. Because of this, I decided to term those kinds of friendships ‘social friendships’. Metaphorically speaking, as one of my respondents picturesquely put it, social friendships are “friends for coffee and chat”:

What do you think, how do people today experience friendships? What do they mean when they say someone is their friend?

First thing, I think they experience it in a way that it is slowly lost...that sincere friendship. And friend [she uses derisive tone], well they think probably, in today's sense the person with which you will go for beer, coffee and similar. Those are some, I can differentiate now for example, male-male friendships, and they talk about girls, about videogames, this and that...[...] and with girls it crosses the boundaries of only gossiping, in my opinion...that is why I literally have one real friend, who I can confide in and all, and the others are friends for fooling around and like that, to go for coffee. Friendship for coffee and chat. Friendships on Facebook [she laughs]. (Respondent 2, 2011).

Since my respondents differentiated between the two types of friendships, different characteristics and dynamics applied when they talked about them. Thus, it soon became clear that in order to observe friendship practices in late modernity, the distinction between two characteristics and the organization of two types of relationships had to be made.

Before the beginning of the analysis of types of friendships in late modernity, it should be noted that some of these categories are not entirely new. It was Georg Simmel who, within his analysis of modernity, already divided types of personal dyadic social relationships according to closeness. According to the social closeness and the level of intimacy, he differentiated already between acquaintances and friends (Simmel 1950). While acquaintance for Simmel was a relationship organized around more superficial characteristics which are shown to the world and not oriented to the particularity of person, friendship for him was exactly the opposite; a relationship which requires the absolute level of psychological intimacy and in which a friend is loved for his particularity and totality (Simmel 1950, 325). However, Simmel argued that this kind of intimacy will become increasingly hard to achieve as social differentiation increases and as a modern person becomes too individualized from the early years of his or her life, and that the amount of energy oriented towards one person in its totality will become too high for the modern social conditions (Simmel 1950, 325). He also argued that a modern man will have too much to hide to achieve intimacy in its completeness (Simmel 1950, 325). Thus, he predicted, the amount of intimacy in differentiated friendships will be limited to the spheres included in a relationship, and aspects which are not included in the relationship won't be touched (Simmel 1950 326). Thus, Simmel correctly predicted the emergence of social friendships. However, what he did not predict was the extent of people's agency when it comes to using culture to their own advantage. This is also what I did not foresee in my initial research questions. While I was focused on cultural conditions of late modernity and their influence on young people's relationships, I did not predict that young

people will simply use a strategy of differentiating between different kinds of friendship relations. As Swidler argues, in using the culture to their own advantage, people deploy “strategies of action“, meaning that they use given cultural choices to solve a characteristic set of questions with characteristic way of solving problems (Swidler 2001, 86). However, it is important to emphasize that this problem solving is not necessarily rational and conscious, but works more as an incorporation of ways of thinking or evaluating the situation in one's behaviour or worldview, which then manifests as, for example, a certain type of organization of one's career or relationships (Swidler 2001). This is what I saw in young people's thinking about friendship during the analysis of the data from the interviews and focus groups. Instead of tending wholly towards differentiated friendships based on only one aspect of intimacy, young people deployed a strategy of action in which they started to differ between the ‘real friendship’, which they use as the safe area of psychological intimacy and social embedding and the ‘social’ friendship in which the emphasis is on the satisfaction of other needs which real friendships cannot satisfy due to highly differentiated social organization of late modernity.

The differentiation between two friendship-practices can be regarded as a strategy of action used to navigate highly differentiated and thus complex social world. After some time, this strategy of action becomes routinized and guides behaviour in this way, which then becomes evident when my respondents talk about their behaviour in certain kinds of friendship, which for them, is in a sense, ‘naturally understood’.

Since the strategy of action was to differentiate between two kinds of social practices of friendships, it was necessary to understand the differences between them.

Since my respondents would often put two types of friendship practices in opposition ‘naturally’ in their narrative, I decided to do the same in my research. To determine what these two social practices of friendships look like, I decided to first examine the essence of one, ‘real’ type of friendship and then use it as a backdrop against which I determine the difference of the social type of friendship. The task of research of real friendship was pursued phenomenologically, in order to locate the essentials of the relationships in terms of its characteristics, and was followed by interpretative framework which established the function of each of the characteristics in the organization of the relationship. At the later stage of research, characteristics and organization of social friendships were differentiated against the backdrop of the phenomenology of real friendships.

## 4.1 Phenomenology of real friendship

Friendship is one of the most complex social relationships<sup>4</sup>. One of the reasons why friendship is often not taken up as a subject in sociology is that it is, from all the relationships, considered to be the most personal one - the one which is the least anchored in some institutional or cultural norms, “the least institutionalized form of all relationships“ (Allan 1993, 5) or “institutionalized non-institution“ (Paine 1969, 514), although the more suitable term would probably be “non-institutionalized institution“. Namely, one of the most important characteristics of friendship in social terms is that it embeds individual in a society, based precisely on one's will. There is no other institution like this in human society which in such an existentially essential manner embeds one into the society, but without the society actively regulating the relationship. Similar to friendship in this sense are only romantic partnerships, however they are still prone to structural governing in terms of less visible practices of gender relating or visible structural governing such as marriage. In comparison with this, friendship is less institutionalized since its creation and maintenance seem to be entirely left out of the institutional control and a matter entirely left to the individual agency (Fischer 1982; O'Connor 1998). Friendship is subject to certain norms also found within friendship such as the representation of equality (Allan 1998). However, not much else in friendship forming and maintenance is regulated by society. Friendship rests on what seems to be entirely voluntary basis. This is often perceived and stressed by my respondents and linked to the value of friendship. Friendship thus seems to be a relationship which is significant in its voluntariness.

However, it is important to note that all of this concerns the contemporary friendship practices in Western societies, since cross-cultural friendship patterns do show variations in terms of the level of social regulation of the friendship relation (Hruschka 2010).

Even if friendship is generally considered to be dependent only on the free choice of individuals participating in it, there are some social patterns which can be discovered within it. Friendship is recognized as embedded in web of commitments and obligations which an individual has, and in this sense embedded also in the social world in which an individual lives (Allan 1998, 71). Structural sources also pose some limits on its formation and maintenance (Allan 1998; Feld and Carter 1998; Fischer 1982).

---

<sup>4</sup> Relationship is hereby defined as a series of interrelated interactions affecting each other retrospectively and with regard to future (Hinde in Blumstein and Kollock 1988)

Manifestations of these patterns also emerged within the interviews in this study. It is through their description and analysis that one can grasp how friendship is a somewhat paradoxical relationship which, although least socially regulated, is closely linked to social world and is extremely meaningful in embedding the individual into the social.

The category of time seems to be central when it comes to real friendship – the one which differentiates it from the social ones. Real friendships are usually experienced as long-term, and time is often linked to this concept; whether the past time in the sense of real friendship being long-term relationship which was there from childhood or school days, the future times in the sense of someone being there when one grows older or the present time which is enduring. How time is of relevance when it comes to real friendship is vividly described by the respondents in one of the focus groups, who termed real friendship as “a shared journey“, thereby indicating how sharing time with a friend is the essence of real friendship: “...that you, like, travel together, like that, you exchange all those things like, experiences, what is happening, what you'd want to happen, what happened and you're like...you want to know everything about each other and then you are like, close and you go, like, side by side... (Respondent 15)

You are like on some kind of shared journey [laughs] (Respondent 1)” (Focus group 3, 2012)

Thus, in order for real friendship to exist, it is required that two individuals have shared certain amount of time together. Similarly, Feld and Carter note that friendship rarely results from one-on-one encounter and is usually a by-product of the shared foci of activity in the past of two persons (Feld and Carter 1998). Under the shared foci of activity, Feld and Carter understand “any social, psychological, legal or physical entity around which joint activities are organized“(Feld and Carter 1998, 136). This can be linked to the research findings that friendship is only rarely formed through one-on-one encounter and mostly arises from structurally conditioned environments (Wellman, Carrington and Hall 1988). The study of East York communities in Toronto area showed that indeed only 2% of friendships arose from one-on-one encounters, while most significant friendships arose from structurally conditioned environments; 21% of friendships began as neighbours, while 18% began as co-workers (Wellman, Carrington and Hall 1988). Structurally conditioned environments, in this context, mean that the organization of shared temporalities within which friendships are formed is often societal in its source. Consequently, this leads to certain spatial zones of socializing within which friendships are often formed. It was exactly those images my respondents often

linked friendship with – social areas within which friendships were formed. These structural sources of friendship are what I decided to examine first.

#### 4.1.1 Experience of the social formation of friendship

When talking about things which defined real friendships for them, the respondents often mentioned places of their formation. Thus, these social sceneries are experienced as important in the meaning which friendship has for respondents. Mostly these were educational areas within which real friendships formed. The significance of these areas for friendship-formation is even consciously recognized by some of the respondents: “In that sense, educational institutions have a big role...except for some kind of knowledge that you acquire there are some social relations, you build yourself as a social person throughout education“ (Respondent 46, 2012)

Since emerging adults in my sample mostly do not work yet, the workplace is only rarely mentioned as the source of formation of real friendships. Neighbourhoods were mentioned in some cases.

Thus the respondents experience further foci of activity as meaningful when it comes to friendship:

##### **1. Physical foci of activity**

- **Shared educational background:**

Respondents often mention their educational backgrounds in the context of the formation of their closest friendships: “In the first place school and that...because it is first some kind of ...where you make new social contacts...and then again...school, yes, college and those activities, of some kind eventually...I mean...you meet most of your friends there.“ (Respondent 44, 2012)

Furthermore, scenes and memories from shared educational backgrounds often come to mind when they are asked which experiences have most influenced the subjective meaning of friendship they have; “I don't know what comes to my mind. Images, experiences. For example with friends, when we were in high school, we threw snowballs at each other...” (Respondent 5, 2011)

Since real friendship, as we will see later, requires time and shared experiences to be built, and young people in late modernity spend significant part of their everyday life of young age in educational facilities, the social environment of this kind functions as social pool within which friendships are often formed.

And indeed, when they talk about the formation of their long-term closest friendships, the respondents mostly talk about high school and/or college: “I have a lot of friends from musical high school, and we're like really close, even after five years and all the high school.” (Respondent 1, 2011)

However, there are also other social areas which are constitutional of the shared foci of activity and are mentioned in the context of friendship formation, such as camps, workshops or diverse courses outside of the obligatory education;

...a camp for high-school students in Germany...

Aha, those were friends from there?

No, they weren't, they were from here [Croatia], but I didn't know them 'till then...and I don't know, high school, college...they kind of built upon one another...people are connected by some weird connections so they are connected till today..

And like, friend of a friend?

Yes...and from the workplace. (Respondent 15, 2012)

Friendship is indeed a voluntary relation in the sense that one voluntarily chooses with whom to become a friend, based on multiple criteria—which will be discussed further. However, the source of the social constraints of its formation has to be sought in the previously mentioned fact that time is required for its formation. Thus it is mostly organized around shared activities which continue in time (Feld and Carter 1998; Wellman, Carrington and Hall 1988):

The closest ones in some kind of surrounding, meaning in elementary school, in high school...then in college. And then at work..while I worked. It means it was always like that...some kind of pattern...for example, I almost never met a friend while going out, and that we are close...I don't know, there are some people who I see at the same spots and we're ok, but I would never say that I've met anybody who became really good friend by going out. (Respondent 17, 2012)

What implications does this have?



One of the implications is that one's friends will often be similar in terms of level of education: "Mostly in elementary school...less in high school. And again now in college. Basically the biggest circle of people I meet is there so that, probably that is also the reason why I choose my friends from that circle" (Respondent 27, 2012)

This further leads to a greater chance of friends having similar level of employment, socioeconomic status and lifestyle. From this it can be inferred that friendship-formation is not free from the structural influences. Friends are not willingly chosen by one's social position but rather one's social position limits the pools from which the friendships can be chosen. Friendship is thus limited in the sense of constraints which the social context puts on the people available for its formation (Fischer 1982; O'Connor 1998). As one of the respondents in my study points out, it is not that he voluntarily chooses not to have friends with different social background, but the structural positioning of the foci of activity around which his friendships are organized forces him to do so:

But like, there are lot of people who I've met with only high school education...and it's not that I respect them less because of that and that I will be less of a friend...maybe circumstances forced me in that way...that since I went to college most of the people I've met ...and now at work...all of them have similar level of education, so ...it is not that I choose on that basis...but it simply happens that way...but like, there are lot of people which I've met who finished only high-school...and it is not that I respect them less for that or that I will be less of a friend...maybe the circumstances forced me to...in the circle in which I've been spending time people are more educated...either they are at college or they have finished one. (Respondent 46, 2012)

Although friendship is typically not thought of as a socially patterned relationship, it is still unlikely to occur between those who are perceived as different (Fischer 1982; O'Connor 1998). Fischer terms this tendency of individuals to associate with people who resemble themselves "homogeneity" (Fischer 1982, 179). His study of adults in Northern California found that friends resemble each other in terms of age, gender, socio-economic status and life-stage (Fischer 1982).

This tendency is further strengthened by the norm which Allan recognizes as important in friendship; the norm of equality-representation which asks of the participants that differences among them, if existing, are not too noticeable (Allan 1998). Some of my respondents also notice this:

...I think that people have to have, what I've said from the beginning, similar lifestyle, similar incomes, because Todorčić<sup>5</sup> doesn't hang out with the street sweeper [laughter] and maybe they'd click perfectly. [laughter] But no...they neither have the opportunity, nor do they have common topics, I suppose. So that is really the fact. You have to be somewhat similar to like...I think, at least.. that fairy tale stories do not exist...this one poor, that one successful and so on...(Respondent 17, Focus group 3, 2012)

To sum up, friendship is indeed a relationship which is not consciously chosen by the criterion of one's social position. However, the requirement of shared time and certain institutional surroundings such as educational facilities in which shared time is organized in late modernity are the sources of constraints of pools within which friends can be chosen. Thus, although a voluntary relationship, friendship is to some extent structurally conditioned.

- **Shared networks**

The second area of friendship formation which is also sometimes mentioned in the interviews is personal networks. The social actors get to know each other through having mutual friends and thus experience this as the area of potential friendship formation: "...my wider clique and clique of my acquaintances are very intertwined...this means that everybody knows everybody and they are very connected, through cycling, through doing yoga, I don't know, capoeira, everybody is connected through very few points of connection" (Respondent 13, 2011)

Fischer's study found that, among the adults in Northern California who have met through a third friend, this often further signifies similarity in the age between friends (Fischer 1982). However, among the respondents in my study, similar lifestyle is often mentioned when friendships are formed through personal networks: "Those parties...you know, you know most people who go to those parties, those are the safe faces, and then you somehow come to know each other through conversations or other friends...and then again it is like crab's children...you have one person you know and that person introduced you to another person and that one to the third...yeah, like crab's children" [he laughs]" (Respondent 7, 2011).

## **2. Non-physical foci of activity; shared social link**

The link that fosters creation of friendship can also exist in the form of what I've decided to term the "shared social link". This is similar to Feld and Carter's non-physical foci of activity around which friendship is organized (Feld and Carter 1998). However, I've decided to define

---

<sup>5</sup> Owner of the Agrokor concern and one of the wealthiest businessmen in Croatia

it more thoroughly. Shared social link is thus a common interest, experience or worldview around which then the friendship forms. My respondents often stressed the importance of the existence of this link, not only for the formation of friendship, but also for its maintenance:

I really seek people who share similar worldview with me in order to be a really close friends...because of..

Worldview? In the sense of values?

In the sense of a general worldview. When that does not exist, and there are some people who I am really fond of...and I'm emotional towards them and they towards me, but when that moment does not exist I don't feel like, I feel like something really important is missing in the relationship. (Respondent 11, 2011)

Why is this sociologically important? As we have previously noted, it was already Simmel who argued that the two-person relationship differs from a group by the lack of supra-individual structure (Simmel 1950). Friendship, as a voluntary relation which is not regulated by society, also lacks structural links which the relationships institutionally regulated, such as marriage, have. Thus shared worldview, interests or experiences serves as a social link in the relationship which lacks the structural ones; it provides a foundation for the formation of the two-person sociability.

- **Shared worldview**

Lots of my respondents stress the importance of the shared worldview with their friends, although there is an amount of disagreement about what the worldview consists of. In most cases a worldview is constituted by values which they consider important in life. Thus for some these are values in the sense of political or religious attitudes, but for most this is what they often call “a general perspective on life“:

...that you have same views on life, values...

Same views on life and values in what sense?

In the sense of, for example, the perspective on some important issues, like moral or political. Although that is not really necessary, you can differentiate regarding politics, I don't find that so important, but some other things, such as tolerance and...I don't know. How to say that? Some like, open worldview. (Respondent 20, 2012)

A worldview is thus, in the answers of my respondents, a general value-orientation in life. Why is this important in friendship? For one, shared worldview allows friendship to form more easily:

Respondent 23:...you feel that you can confide in someone a little bit more or somehow in the relationship up to date you see if someone suits you...

And why do you feel?

Respondent 23: Well...

Respondent 21: Well I am telling you, for me a predisposition is that a person has similar attitudes and opinions.

Respondent 23: Yes, that too, to see like, how they function.

Respondent 21: And then you naturally hang out more with that person.

Respondent 23: What I wouldn't even...attitudes, opinions. I would say maybe that people share same values.

Respondent 21: Well, yes.

Respondent 2: Because they maybe don't need to share the same taste in music or I don't know what, but some like, human values... (Focus group 2, 2012)

Thus, similar worldviews serve as a basis for shared interests which can be practiced together.

Secondly, it can be assumed that sharing of the same worldview creates a secure social arena for reflexivity. Blumstein and Kollock argue that one of the main elements of personal relationships is validation it provides for one's social identities and worldviews (Blumstein and Kollock 1988). Moreover, Giddens argues that the project of self-identity is linked to a pure relationship (Giddens 1991). From all this, it can be inferred that different worldviews between friends pose a threat to each other's worldview, and this further means – a threat to each other's identity. Thus they are not desirable: “...it is stupid when like, every topic is like, controversial, you practically cannot say anything...there are a lot of topics which, if you don't want to fight, if you want like, have a normal coffee with someone...then the choice of topics is practically very narrowed [smiles]...because whatever happens, if you want to comment it, you have this opposing attitudes.” (Respondent 34, 2012)

Indicative of this threat are experiences of some of the respondents who had the experience of friendship-breaking over the differences in worldviews:

It was because of the religion. So, a friend...it happened at the college...actually, during college...so, a friend who wasn't from biology, we were very good through high school and so on...aaa...and we basically stopped hanging out...because of my fairly negative attitude, actually I wouldn't say negative...challenging attitude...

And she is a believer?

And she...is a fanatic, yes, yes. And so, I was the embodied devil who drew her away from the faith...I mean...

So would you then say that similar religious or political attitudes and so on are important in friendships, or?

It seems that they are, yes. That surprised me. I mean, one should be a friend with a person with whom you agree, except that he/she suits you...in most of those things because otherwise...it is, in a way, a time bomb. (Respondent 30, 2012)

As is evident from this example, friendship was unable to continue since the differences in worldview challenged the identity of both of the participants in the relationship.

Moreover, shared worldview is experienced as a manifestation of a personal choice in the construction of relationship, consistent with one's self-determination:

...when I choose close friends, or in other words, when I form relationships with them, I would hardly be in a relation with someone who is in some kind of significant conflict with one of my important determinants.

When we are already discussing the topic of a significant conflict...are similar attitudes important to you in friendship, let's say political?

Absolutely, absolutely. I think I couldn't be a friend with someone who has attitudes which I can in no way support...or maybe, I could, with someone who has attitudes which I cannot support, but not with someone whose attitudes I find fundamentally wrong. (Respondent 41, 2012)

However, some of my respondents do not categorically refuse the possibility of being befriended with someone who has different worldview, but they nevertheless notice that most of their friends have a similar one: "Yes, it is important mmm...I mean, differences in attitudes do not necessarily mean that, like, friendship won't happen...but then, among most of

my friends I see that we really have similar ones, some political ,some religious, some moral ones...” (Respondent 38, 2012)

In general, the importance of similar worldview or of sharing political/religious beliefs in friendship also seems to be determined by the degree to which a particular kind of worldview is important to the respondent himself or herself. For example, th respondents who find the areas of certain political beliefs to be important parts of their identity, claim they would find it hard to be friends with someone of the opposite political orientation: “Well, I study politology so those kinds of things matter to me...political attitudes are...important to me...political, religious not....I can accept all that....but political, I couldn't be a friend with a right-oriented person. Like, really good friend, I couldn't be...[she laughs] I can't get over that.” (Respondent 33, 2012)

For other respondents this doesn't have any role in friendship and they are proud of differences between them and their friends: “I have friends which are...diametrically opposite than I am regarding that question, and regarding both politics and religion, really very much...but I am really glad that it does not stand in the way of our friendship. And that they were also open towards me, though we are different and vice versa. About that I am really very proud in friendships, that I have different friends...in that sense.” (Respondent 28, 2012)

There was also one respondent who claimed not to mind if a friend has different worldview than his or hers, insofar he/she does not impose his/her belief: “When someone imposes that on me I don't accept it very easily, but...what attitudes someone himself has, that is all the same to me.” (Respondent 43, 2012)

Similar worldview is more relevant when it comes to real, intimate friendships. When it comes to more superficial friendships, my respondents are not that strict: “...the fact is that I never really have and couldn't be friends with a skinhead or someone from HČSP [extremely right oriented political party in Croatia](she laughs)...I mean, I can on a superficial level...” (Respondent 39, 2012)

Thus it seems that sharing the worldview in friendship is as important to the respondent as the level to which a particular worldview is related to his/her identity. It is thus generally not a precondition for friendship, but can serve as shared social link in forming and maintenance of one.

- **Shared interests**

Common interests between individuals are also often experienced as a foundation for the establishment of friendship: “Some, like, similar persons...maybe in thinking, maybe not even that, I love different people, but basically you seek friends through parties, through the same music, through clubs you go to...” (Respondent 14, 2011)

Shared interests are not seen as a necessary precondition for the friendship forming. However, they are seen as a link which fosters further socializing around the activities of common interests or conversation about them:

It is good to have some similar interests in the sense of fun...like, let's say, places to go out to, music for example most often, some interests in the sense of some cultural for example...cinema...I mean, it is not necessary but it is desirable to have as much some kind of shared themes...

Why is it desirable?

Well, to have more common topics for your conversations, so, and some kind of similar deliberations... (Respondent 44, 2012)

This, then, organizes a shared activity in time, and from this friendships evolve more easily.

Thus, shared interests serve as a psychological basis around which shared experiences and activities in time can be organized. This is then what leads to easier friendship formation: “...you don't emphasize and you don't choose people based on that, but somehow there is still present that some, let's say some intellectual mind level I mean, you know...it is easier to talk to someone and befriend them, find some similar interests...with someone who is in your social stratification, Parsons and all that... so who is somehow *al pari* to you.” (Respondent 37, 2012)

Some of the respondents also stress the importance of similar interests for the maintenance of the friendship:

..to have similar interests...similar situations...

In what sense?

If you don't have similar problems...very fast that friendship won't hold, or at least it's been my experience till now... (Respondent 21, 2012)

When interests of the participants in friendship suddenly start to diverge, this can endanger the friendship since the foundation of the two-person sociability is threatened: “...with me it

was the fact that I have kids, and my, from my friends nobody had kids in that moment and it was...mmm..for example, someone's problem of not getting ten hours sleep a day, I find it stupid, if I didn't get three hours of sleep a day, like, sorry, that irritates me. So you split up...you split up because you simply start looking at things differently..." (Respondent 21, 2012)

Choosing similar people for friends is also linked to a voluntary basis of friendship. Since friendship is experienced as a voluntary relation, similar interests are important to the respondents in the sense of exercising the personal agency in the selection of their social circles: "In friendship you choose people precisely by that principle, that means, you choose people based on how many common grounds you share and it is normal that it is some kind of a more normal relation where you choose people who suit you, and not the one in which you have to put up with the shortcomings which really don't suit you." (Respondent 14, 2011)

This is the quality of the friendship which is often mentioned in the context of contrast with the pre-given nature of ascribed relationships, such as familial ones. It will be described later how this contributes to the sense of self-affirmation of the late-modern individual.

- **Shared experiences**

Shared experiences are often mentioned as important in the context of forming a real friendship. In the answers of my respondents there is a strong emphasis on the temporality. The category of temporality is seen as crucial in the distinction between real, close and more superficial kinds of friendships. The temporal organization of relationship is crucial in forming real friendships. This means that sharing long temporal periods or intensively spent shorter temporal periods is seen as a prerequisite for the formation of a real intimate friendship:

Respondent 23:...it means that investing is important, how much you invest...it means, you have to invest in that also as much as what not, if you want to be good at something.

Investing of what?

Respondent 21: Well, time...

Respondent 23: Yourself, time...and simply, the effort.

So like, time is important for friendship?



Respondent 23: It's an important factor.

Respondent 28: I think that it is. It is. There are people with who you experience certain life moments, and there are people and there are people with whom you drink coffee and then talk about those life moments in which you were with somebody else. [...]

So in order to become a friend with someone you have to spend time together?

Respondent 21: Yes.

A lot of time, or?

Respondent 28: I think that yes.

Respondent 21: I think so.

(...)

Respondent 3: I want to say that time is a relative factor...sometimes for friendship a lot of time is needed, and sometimes you are good...

Respondent 21: ....fast with someone, yes.

Respondent 3: Fast, yes, sometimes when you are with someone...

What does fast mean, fast? I mean, how much time is fast?

Respondent 21: I mean, like, in six months you can become a super-super friend with someone (...) I mean, is it important that you spend a lot of time together or like...for example, six months...you know, like, can you become a friend with someone after one coffee you had together, three coffees...

Respondent 21: You can't, not after one coffee.

Respondent 3: I'd say that that depends on the intensity of socializing a great deal...the time you spent together, because again that...that is it, it is a little specific, but these friends from international level, very good friends, when you'd sum it up we all together spent maybe two, three weeks together...that was throughout a year...

But it was intensive?

Respondent 3: But it was extremely intensive, yes.

Respondent 21: You exchanged a lot of experience...went through it together.

So, either time or intensity is needed?

Respondent 3: Yes.

Respondent 23: So effort and time.

Respondent 21: Yes, I agree with that.

Respondent 23: Like, a cumulative amount of time.

Respondent 21: Like in Big Brother house, for example.

Respondent 28: I don't agree with that, because I think that a friend in fact has to spend certain life moments and situations of yours with you.

Mmhm.

Respondent 28: Someone who you were two weeks on a conference with when you were a student, you probably won't call him, like, on the baptizing of your third child, get it, like in ten, fifteen, twenty years...(Focus group 2, 2012)

Thus, although my respondents differentiate in their opinions about whether friendship can also be formed through shorter intensive socializing due to their personal experiences, they generally recognize time as important in the forming of friendship. This is in accordance with Giddens's claim that time is not merely an environment in which the elapsing of social events occurs, but that it is constitutive of the forms of social activity (Giddens 1987). In this case, the temporal organization of a relationship differentiates between the real and the other kinds of friendship; it takes time to form real friendships, because time allows the experiences to be shared. Friendships which are considered less close usually lack precisely this quality:

Like, on Facebook I have 800 friends because, I say, I was active in that organization and those are people from all parts of the world...and they are my friends, and I don't know, when I come to Istanbul, I always get in touch with them...I get in touch with those who are from Istanbul, we sit for a coffee, we are glad to do that, we talk, we always have something to laugh at and we know each other...but we don't spend enough time together. What is in my opinion also important for friendship, as much as we cannot see each other for six months and be great again, I think that for, like, real friendships it is nevertheless important that people spend time together. (Respondent 3, Focus group 2, 2012)

The time and the shared experiences which it enables are also linked to the forming of trust which allows real friendship to form, which will be explained later. For now, it suffices to

note that time is experienced as that factor which allows the organization of friendship through shared experiences. These then constitute the basis for friendship:

Respondent 30: Some experience that you have with that person...so, like...I cannot imagine that...with someone in order to become best friends, in order to know everything about each other, so...it's something that comes with time...like, with events in life...

Respondent 42: I also think that time is somehow...

Respondent 30: ...it means, not what he or she says to you, but you see him or her in situations...

Respondent 42: Yes.

Respondent 30: How he or she acts, how he or she reacts...

Aha, ok, others..Do you agree with that, or?

Respondent 44: Yes...although clicking with someone is more like a basis for friendship.

Respondent 30: Yes, but would you call him a friend? I mean that person who...

Respondent 44: Well after one night I wouldn't, hardly [laughs]... that for sure...

Respondent 30: You still need some time to be able to call him or her a friend.

Respondent 44: Well yes. Time. Ok.

And you never had an experience in which you've clicked with someone and become a good friend, like in a month?

Respondent 24: I have such a friend from college...but that's because we spent...

College-friend.

Respondent 24:E, that's because we spent 24 hours a day together because of college and then the time was really intensively spent...

So it's still time. If it's not longer time period then it has to be intensively spent together, or?

Respondent 44: No, I don't know. For example, I have a friend I've met at a certain festival, it lasted for like, two days. And we stayed in contact, like, she's not from here...we met at a different country...and each of us lives in her own country. But we're in contact through Skype and like, we're really, very good friends.

Mmhm. And how much did it take you to become really good friend, like instantly?

Respondent 44: Well...I mean the communication started instantly, that communication continued and with time it became more and more intimate...

Ok, but would you say like, right after that festival, that you were good friends?

Respondent 44: Well I mean, the click happened so, like, to continue it and to...and the wish for trust and what not...I mean, it definitely takes time to evolve, yes.“ (Focus group 1, 2012)

In spite of the possibility of feeling an instant resonance with someone, time is still considered of the essence for forming a real friendship. Namely, as further on will be shown, real friendships require intimacy and trust which can evolve only through time and shared experiences:

Ok, but what about let's say, those situations when you become friends with someone, for example, like you've said, you spend two weeks on some kind of conference and I don't know, you don't see each other after that but later you maybe see each other again...

Respondent 28: Well yes, it's ok, I don't know...you visit him or her if you want or he/she comes to you, if you want. So, you want to maintain it, but in order to maintain it you still have to have a certain kind of immediate physical contact.

That means that real friendships should...?

Respondent 28: I find it very important, yes.

So it's again the time you spend together.

Respondent 28: Yes, in some life situations. That means, not the time where you write to each other on Facebook but shared time where you..

Respondent 21:...live through...

Respondent 28: ...live through situations, yes. Some shared experience. (Focus group 2, 2012)

Giddens argues that what he terms “shared histories“ are crucial for the forming of pure relationships in late modernity because they function as a substitute for the social link of the shared social position (Giddens 1991, 97).

It is interesting to note that the claim that friendships are formed through shared history or experiences reveals another dimension of the paradoxical nature of friendship, when linked to its apparent voluntary nature. If friendships are established through shared experience, this again lessens the individual agency in the choice of a friend. Namely, given that one has to

spend time in a form of shared experiences with a potential friend, this implies that individuals, with whom one is forced to spend time in the already mentioned institutional contexts such as the educational ones, will have a greater chance of becoming one's friends. This then again points to the direction of the constraints which the structure puts on the formation of friendships:

...experiences bring people of very different profiles closer, very different opinions, characters, personalities, values, attitudes, interest, goals, and those are all some kind of secondary categories when it comes to that that somewhere some circumstance brought you to a situation that you hang out intensely together in the long-term....that is something which cannot be planned...[...] that friendships in reality arise spontaneously in the flow of time and common experiences which it brings. (Respondent 47, 2012)

Shared experiences or shared history serve as an area of a more passive establishment of trust, whereas in friendships which are formed in shorter time periods trust has to be won more actively: "I grew up with her...so sincerity and trust were always there...I mean you get what I want to say...with people I have to earn trust, but with her I didn't...it went through development..." (Respondent 29, 2012)

In friendships formed in this kind of way the aforementioned shared social links such as common worldview or interests become less important, since the history of shared experiences takes over the function of establishing of the two-person sociability:

...you don't have to be a priori very compatible with them, but as long as there is some kind of time which covers your common experience and brings some kind of shared points of references of your association those are securities of some kind of a lasting friendship and closeness and that is what brings you together...that interests and values and attitudes and those kind of like, categories for which you would usually expect to bring people closer, that in long-term friendships they simply stop being important, or in other words, get covered by some kind of layer of shared experience which then makes people mutual friends. (Respondent 47, 2012)

Thus, we could say that shared histories in the sense of shared experiences in longer periods of time or intensively shared shorter periods of time have the function of forming the two-person sociability.

However, it is because of the increased differentiation of modern society that Georg Simmel already in the advent of modernity proposed that friendships such as these are going to become increasingly hard to maintain as the social conditions of modernity advance (Simmel

1950). And indeed, in late modernity, the process of pluralisation of the social world, in the sense of increased mobility and diversification of interests and life-paths, is much more emphasized than in early modernity. This then means that an increasing number of individuals do not spend their life tied to one community or locality. This leads to the pluralisation of social life-worlds and multiplicity of experiences on a daily basis (Giddens 1991; Gergen 2000; Wellman, Carrington and Hall 1988). This is at the same time both the condition and the consequence of much more complex differentiation of society than in early modernity.

In such circumstances, if friendship is based only on shared history of experiences which are not continuously renewed, its basis can become endangered. One of my respondents describes precisely this, how her friendship based on common history slowly weakened under the influence of the aforementioned factors:

I should start with my best friend, that is, now ex best friend...with whom I had extremely intense relationship. Like for good, I don't know, seven years...

Ex?

Yes, because little by little that distance influenced it, and then some different interests and ways...

Aha, she stayed in Koprivnica?

She went to study to Opatija and she went back to Koprivnica when she graduated. But we had one semester of life together....and like, first semester of life together with my friend was terrible...awful.

Yes? In what sense?

In the sense that we did not get along at all, we argued constantly, we both had some things which didn't have anything to do with it..I don't know, I had a crisis with a boyfriend, with this and that, and she had crisis with the college...and we did not help each other at all, we just made it more difficult for each other..we were like, ok, we'll get to that where it is great, where we live together and hang out together...but that simply never happened. And she moved away.

Aha, ok...and did that in some way influenced your opinion about friendship?

Well yes, because I realized we do change as people...and if my best friend on whom I count 100% becomes a different person, together with me...that maybe we don't have so much in common anymore. I get it that that love between us will always be present, but she also has some different

interests now, I have different interests, and now we came to the point where she extremely bores me sometimes... (Respondent 13, 2011)

The effect which social conditions of late modernity potentially have on friendship will be elaborated in more detail later.

- **‘Click’**

Lots of my respondents mention a phenomenon of initial 'click' when talking about the formation of friendship. 'Click' does not fit into the category of 'foci of activity' since it is described in terms of emotional and/or cognitive resonance between a potential friends or friends, which is felt in energetic terms. It does, however, constitute a predisposition for the formation of a shared social link: "...like, to click with someone is more like some kind of basis for friendship" (Respondent 44, Focus group 1, 2011)

‘Click’ which my respondents describe can be defined as a non-verbal affect transmission:

Some kind of vibe...how to explain..

Vibe?

Something you cannot explain between people. With someone you click instantly, like in girl-guy...guy, girl, it's like that with friends also...now what that is...is it character, is it what he's like as person...you know, if you are compatible, in that sense. (Respondent 37, 2012)

It is often described as felt instantly in the first moments of communication with a friend, but it is considered to be a predisposition for the formation of friendship rather than the manifestation of it: "There is instantly a sort of a beginner click, same as with a relationship or something. But truthfully...I think that for a real notion, at least my notion of a friendship, it still takes a little more." (Respondent 41, 2012)

A 'click' can in general be regarded as the predisposition for the establishment of emotional/cognitive resonance within a relationship between certain two persons. Randall Collins argues that in order for an interaction ritual to be successful, mutual entrainment of emotion and attention is required, which then produces shared emotional/cognitive experience (Collins 2004, 48). Thus the 'click' as the predisposition ensures that two-person sociability which is to be built has the potential for the series of successful interaction rituals. It can be regarded as the initial sense of the prospective successful interactions with a potential friend in the future.

However, a 'click' does not end upon the establishment of the relationship. In fact, the need of continuing of this emotional/cognitive resonance with a friend further throughout friendship is also sometimes described by the respondents: "I mean to me it's foremost, I somehow, when I meet people, I either love them or not...regardless of their...maybe some people are similar to me when it comes to interests and I could spend more time with them, but like, if their soul does not suit mine..." (Respondent 6, 2011)

Thus a 'click', as an emotional and cognitive resonance serves a basis for the long-term emotional connection between friends: "I think that that certain sort of feeling, which is not entirely on a some kind of a rational level, is really important in friendship..I don't agree about lot of things with my...mmm, close people. There is a certain emotional moment which is important." (Respondent 12, 2011)

#### 4.1.2 Characteristics of real friendship; maintenance of friendship

The aforementioned characteristics were important mostly in the sense of friendship formation or its dissolution. What about friendship as social relationship itself? What are the characteristics which a relationship needs to have in order to be recognized as friendship?

The respondents distinguish between what they call a 'real' friendship and other kinds of friendships in their friendship discourse. 'Real' friendships are generally recognized as limited in number and long-termed.

What other characteristics does a relationship has to have in order to be considered a real friendship and distinguished from superficial kinds of friendships? I attempted to phenomenologically approach the essence of friendship as social relationship. This was done by bracketing the common knowledge of friendship and instead asking my respondents what constituted this phenomenon for them; what characteristics the relationship had to have in order to be recognized as real friendship. Following this, I probed the essence of each of the characteristics, which I then tried to combine with interpretative sociological knowledge in order to better grasp their function within friendship.

On the analytical level, it can be distinguished between the normative characteristics of friendship, which are the principles upon which a friendship as a relationship is based and a substantive ones which manifest itself as a content of friendship. **The normative**



characteristics found to regulate friendship behaviour are the further: *personal choice, trust, sincerity, benevolence, reciprocity, reliability and effort*. **The substantial** characteristics experienced by the respondents are *intimacy, possibility of authenticity, understanding, reflexivity, support and fun*.

However, in the narrative of this chapter I do not follow this order of itemization, since I tried to capture the process of real friendship and describe characteristics in the order of their importance and mutual connection.

- **Personal agency**

A friendship is a relationship which rests upon a personal agency to a greater extent than any other relationship. There are, however, two types of personal agency I have found to be important in the formation and maintenance of friendship:

### **1. Personal choice**

For a relationship to be recognized as friendship there has to be the element of free will in choosing a friend. Many respondents emphasized the element of a personal choice when talking about friendship: "...friends are people you've chosen by yourself" (Respondent 39, 2012)

Although the formation of friendship is to some extent limited in the sense of the aforementioned social pools from which one chooses friends, the choice of a particular person is nevertheless considered voluntary: "...people with whom you are not forced to be, but you want to be in their company and you are sincerely invested in their life..." (Respondent 46, 2012)

The respondents also often contrast the element of personal choice in friendship with the pre-giveness of ascribed relationships such as familial ones: „Friends you chose, while family is family - that is something which is given to you. In friendships, if a certain person does not suit you, you'll avoid her..." (Respondent 3, 2011)

Thus, the element of free choice is important not only because of the choice, but also because of the possibility of not choosing that particular person – but nevertheless choosing it. This is what gives each party in friendship a particular value which is not tied to one's objective

social position<sup>6</sup>: „...friendship is, of course, a non-formal relation, but also a non-obligational relation...consequently, you choose friends because you want to and because it suits you..“ (Respondent 28, 2012)

As already mentioned, friendship is recognized in sociological theory as particular in the sense that it is the most non-institutionalized relationship (Allan 1993; Paine 1969). It is not an ascribed relationship, but is instead dependable entirely upon a personal agency, both in its formation and dissolution. In this sense, it is to a great extent freed from structural constraints in the sense of the influences of one's objective social position. However, paradoxically, precisely because of not being dependent on one's objective social position, friendship influences one's subjective social position in the sense that it gives participants psychological feeling of value in being chosen and choosing someone for a friend: „...I have the feeling that other things in life are somehow forced on you, more or less, but friends, like, you choose them on your own, to make your life more beautiful.“ (Respondent 17, 2012)

This gives friendship as a social relationship unique opportunity for social embeddedness of the individual, not tied to structural factors, but which nevertheless influences one's experience of embeddedness – one's subjective social position. This is what makes friendship different from other social relationships; it makes it possible to embed an individual into a certain form of sociability without an institutionalized or ascribed foundation. In other words, it embeds an individual into the society, but at the same time this is done beyond the system of social stratification. However, this is again valid only for Western friendships, since there is cross-cultural evidence that in some cultures, such as the Kwoma in Papua New Guinea or Serbia, there are ascribed forms of friendships in the sense of inherited friendships (Hruschka 2010). This form of 'friendship' exists also within Croatian culture, in the form of godparent relationship (Croatian: 'kumstvo'), a relationship similar to friendship which is inherited from parents.

Why is the personal choice important for friendship? Eva Illouz argues that choice is a cultural hallmark of modernity which embodies two other cultural principles of modernity; rationality and autonomy (Illouz 2011). In this sense, she argues, personal choice is one of the strongest cultural instances for shaping of the modern self (Illouz 2011). In this sense, friendship with its emphasis on personal choice is indeed a modern experience. However,

---

<sup>6</sup> 'Social positions' are here and further in the text used in the sense of person's position in the social hierarchy, according to Kristina Lindemann. Objective social position is one's position in the social stratum. Subjective social position depends both on the objective social position in social hierarchy, and on how people experience society, their comparison with the position of others and the anticipation of their position in the future. Social behavior and attitudes, argues Lindemann, originate from their subjective social position rather than from their objective status (Lindemann 2007).

from my interviews I have sensed that choosing a particular person for a friend gives the respondents the feeling of autonomy and the ability to shape one's life in accordance with one's own choices, out of the structural social constraints:

Respondent 26: When everybody is criticizing you, for example...

Respondent 41: Yes.

Respondent 26: ...they will give you the support, like, go on, you can do it!

Respondent 41: Yes.

Respondent 26: If I decide to play tamburitza on the main square, then ok – I have the support, I'll do it. That's important.

Respondent 41: Yes.

Respondent 26: That you are not alone in that.

Respondent 41: Yes.

Aha, ok. Others?

Respondent 13: I think so, yes. Your decision might clash with someone else's ideas, but friends don't have the power to say to you – no, that's not in my interest, don't do that. Family has that sort of power to say – that is not good for us and thus also not for you...but it's the same to a friend whether you decided this or that...unless it is something like, extremely bad, 'I will go to another country without any plans', then a friend will tell you realistically, but he will support you if you succeed to explain yourself in anything. 'I want it now because – ' is enough to a friend.

Respondent 50: For example, if the family is built as a certain unit. You want to detach yourself and it is considered to be cultural, like, egoism...and then a friend is a first person who will give you a support to evolve as a person. Get it, in depth. So the support on that level...that detachment from family, friends are very important for that detachment from family. (Focus group 5, 2013)

In this sense a personal choice does not rest on the process of the rational decision-making, but is instead intrinsically connected to the possibility of authenticity which certain friendship provides through acceptance and support. Moreover, a personal agency in deciding with whom to establish a relationship of friendship enables the prospective establishment of sincerity within that friendship: „... you choose your friends by yourself so it's kind of contradictory to lie to them at all...“ (Respondent 17, 2012)

Thus, if friendship provides the area of authenticity and sincerity, this further means that it provides the social area where one is accepted for one's own sake, and not for the sake of characteristics determined by the social stratum. Thus, in this way, friendship as a relationship based on a personal choice contributes to one's self-determination as a social actor and as a creator of one's own life, which can, as we have seen before, be regarded as a cultural hallmark of late modernity.

However, the founding of friendship upon a personal choice also has its downfalls. Namely, that further means that it is a relationship not only built upon one's personal decision, but that personal agency is also crucial when it comes to its dissolution. It is recognized by the respondents that, while ascribed relationships such as familial ones cannot be dissolved, friendship has the potential of dissolution which is entirely dependent on one's personal will. However, the maintenance of friendship in spite of the possibility of its dissolution on either side at any moment gives friendship as a relationship an additional value: „In friendship you choose precisely by that principle, meaning, you choose people by how much common grounds you have and it is normal that this is a normal relationship where you choose people that suit you, and don't have to put up with people who really don't suit you.“ (Respondent 13, 2011)

Real friendships are thus social relationships based on a personal choice to the extent unlike any other social relationship. It could be argued though, that in their foundation grounded on personal choice and the potential for embeddedness not tied to one's objective social position friendships are similar to romantic relationships in late modernity, which are also based on a personal choice. In this sense, Giddens considers both romantic relationships and friendships to be pure relationships, based entirely on what relationship gives to parties involved and not on external regulations (Giddens 1990, 1991). However, I would argue that friendships are to a greater extent based on free will than romantic relationships, since the latter also include physical attraction. As we have seen, friendship does indeed also include an element of attraction – what was termed as 'click' - but this element of attraction is qualitatively different from the one in romantic relationships. Attraction in romantic relationships includes a physical component, and it can thus be argued that they are to less extent based on the rationale of the free will – even if entering the romantic relationship is a matter of personal agency in late modernity. In this way they differ from friendships. Thus, friendship can be regarded as a particular kind of social relationship which is based on a personal choice more than any other.

## 2. Personal effort

Another important feature of contemporary friendships is the effort. The effort can be regarded as a personal choice of investing into a relationship with a certain person. Thus, it is a personal choice as dynamically manifested in the context of the maintenance of friendship. It is often emphasized as either important generally in friendships or important in the context of certain social situations which put a strain on the friendship:

Respondent 23: That's exactly what I wanted to say, this...that means investing is important, the much you invest in it, the better it will be....that means, you have to invest in it as much as in anything else, if you want to be good at it.

Investing what?

Respondent 21: Well, time....

Respondent 23: Yourself, time...and simply, effort. (Focus group 2, 2012)

Why is effort important? Through effort one proves that one is committed to friendship. Commitment is, according to Giddens, a crucial aspect of pure relationships in that it replaces the external anchors of personal relationships in pre-modern social settings (Giddens 1991, 92). A committed person recognizes tensions intrinsic to pure relationship but is nevertheless willing to take a chance in it, accepting that the only rewards will be the ones coming from a relationship (Giddens 1991, 92). Effort is indeed among the respondents often emphasized as an intervening condition upon which a social actor decides whether a certain friendship is worth continuing: "...yeah, but like, if someone is extremely important to me, then I'll find...I'll really find time, I'll like, find time. But, if I don't recognize the same effort from the other side, like, I don't have time, period, we don't have anything to talk about..." (Respondent 17, Focus group 3, 2012)

- **Trust**

The respondents find the trust to be one of the two most important characteristics of friendship, other being intimacy. Only in the presence of trust, they claim, can a relationship be recognized as a real friendship.

Trust is, according to Giddens, an intrinsic mechanism which regulates a pure relationship, which has no external social holders in the form of obligation or duty (Giddens 1991, 6).

Giddens argues that trust is closely interrelated with intimacy in pure relationships of late modernity; when it is won, it constitutes the basis for intimacy (Giddens 1991).

This was confirmed by the respondents in my study. They indeed see trust as the precondition of intimacy:

Respondent 21: Well, you won't confide in someone if you think...if you know that that person will say what you've told him to everyone tomorrow. And it is important to you that he doesn't tell. That means, if you don't have trust, I also don't think there will be intimacy...unless you want him to say it to everyone [laughs]

Others?

Respondent 3: ...I agree that the predisposition of intimacy is trust, so, if I don't trust someone I like, won't tell some things about my family or what I'm thinking about or I don't know what, some details.“ (Focus group 2, 2012)

Trust is seen as a precondition of intimacy since it serves as a security mechanism against private details of one's life shared within friendship being shared outside of the relationship:

Respondent 42: You have to first trust someone in order to accomplish some intimacy.

Respondent 44: Well yes.

Because?

Respondent 42: Because you won't share your intimate stuff with someone and won't expect from them to keep it in the circle of friends if you don't have trust in him.

Why?

Respondent 42: Well...in order to protect yourself, I guess?

Aha, in order to protect yourself. In what sense?

Respondent 42: Well, so that a wide circle of people doesn't find out some confidential information about yourself.

Respondent 7: This already enters the psychology, this question. Because one always a priori protects oneself, regardless of a situation, which means, you cannot stumble upon someone without protecting yourself.

Respondent 44: Yes.

Respondent 42: Yes.“ (Focus group 1, 2012)

This finding is in line with Giddens's argument that trust in late modernity serves as a form of knowledge that the other is committed and does not harbour antagonism towards the other, which offers security in the absence of external regulation of the intimate relationships (Giddens 1990, 1991). Marek Kohn generally defines trust as “an expectation, or disposition to expect that another party will act in one's interest“ (Kohn 2008, 9). Thus, trust in friendship can be defined as a belief that a friend will act by having one's best interest in mind. This then serves as a protective mechanism against the risks inherent in relationships in which there are no external societal regulations. Giddens sees trust as “the balance of autonomy and mutual disclosure“, leading to “knowing others' personality and being able to rely on regularly eliciting certain sorts of desired responses from other“ (Giddens 1991, 96). Diego Gambetta defines trust as “the particular level of probability with which an agent or group of agents will perform a particular action, both before he can monitor such action (or independently of his capacity ever to be able to monitor it) and in context in which it affects his own behaviour“ (Gambetta 1998, 218).

My respondents experience trust as the implicit social agreement made between friends not to disclose the intimate details shared within friendship with those outside the relationship:

Trust. That is most important.

Trust in what sense?

Well, that when you say something to someone in confidence, to your like best friend or female friend, that they keep it to themselves....and not like, keep it to yourself and then it goes around in 68 circles... (Respondent 29, 2012)

On the level of behaviour, my respondents see trust in the wider sense of commitment to the protection of friend's intimacy and interests: “That to a friend...you can say things which are really intimate [...] and that he will keep it safe [...] that is trust in that case. That you know that it will not be found out by I don't know who...” (Respondent 4, 2011)

This is what the respondents sometimes name ‘loyalty’; which seems to be trust manifested in the behaviours which prove trustworthiness of a friend: “...That a friend doesn't betray you at the first chance he gets.“ (Respondent 32, 2012)

Trust is also linked with acceptance; for an establishment of trust there has to be a sense of acceptance from a friend: “You won't be intimate with someone for whom you think will judge you after that...that you don't trust him...that there is no trust“ (Respondent 24, Focus group 5, 2013)

On the level of the intention behind the behaviour, trust is established through gaining of faith in friend's benevolence towards oneself: “... I believe that you don't do it because you are selfish but...it is literally based on trust, because you can find an altruistic touch and selfish touch in everything...[...] In general, I have to believe that you do it because of the altruistic reasons, and that is it. And you have to believe [that I do it], because if you don't – goodybye!“(Respondent 24, 2012)

How does trust evolve?

Both Kohn and Giddens argue that trust has to be won in a sense of certain behaviour in time that proves one to be trustworthy (Giddens 2001; Kohn 2008). My respondents also argue that trust is something which evolves through time. The element of temporality is experienced as an important factor in the establishment of trust because it allows the sharing of experiences with a potential friend, which further gives social actor the opportunity to observe a friend in different situations and contexts:

Respondent 24: I personally have most trust in people who I grew up with...these are my closest friends, let's say....although, there are also those who are not that, it means, we don't have such long-term relation of friendship, but...

Ok, and how do you establish that trust?

Respondent 30: With time. (Focus group 1, 2012)

Diego Gambetta claims that trust is possible only in situations in which the other social agent in a relationship has freedom to decide how to act, meaning that there also exists the risk of failure of trust or of betrayal; if this possibility would not exist then the relationship would include obligational note and trust would not be necessary in the first place (Gambetta 1998). This is then what spending time with another person offers to social actors – an opportunity to observe the potential friend's behaviour in exercising of this freedom:

Respondent 28: You simply realize that if you want to confide in someone, if you can have trust to share your intimacy.



Ok, on the basis of what do you realize that...?

Respondent 21: ...you realize if the person suits you.

Respondent 28: Yes, through communication. You simply feel it...

Respondent 3: By sharing experiences...when you know more about each other...than other people.

[...]

Respondent 3: I would agree with that and add some...some sacrifices. I mean, I don't think a scapegoat or something [everybody laughs] but like, if you do a certain favour or if you offer a shoulder to cry on...

Respondent 21: Or if a person can count on you in certain situations...

Respondent 3: ...can count on you like, stupid things, from I have to move...

Respondent 21: Yes.

Respondent 3: ...to, like, somebody needs to look after my pet [laughs]

Respondent 21: And little things also like, mean a lot. Not some like, I don't know, big favours like I don't know, but through those little things you see if someone is willing to help and be there when you need him.

Respondent 3: Little things, precisely that, maybe a very important thing is showing one's appreciation.

Respondent 21: Whether someone remembers you, like, send you a message or....or doesn't call you for three months...

[...]

...and how would you say that trust is related to that?

Respondent 28: Because those are all real situations, in which the trust is built or tested...even tested, which means, if you don't know if you can trust someone through some kind of those common situations, you can convince yourself on your own. (Focus group 2, 2012)

Time is crucial in the organization of the possibility of gaining knowledge about other, which can also serve to evaluate the level of trustworthiness of the other as a potential friend:

Respondent 30: [It's established] With time with experience...

With experience, because?

Respondent 42: Some situations in which...

Respondent 24: Yes. [sneers]

Respondent 42: Yes.

Respondent 30: You know how someone will react, you get to know a person through his reactions, through years, months...

Respondent 7: Yes, and then really you evaluate, you meet a lot of people so you assess somehow, maybe even subconsciously, if someone is what you implicitly included in this domain of trust... (Focus group 1, 2012)

However, trust is also related to feelings of affection towards a friend. Some respondents claim that they feel trust as the consequence of emotions they feel towards a friend: “To me trust is an exceptionally emotional kind of category, like, exceptionally...trust is not something you have towards everyone, but exactly towards someone who is...who is very, very close, very close emotionally...with him I feel some kind of a special and very exclusive connection...” (Respondent 47, Focus group 4, 2012)

To sum up, three categories are emphasized as central in building trust; 1) time which offers the opportunity of observing the behaviour of a potential friend in different situations and thus the gain 2) knowledge about him, which then serves as a basis for the evaluation of his level of trustworthiness, and also 3) affection towards a friend which then fosters the feeling of trust. Once trust is established, the foundation is established for the development of intimacy and closeness between friends.

- **Intimacy**

Trust enables the content of intimacy in a friendship. Intimacy is considered by most of my respondents to be *differentia specifica* which distinguishes real friendship from other socially more distant kinds of relationships:

Respondent 47: ...intimacy is some kind of mutual readiness for open communication,...in fact, in some situations even expectations of that kind of a totally open communication....or in other words, the expectation that the other side will, in an intimate friend relation, tell everything to your face.

Ok, others?

Respondent 27: I also agree.

Respondent 25: Well, yes.

So that would also be...

Respondent 27: Yes.

Respondent 25: Well yes...you expect that for example...from that kind of a relation. Maybe you expect it more than...that is the beginning of it, let's say. You expect more than from other people. Maybe only acquaintances or some less close friends.

With them there is no such intimacy?

Respondent 25: Well, no. I mean...somehow you don't bring yourself in that kind of situation.  
(Focus group 4, 2012)

Why is intimacy crucial in a real friendship? Because it allows a friendship to achieve, as the respondents often call it, the 'depth' which other, more superficial kinds of friendship, don't have. The 'depth' of a relationship manifests itself as the exposing of all dimensions of one's self within the friendship relation: "It is the most important thing, because you achieve the depth of the relation...also that I uncover myself, that they know as much as possible about me....the less they know the relation is more superficial." (Respondent 14, 2011); "It is important to me [...] that I can share everything with my friends..." (Respondent 17, 2012)

How is the 'depth' achieved? Two central properties of intimacy are self-disclosure and the knowledge of the other: "You can have a „frend“ [laughs little cynically], which is today taken over from English...with whom you go out, with whom you hang out but they don't really know you...And then intimacy is, I don't know, between two people or a group of people who know each other more..." (Respondent 3, 2011)

Giddens also argues that self-disclosure is the key mechanism in achieving a pure relationship (Giddens 1991).

Self-disclosure can be defined as a social behaviour of openness about oneself which leads to achieving intimacy: "...sharing of one's secrets, problems, basically confiding in them" (Respondent 5, 2011)

However, in most cases, with the variation depending on the individual personal attributes such as communication styles, the self-disclosure happens only after the formation of trust in

relationship. This is intrinsically linked with time, which allows individuals to share experiences, which leads to the knowledge of the other and to trust. This fosters mutual confiding. Putting one's intimacy to other persons' disposal leads to the mutual knowledge of each other. This then, as Giddens also notes, leads to the ability to elicit the wanted sorts of responses from other, as something which is foundation of a relationship lacking external regulations (Giddens 1991). As one respondent describes: "It is crucial, like...I mean, if they don't open up, what makes you friends, really... you have to know someone, or, know very well for him to be your friends...otherwise you are acquaintances...for example...we [me and him] can be acquaintances because we went to college together for a short period of time, but we are definitely not friends...I really don't know which are your interests or what is your thing in life and things like that..." (Respondent 19, 27, 2012)

Can intimacy in a real friendship be achieved without self-disclosure? Namely, as we have seen before from the historical overview of friendships, it seems that self-disclosure is not necessarily considered crucial for the achievement of intimacy in different cultures and historical periods. It is also interesting to note the cross-cultural perspective; self-disclosure is in not a culturally universal characteristic of friendship; while it is often mentioned in the U.S. context as friendship ideal, it is only occasionally mentioned in cross-cultural research of friendship in sixty societies; it is mentioned in only 33% of societies and disconfirmed in 10% (Hruschka 2010, 56). Thus, the emphasis on self-disclosure as the main behaviour for achieving intimacy is neither culturally nor historically universal feature of intimate relations. It is rather the product of a relatively recent cultural history, and is also not the only type of intimacy to be found in personal relationships (Jamieson 1998). Although most respondents claimed that real friendship cannot happen without intimacy, there were three respondents who claimed closeness to be important instead of intimacy. However, two of these respondents reported to be on various extremes of extraversion/introversion levels. The respondent who reported to be very introverted does not feel like sharing intimate details about her life is the precondition for achieving closeness: "When I was younger...I am really emotionally closed and I always thought that friends have to, I don't know, cry on each other's shoulder and share some deep emotions...and then I realized that I really think that if it doesn't come naturally for you, you won't do it...And generally...people with whom I am a friend...I don't know, we are close, but I cannot say that we share some deep emotions...if there is a problem then we will talk it over.." (Respondent 26, 2012)

On the other side, the respondent who reported extreme extroversion does not have any problems sharing intimate details with anyone, and this renders self-disclosure as *differentia specifica* of a real friendship unlikely.”...It's hard to imagine for me what intimacy would be, I for example don't have a problem with sharing secrets....or sharing them only with close friends. I don't have any problems with telling everything to anyone, so it's like, I assume it concerns people who cannot really...or don't want to...share everything with everyone...” (Respondent 17, 2012)

Under these conditions of extreme extroversion or introversion, closeness is what is experienced as replacing intimacy. It is not achieved through self-disclosure, but instead through shared experiences which foster knowledge of the other and trust over time: “Closeness is like...that you, like, travel together, like, you exchange all those things which you, like, experience, everything that happens, what you want to happen, what happened and you're like... you want to know everything about each other and you're like close, you go, like, side by side...” (Respondent 17, 2012)

Special kind of closeness which sometimes also replaces intimacy and is mentioned in the context of small cities is familiarity; this I will analyze more thoroughly later.

From these findings, it seems that the variations in self-disclosure and its importance for a friendship are dependent on personal attributes of the individual. Most respondents recognize this and thus tolerate limits to intimacy in friendships. Some openly state that they don't share their innermost thoughts with friends, considering them to be reserved only for themselves: “There are limits, yes, and they should be respected. (..)when I simply don't want to get the opinion from others on my intimate thoughts or anything...when the opinions of others would burden me, simply.” (Respondent 10, 2011)

Other respondents state that lack of self-disclosure in friendships is tolerable, but must be based on the intention behind such behaviour. If what is behind the lack of self-disclosure in friendship is one's own personal style of communication and the pace of intimately sharing with other, then it is considered acceptable and such friendship can exist: “...there are people who are friends for years and they never open up entirely...that vibe is something that needs to be felt in people. I don't think here there is the labelling of good or bad...it is important that you are sincere, that you don't lie.” (Respondent 32, 2012)

However, if the lack of trust is what lies behind the lack of self-disclosure, then it is not considered acceptable and a friendship will most likely fail to form:

...I am very open and I couldn't stand not to say something, no way...[...] but I have like, some friends, who from different reasons won't say some things...I mean, that is for example ok, as long as I don't know, it doesn't offend me in the sense that they don't have trust in me...

As long as it is their personal decision?

Yes, their personal decision not to share something, and not because they think I would share it further. (Respondent 31, 2012)

This goes partly against Giddens's emphasis on self-disclosure in “pure relationships“ as the main mechanism of their maintenance (Giddens 1991). It seems that in some cases the lack of self-disclosure in friendships is allowed as long as there are other features of a real friendship present, such as trust. To sum up, to what extent is then this self-disclosure necessary for friendship? It seems that limits of self-disclosure in friendship are considered legitimate, when the intentions behind them do not point to the lack of other ingredients of friendship, such as trust or sincerity.

However, in a real friendship self-disclosure is still considered generally important and as something which should be fully achieved to the level to which a certain individual is generally comfortable in sharing:

Respondent 3: I would like to add...maybe it is important that there is no more shame. Or no more, no more taboo topics of any kind. I mean, we all have our taboo topics...

Respondent 21: Yes, and certain limits.

Respondent 3:...and certain limits, we won't share everything with everybody, I mean, and now seriously, but even a patient won't share everything with his psychiatrist [he sneers]. Or the priest, like...but some limits always exist.

Ok, do you want to say that there are limits or that there aren't?

Respondent 3: I mean...there are limits, yes, there are. But those are...let's say it like this, with the most intimate friends or the closest friends those limits are the closest to that...to that area which every one of us holds only for himself or herself. So let's say that your...close family reaches that area, if you are in good relations with them. Your partner reaches it at one point of your life and

those best friends reach it that are rare and who maybe...some people don't even have those kinds of friends. (Focus group 2)

Respondent 21: It is necessary for a real friendship that you sometimes maybe open up a little more and share things with someone.

Respondent 3: Or vice-versa.

Wait, so, without intimacy, in the sense of self-disclosure, friendship...

Respondent 21: You cannot be like, really good friends with someone, if you don't want to share anything with them. (Focus group 2, 2012)

Self-disclosure to at least some extent is thus needed to achieve intimacy around which a real friendship is organized in late modernity. However, Štulhofer and Miladinov warn that this is precisely why such relationships are risky (Štulhofer and Miladinov 2004). In pure relationships risks are no longer external, but are instead intrinsic, related to the expectations one has from the interaction with other people (Štulhofer and Miladinov 2004). The risk is inherent when putting one's intimacy at the disposal of the other without the guarantee what the other will do with this content:

...it is the important generator basically of that some kind closeness feeling....that real friendship relation implicates some kind of emotional vulnerability in some kind of situations...present all the time. [...] All before that is some kind of hanging out and associating eventually, by interests and common subjects, but that emotional component really, as much as some are not willing to admit that, is what necessarily makes a friendship, what distinguishes it from some kind of acquaintance. (Respondent 47, 2012)

How does one battle with those intrinsic risks in the face of no external social strings? Giddens proposes that modern individuals use trust as a mechanism which makes intimacy possible (Giddens 1991). I have indeed found in my interviews that my respondents use trust as a mechanism which serves as a form of security against those internal risks.

- **Benevolence**

Benevolence towards a friend is considered important in friendship. Namely, faith in friend's good intentions towards oneself forms the basis of trust:

Respondent 23: Well, benevolence is necessary [emphasizes] for a friendship. Because, if it is absent, then that person is not your friend.

Respondent 21: Yes.

Respondent 21: Or is your enemy.

Respondent 23: If they are not benevolent towards you then it is simply not your friend...that's a non-friend.<sup>7</sup>

Respondent 28: Yes, he has those compromising informations about you in his database...[laughs] and is not afraid to use them [everybody laughs]

Respondent 3: And doesn't have good intentions, so... (Focus group 2, 2012)

At the level of intention, benevolence manifests itself in having friend's best interest at heart, both in his or her presence or absence. On the level of behaviour, this includes wanting the best for a friend, sharing emotional states of a friend and protecting him or her against emotional hurt: "...good friendship, I think, is based on that that a person is aware of both your weaknesses and your strengths, and at the same time, that he/she won't trample over your weakness..." (Respondent 9, 2011); "...like, not-to-be-jealous, like, openness towards that friend, to be happy for his successes, and like...to take delight in his successes and suffer with him in his failures..." (Respondent 4, 2011)

There is a particular kind of benevolence which is especially interesting sociologically; tactfulness. Tactfulness is a behaviour which is oriented towards saving friend's face in face of excessive emotional vulnerability which could endanger his self: "There are sometimes some things which you won't say because you don't want to hurt a friend..." (Respondent 4, 2011)

Although tactfulness is generally regarded by the respondents as something which is more needed in non-intimate relationships, precisely due to the lack of knowledge about the others and thus lack of possibility to predict their reactions, the need for tactfulness is nevertheless emphasized also in friendship. Tactfulness is interesting sociologically because it can be understood as a protective practice in Goffman's sense (Goffman 1990). Protective practices are defensive techniques of impression management which help social actor to save his social performance by not invading back regions of his performance (Goffman 1990). In friendship tactfulness is manifested precisely as this. Even if, as we shall see later, the discrepancy

---

<sup>7</sup> The translation from the Croatian here is not possible in the way of conveying the whole meaning of this sentence. The Croatian original: „nije prijatelj...to je ne-prijatelj“. „Ne-prijatelj“ in Croatian means both non-friend and enemy.



between the back and the front of social actor's performance in friendship is minimal, it still takes part in front of one's own self, in order to save the cohesion of self. This is where tactfulness in friendship takes part; it maintains the illusion of a social performance of a friend in times in which this performance is endangered and thus helps the friend to save his or her face and maintain the cohesion of his emotionally weakened self. On the level of behaviour, it manifests as attunement to emotional needs of a friend in situations which are potentially breaching his social performance:

Respondent 21: You have to have a feeling how you will say...You won't say 'Jesus, that sucks'. Or I don't know.

Why not?

Respondent 21: Well, not to hurt him. If you care, you don't want to hurt someone. Like, you have to be a little more sensitive...“ (Focus group 2, 2012)

Ok, and tell me, how is it in friendships then? Does a friendship need tactfulness? Is tactfulness one of the characteristics of a friendship?

Respondent 42: I think it is. I think it is really, because...I don't know, like, every person has bad days, has I don't know mmm...different, like, situations in life...to which I think, friends should attune to. You won't, I don't know...

Respondent 7: You evaluate the situation.

Respondent 42: Yes, I think that one should do that.

Respondent 7: ...if a friend is in a bad mood you won't make him, let's do now...I don't know.

Because?

Respondent 24: Because you are his or her friend. And because it is not important what you say, really, it is important that he wants to feel better that day. Because you probably know that it doesn't suit him or something...but your reaction is really important not because of it per se...not because of what you want to say, but because of the attitude you have towards him or her. Sometimes, it is really more important than...the particular sentence. (Focus group 1, 2012)

These are different ways in which friends behave benevolently towards each other. Although behaviours of manifested benevolence are different, they have all been put in this category, since the intention behind them is the same. What is then this intention?

Some respondents describe the experience which sheds more light on this phenomenon:

...that I can be happy for him...when Marko found out that he will play in this band, it felt for me like I would be playing with them. It was like, I couldn't fake it...I was like, why was I happy if he's the one to whom something great happened...like, how is this possible? Like you know, because I'm naturally not much of an altruist...it's like...it's like it happened to me, like that's it...that's me. And that's the way I behave sometimes, like it's mine. A blow at him is a blow at me. (Respondent 12, 2011)

What this respondent describes in his experience goes further than having friend's best interest at heart. He instead describes what can be seen as a sort of identification with a friend: seeing friend's interests as one's own. Sandra Lynch notices this phenomenon in her analysis of friendship and calls it “friend as the other self” (Lynch 2005, 44). It consists of finding parts of one's own self in a self of a friend through the process of identification and thus identifying friend as “another self” (Lynch 2005, 44). This means that through this mechanism the individual experiences his/hers friend's experience as it was one's own to some extent (Lynch 2005).

How does this happen? Some of the further explanation for this phenomenon can be found in the psychological experiments by Aron and collaborators in which participants were shown seven pairs of overlapping circles to varying degrees, with circles presenting their own self and the self of a close person, and were then asked to select the pair which best describes their relationship with a particular person (Aron et al 1992 in Aron et al 2004). Results showed that perceived closeness was associated with the most overlapping pairs of circles chosen, thus indicating that when feeling psychologically close to someone, people perceive their selves as more entangled than when feeling psychologically distant from them (Aron et al 1992 in Aron et al 2004). Other experiment conducted by the same group of researchers presented the participants with different sets of traits for self, close other and non-close others, after which participants were given a surprise recognition test in which they were presented with each trait and asked for which person they had rated it, whereas familiarity and similarity were controlled for (Mashek et al. 2003). The results showed that there were more source confusions between traits rated for self and close others than there were between traits rated for self and non-close others, again indicating that the traits of close others are entangled within one's self with perceptions of one's own self (Mashek et al. 2003). Aron and collaborators also conducted experiments in which allocation of money to close other and non-close others was measured, and in which the knowledge that the money was allocated to

the close other made no significant difference to the amount of money donated to him or her (Aron et al 1991 in Aron et al 2004). Based on all of this, Aron et al. argue that in close relationships one's self expands to include close others in it, and this further implicates that the outcomes of a close other in a certain situations is directly experienced as one's outcome, on a level which is stronger than basic rationale reasoning of long-term benefits within a relationship with close others or a simple caring about the partner's outcomes (Aron et al 2004). This can be regarded as a possible explanation of motives underlying benevolent behaviour within friendship. Some respondents describe this experience: "...I really experienced the success of my friend as my own and I was really pleased and the same...like, if somebody asked me, would you feel glad in the same way if you did that or her...I'd say, it's really all the same, because I experience it, like, the same..." (Respondent 17, 2012).

What are the implications of this for the social life? One of the possible implications is that because of this phenomenon, friendships have the capacity to facilitate solidarity which is not based on any normative grounds, but is based on the process of particularly strong mutual identification within friendship. This kind of solidarity, I would argue, is potentially a lot stronger than any solidarity based on normative grounds.

- **Reliability**

Another term which often emerged as intertwined with trust was reliability, in the sense of faith which one has in one's friend to offer certain kinds of behaviour in times when this behaviour is required: "That he/she gives you support, their view of the situation and alike..." (Respondent 4, 2011)

Reliability is generally experienced as needed in friendships, but it is not seen to constitute the foundation of a friendship, in the way in which trust and intimacy do. Reliability is recognized on two levels; on the level of personal trait of a person which then manifests in relationship related to everyday friendship practices and in the general sense of the support which friend is likely to offer in times when it is needed:

For example, friends who are sometimes late for twenty or more minutes for an appointment...that is not reliability, but they are still my friends because it is one of their sides, their characteristics to which...which you have accepted, in fact. Yes. But reliability in the sense that they will be there for you if you need a shoulder to cry on or something like that, that is what I, for example, demand, yes. (Respondent 27, Focus group 4, 2012)

While the general kind of reliability in the sense of offering of support is seen as necessary in a friendship, in discussions about this subject in focus groups the respondents could not achieve a consensus regarding to which extent it is important for a friendship. It is generally seen that the importance of it for a friendship is a matter of personal decision. Some respondents claim that friendship without reliability related to everyday practices is tolerated if it is interpreted as a personal trait without the malevolent intention behind it:

Respondent 6:...reliability can be like a trait of character, like...some people are simply...they promise everything, they say everything and then...

Respondent 1: They are wonderful, but it simply does not work.

Respondent 6: Yes. Like, they really have the best intentions [laughs], but they never make it happen.

Respondent 1 [laughs]: But they really make an effort...and when they say it, they really, really believe that it will happen, but they simply do not show up. For example, I have a neighbour who is lovely, but, he has been promising for two months that he will come help put pictures on my wall [laughs] and everytime, he is so convincing in saying that and promising it to me...and he is a great man, very sweet and kind, but he doesn't show up. And I know he won't come. But when he promises that he will come, he really believes in that and the way in which he says it, you really believe it like, here it comes, he will come tomorrow...not showing up is not an option. But he is totally unreliable, exactly that.

Ok, and what would you say about that kind of people as friends? Can you be friends with someone if the person is...?

Respondent 6: Ok, I have a friend of the exact that kind who really drives me crazy with that...but we really have trust and intimacy...and like, I think of her as like, a really great person and she really is a great girl.. But that she is reliable, she is not. First and foremost, she is always late, then, I don't know, we'll go somewhere tomorrow, it's like yes, yes, no problem, and then, five minutes before it she says, but hey I have some other plans [laughter] like....notify me in advance that you are not available.

Ok, so that means..

Respondent 6: That is simply a thing...

That means that there can be a friendship without reliability?

Respondent 3: Well yes, if you simply accept that someone and exactly what you say...

Respondent 6: Yes, yes, I've accepted that like...being that...

Respondent 3: ...and you know that this someone has a lot of qualities, but he is simply unreliable.

Respondent 1: But see, if he doesn't do it on purpose, if he for example, really promises to come and get the pictures, but then he is a little nonchalant, and you haven't told him 'at five o'clock' , and then he maybe waits for you to call him and then bla bla bla, it can be anything. I mean, the way I see it, if the person has the best intentions....and if he or she is then sometimes late, what can you do? I mean, if I really know that she or he cares about everything, that they have serious intentions, but are maybe, little more nonchalant. (Focus group 3, 2012)

However, some of the respondents don't even tolerate this level of unreliability in friendship since they reflexively link unreliability of a friend to their own identity – to how much a friend values the relationship and thus them – and thus find it unacceptable: “If someone lets you down in the sense...those are not big things, but if it happens all the time, we make an arrangement, and then next week – 'I don't want to do it anymore'. Or I don't find it good, I wouldn't do it now...that means, this other person doesn't value – in other words – ' I don't care'...for that what we made the arrangement for...for you or your time...” (Respondent 13, 2011)

Reliability is also by some of the respondents found to have a rational feel to it versus trust which was felt to have more of an emotional quality. Thus reliability is seen not as the key prerequisite for a friendship, but is more likely to constitute a basis for other kinds of social relations which lack regulation by trust and intimacy. In those kinds of more formal relations, reliability then serves as a substitute security mechanism of achieving one's goals within or on the basis of that relationship:

Respondent 28: I think that those are not synonyms. That trust is the basis for intimacy, and that reliability is a different thing.

Respondent 3: Yes.

Reliability is a different thing?

Respondent 28: Yes. And it does not lead to intimacy. It doesn't have to lead to intimacy.

Respondent 21: Yes.

Respondent 3: But it can...

Respondent 28: Reliability can also be a characteristic of a business partner or a colleague.

Respondent 21: Yes.

Respondent 28: That means someone you don't really...reliability doesn't have to...

Respondent 21: Yes, it doesn't have anything to do with feelings. It is not emotional, it is, how to say, a fact.

Respondent 28: If you know that someone is reliable, you can ask him to look after your flat or I don't know, walk your dog when you are abroad...that doesn't mean that when you come back...

Respondent 21: Yes.

Respondent 28: ...that you will confide in him about everything.

Aha, in which way is then reliability...is it important for friendship? Or how important is it...and in which way?

Respondent 28: It is important...

Respondent 21: It is...

Respondent 28: But not as a way of achieving the closeness. Really reliable can be...

Respondent 21: It doesn't have that emotional component. It's not like you're gonna get close with someone because he is reliable...[blows and laughs] I don't know.

Respondent 28: Well yeah, I mean, when you search for a handyman you look for a reliable handyman...

Respondent 21: Well yes, yes. It's more like some sort of...objective...objective characteristic.  
(Focus group 2, 2012)

- **Understanding**

Emotional understanding is another feature of a relationship which is found to be important within friendship: “That they always understand you no matter in which state you are...” (Respondent 48, 2012)

Understanding can be regarded as what Robert Stolorow calls intersubjective context which accepts one's emotional states; a “relational home for one's affects” (Stolorow 2007, 46). He argues the importance of these in times of negative emotional states which afflict an individual (Stolorow 2007). Randal Collins claims that successful interaction chains are characterized by the buildup of the emotional energy which then functions as the basis for the

prospective successful interactions in the future (Collins 2004). Building up both on Stolorow and Collins, it can be argued that the intersubjective context for one's affects is generally important regardless of the type of affect. Understanding allows the intersubjective context for the energetic release which functions as the energetic build-up, which is then later used for further social interactions: "I am ok, someone gets me...he gets my insanity and my nervousness and my derangement on that level...he knows I mean that and that. That is, like, really liberating" (Respondent 12, 2011)

Emotional understanding in this way creates a safe context for one's energetic release and thus enables authenticity in friendship.

- **Sincerity & authenticity**

Authenticity and sincerity were concepts which for my respondents also emerged as important in friendship, but also often intertwined. Precisely because of this, the differentiation between those two concepts was needed prior to their further usage:

Respondent 24: That means than this [shows the paper with the 'authenticity' concept] would be the characteristic of one friend, and this [shows the paper with the 'sincerity' concept] their relationship.

Aha, ok.

Respondent 44: I mean, if that's it.

Ok. Others?

Respondent 30: Yes, I think that's nicely put.

Respondent 24: Yes. (Focus group 1, 2012)

While sincerity is experienced as a relational trait, authenticity is experienced by the respondents as a more individual trait. This is somewhat in accordance with Trilling's definition of authenticity and sincerity, according to which sincerity is the individual's congruence towards others, while authenticity is the congruence towards oneself (1972). However, this definition has to be somewhat broadened, since both authenticity and sincerity require a relation with others to be exhibited:

Respondent 28: Yeah, well, with that sincerity we touched one dimension, but we can really watch the other dimension of all that. You are sincere in a relation with friend and he is with you, and in a way to be literally what you are....and that is authenticity then.

Ok.

Respondent 28: You are what you are and you know that you can be that in front of a friend and you know he is that in front of you. (Focus group 2, 2012)

If what respondents describe is analyzed deploying Goffman's concept of social performance (Goffman 1990), authenticity can be defined as a minimal discrepancy between the back and the front of the social actor's performance. However, sincerity is described more as an orientation in behaviour in relationship with a friend. In this sense, sincerity can be regarded as the principle of behaviour in friendship, whereas the possibility of authenticity is the content arising from the friendship.

Authenticity in friendship is experienced as sharing all the dimensions of one's self.

Respondent 27:...for example, I love a certain type of sense of humor....which is like, always linked to some sexual allusions and similar [laughter]

Very honest.

Respondent 27 [laughs]: Yes. And with other people I don't really practice that type of a humor to that extent because they wouldn't understand me and maybe they would be embarrassed about it. (Focus group 4, 2012)

My respondents often describe authenticity in terms of “not having to pretend“ or “being able to be oneself“. In other words, authenticity is experienced as congruency between the front and the back region of one's social performance: “...that the person sees you how it is, that you don't have to pretend like 90% of time with people all around you. With people you meet you have to hide one part of yourself...” (Respondent 33, 2012)

In other words, authenticity means that the impression management in friendship is reduced to a minimum: “That when you talk to someone or spend time with him, you feel as free as possible, that you are yourself as much as possible. In the sense that...[...] you don't enter your head and evaluate how someone is looking at you“ (Respondent 11, 2011)

The possibility of a friendship to constitute the area of authenticity is experienced as preconditioned by acceptance on behalf of a friend. In other words, the faith that the friend



will accept both the back and the front region of one's social performance is what enables authenticity: "You have to put everything out in the open, and if he accepts you the way you are, that is the only way for long-term friendship. Otherwise, it won't go." (Respondent 23, 2012) Why does the possibility of authenticity in friendship have a social value? This is particularly evident from the further discussion in one of the focus groups:

Respondent 23: Because you don't invest...you don't have to spend a lot of energy.

Respondent 21: That's just what I wanted to say....now if you were thinking about how you will do this and that, what clothes you will put on...

Respondent 23: Because it makes a person tired.

Respondent 21: ...yes, you lose energy on stupid things.

Aha.

Respondent 21: And I don't know which...

Respondent 23: For example, now I have to restraint myself from drinking everything [shows juices] [everybody laughs] (Focus group 2, 2012)

As it is evident from this discussion, to enact a social performance in front of other social actors requires energy. In other words, a social actor has to put up a front, has to care about setting, has to see that his appearance matches his manner, which are all features of social performance (Goffman 1990). Being authentic, on the contrary, requires none of those things, and consequently requires less energy, which has a psychologically rewarding effect. Namely, if friendship is a form of sociability which enables both the front and the back of one's social performance, it then presents a socially safe arena for self-disclosure and thus intimacy: "You won't be intimate with someone for whom you think that he/she will judge you afterwards." (Respondent 24, Focus group 1, 2012)

"...they can express themselves and their attitudes without fear of judgement and some kind of...meddling of the aggressive kind [she laughs], I don't know, in the sense you have to do this or that..." (Respondent 44, 2012)

Thus friendship offers a unique opportunity to be accepted on account of both the front and the back region of one's performance, and not only based on the front:

Respondent 28: You are what you are and you know you can be this in front of a friend and you know he is this in front of you.

Mmhm, ok. Is that important?

Respondent 28: Of course it is.

Respondent 3: Well, it is.

Because?

Respondent 28: Because somewhere you have to be what you are.

Aha, ok.

Respondent 28: That is, everybody would want that, everybody desires it and wants it...

Ok, and when you say 'somewhere you have to be what you are'... what I am hearing is that in other places you are not necessarily what you are...

Respondent 28: Some situations don't....either they completely disregard it or they even don't allow it. You come to a courthouse like a punker which you are, but you come to a courthouse on a certain basis, I don't know, it means you cannot be what you are in court. You cannot be authentic. (Focus group 2, 2012)

The psychologically rewarding effect of this acceptance leads to a socially embedding effect on the basis of one's individuality. Thus friendship, on the account of knowing that the least possible performing is allowed and that it will be accepted, can be regarded as sociability through which individuals are integrated into society, but beyond the structurally defined roles. In other words, even those characteristics of one's self which in other structurally more constrained circumstances are considered unacceptable, are integrated into society through friendship. This is, I would dare to say, one of its biggest social values.

Closely related to authenticity is sincerity: "Sincerity. Even if it is brutal..." (Respondent 32, 2012). Sincerity is found to be more of a narrow term than authenticity, since the respondents argue that one has to be authentic in order to be sincere towards a friend:

"It is very much linked to authenticity, right...if someone is authentic, someone who is naked in front of you, whom you know to the core – there is nothing but sincerity." (Respondent 41, 2012)

In this sense sincerity is the principle which is used to guide the behaviour within friendship. Once again building on Goffman (Goffman 1990), sincerity can be defined as the principle of being upfront with a friend about all the regions of his or her social performance. This includes also back region of social performance, the region to which other audiences are not invited and for this reason sincerity is seen as the other important *differentia specifica* of a real friendship since it does not happen in more superficial social relationships. Namely, in relationships which are seen as more superficial, audience is usually neither invited in nor feels comfortable coming to the back region of social performance. In real friendship this invitation exists, due to trust which ensures that it will not be misused. However, the relationship flows in two-directions; trust allows sincerity in real friendships, but sincerity also builds further trust: “It is such a cliché, but you have to be honest...because all friendships which I had and which ended were sedimentation onto not addressing something which bothers you...” (Respondent 33, 2012). In this way, a real friendship is regulated within the relationship, in the lack of external regulations: “...friendship implies that you can tell someone when he starts acting like that, like...you say to them, you're trying to impress someone by humiliating me, that isn't cool, stop doing that...” (Respondent 47, 2012).

Some of my respondents link this with the knowledge of the other person and the ability to foresee his or her reactions. Sincerity is enabled within friendship by the possibility of foreseeing reactions of a friend, which is to a lesser extent possible in the case of strangers:

Respondent 30: I don't know some of you at all and I won't say, oh, you've got ugly...something...I'll instead say, oh, where did you buy, they are really interesting...

Respondent 42: Yes.

Respondent 7: You won't say that like, really....that something is off.

That means, you want to say we're kinder to strangers than to friends...?

[everybody laughs]

Respondent 30: Well yes. Yes, yes, we are.

Respondent 7: Yes.

Respondent 30: Yes, you don't know other people's reactions.

Ok, and in friendship?

Respondent 30: You can probably assume. (Focus group 1, 2012)

Thus, sincerity is often emphasized by my respondents as an important foundation of a real friendship, particularly in the context of distinguishing a real friendship from a more superficial one: "...Anyone can listen to you....but really, anyone. And nod. Maybe he/she doesn't even know what to do. And when someone really tells you what he/she thinks and you don't like that, you get mad...but later...later it seems, well that's ok." (Respondent 12, 2011)

What is the intention behind sincerity? Sincerity is, as seen by the respondents, guided by benevolence towards friends and thus caring about their wellbeing:

...for example, one of my bros...he had a brother who died from stomach cancer...and f\*\*k it, he was his older brother, some kind of a male personality who died, seven years older than he was...and what, he basically confined himself to home, he is so non-motivated, he just smokes pot, sits and stares at the computer screen, plays videogames...and he is hard to motivate. But I think I wouldn't be his friend if I didn't tell him the way things are...I mean, if I don't tell him what I see, from some kind of an objective point of view..Because, I know that he will also, one day, when something like this happens, that he will also say that to me. That is it.. (Respondent 9, 2011)

Respondent 3: I also think that sincerity is extremely important...but it also has a wide range of sincerity. Sometimes one has to be painfully sincere in friendships and tell some things which a person doesn't notice or...

Respondent 21: Doesn't want to understand.

Respondent 3: ...or doesn't want to understand or simply , yes.

Why does one have to say it?

Respondent 3: Well because...because if you are a friend to that person, then you want that person to build himself/herself further in life. So if he/she constantly does a certain error... (Focus group 2, 2012)

Thus, the intention behind the need for sincerity is best understood when linked with the content of friendship which sincerity as a principle enables; mutual reflexivity. In other words, sincerity enables a reflexive communication between friends which, due to the security mechanisms of trust and benevolence, can be safely used for one's evaluation of oneself:

Why is sincerity important in friendship?

Respondent 28: To me sincerity is, like, based on some of my values, maybe even the most important.

Ok...and how would you define sincerity in friendship?

Respondent 28: Sincerity in friendship? That I can get it any time I ask for it. And that I know simply that...that somebody is always sincere towards me.

Ok, and sincere in what sense?

Respondent 28: In every literal sense.

Respondent 3: Except in the one, hey dear, how do I look? Very pretty, very pretty [he fakes it and laughs]

Respondent 21: That is even most important.

Respondent 28: No, even to that extent. That I know that somebody is sincere...on every level. On any subject.

How do you mean, that is even most important, on all levels?

Respondent 21: Well if he/she lies to you about such a little thing, then I mean...[laughs] [...] I find that particularly important. To...someone, to say to me sincerely..

In a friendship.

Respondent 21: Yes, in a friendship, to...I mean, what's the point if somebody is not honest...

And why is it so important in a friendship that somebody is sincere to you?

Respondent 21: Well to know what a person thinks, why would I wanna fool myself...

Respondent 23: It is good to have objective feedback. (Focus group 2, 2012)

The need for sincerity in friendship goes to the extent in which even tactfulness is put aside and brutal honesty is both expected and given, provided that the intention behind the sincerity is benevolence towards a friend: "...that you can tell them everything, whether they find it good or bad....even if this can lead to a fight, but it is for their own sake" (Respondent 48, 2012)

However, while my respondents appreciate honesty in friendship, they recognize and emphasize its limits. The first limit of sincerity is benevolence towards a friend which is, as it was already described, manifested as tactfulness. The second limit of sincerity is the

acceptance of other person's authenticity and this was often emphasized by my respondents during the focus groups:

Respondent 30: Or I don't know, if someone dresses, let's say in a certain way and something is, in the context of himself, ok...that doesn't mean it's ok in mine, but I look at him in the context of his...ok, now we're diverting from the subject a little...

No, no, no, wait, tell me, ok, it means, I look at him in the context...

Respondent 30: In the context of himself, which means if someone likes to wear platform shoes...and wears it all his life, I find it ugly, but I'll say to him it suits him well in the context of himself...if he likes it.

Mhmm, that means it's like certain acceptance?

Respondent 30: Yes, yes. Let's say. (Focus group 1)

Respondent 3: I study medicine and like, it's that I'm nagging to my friends all the time, but like...when they smoke from time to time I emphasize that it is not exactly best for their health, bla bla bla. But on the other hand, if you are a friend, you will have your boundaries and you won't try to dictate his or her life.

Would that be like some kind of an acceptance?

Respondent 3: Yes, but exactly because of that acceptance I'd say that...[coughs] you don't need to be a hundred percent honest all the time, I don't know, I don't know...if your friend wears a dress or what do I know, something you don't like and asks you how you like it, I'll say 'it's ok.'. I won't be honest... (Focus group 2, 2012)

If this limit in sincerity wouldn't exist, the respondents feel that the individuality of a friend would be endangered and consequently this would endanger friendship as a relationship.

Let us sum up by adapting the starting Trilling's definition of authenticity and sincerity (1972) with these findings. The respondents thus experience sincerity as an individual's congruence towards others, while authenticity is also experienced by the individual's congruence towards others, but about oneself.

- **Reflexivity**

A friendship is experienced as a relationship offering a unique opportunity of reflexive evaluation of oneself, which is enabled by the underlying principles of sincerity, benevolence

and trust. Reflexive evaluation is described as a mutual exchange of individual's views of situation or oneself and is often emphasized as a significant characteristic of friendship.

The importance of reflexivity for the social life is emphasized in sociological social psychology which views the self as the emergent and reflective of society (Stets and Burke 2003). Following the lead of George Herbert Mead who had first shown how self is in the first place constructed in this manner of feedback in early socialization (Mead 1972), this approach argues that the self is created through shared language and meanings which enable a person to take the role of others and reflect on oneself as an object viewed from the standpoint of others, the latter constituting the basics of one's selfhood (Mead 1972; Stets and Burke 2003). Thus it is precisely through the process of reflexivity that one incorporates the social into one's own self. However, this perspective implies only the formation of one's self, and can be further expanded by including one's whole life, building on the intersubjective psychoanalysis of Robert Stolorow and George Atwood. Stolorow and Atwood argue that the self maintains its sense of self through such intersubjective systems throughout the rest of its life (Stolorow and Atwood 2002). Friendship could be considered as one such intersubjective system, constituted of friends as significant others. And indeed, the findings from Baldwin's research in social psychology have shown that the evaluation from a significant other becomes part of one's own self-evaluation in the form of a relational schema and is later activated in different social situations even if the significant other is not present (Baldwin in Pierce et al 1997). Thus, reflexivity in friendship can be very socially significant particularly for this reason; it serves as the continual building block of one's self through sociability, not only in childhood but also further in life.

There are two different forms of reflexivity which my respondents recognize: feedback reflexivity and affirmative reflexivity.

Feedback reflexivity offers feedback from a friend in the form of his or her own view of certain problems or situations in the friend's life: "...I think I wouldn't be his friend if I don't tell him where he's at....I mean, if I don't tell him what I see, from some kind of an objective perspective.." (Respondent 9, 2011)

This feedback can then be used for the self-evaluation and regulation of one's behaviour:

Respondent 23: It is good to have objective feedback.

Ok, because?

Respondent 23: So that you can align yourself better.

How do you mean objective feedback, why do you think it is objective?

Respondent 23: Well, because you have a subjective picture of yourself, which is not the same as the picture you send outside.

Respondent 3: Yes, but other people also have subjective picture of you.

Respondent 23: Yes.

Respondent 21: Well that's why you have to gather more opinions...

Respondent 23: And do an average. (Focus group 2, 2012)

The respondents see friendship as a social relation which offers an unique kind of feedback in this sense:

...that kind of feedback you cannot get from anyone else. If you are really interested in your growth, in understanding your problems, if you need someone to explain some things....to tell you your faults which you alone will never get, and to tell you what he or she thinks that you are doing wrong...because we are very used to criticizing everyone around us, and we find it the most difficult to look at ourselves. And then someone can objectively tell you without fear that you will be angry at him, or that he will insult you...I mean, really he may even insult you, and you will be ok with it. (Respondent 13, 2011)

In addition with the general importance of reflexivity as the basis of selfhood (Stets and Burke 2003), reflexivity in friendship holds a special position in comparison to the reflexivity in non-close relationships. Considering the aforementioned trust and mutual benevolence, it is reasonable to expect that real friends will have good intentions when offering their own perspective on a certain situation. That is why social actors are more likely to listen to a friend's point of view than the one of a stranger, even if the point of view does not suit them: "...that you can give and take, like, honest....man, that is the key thing. No sucking up. That he or she can tell you to go to hell, like, because you deserve it." (Respondent 19, 2011); "...in that situation I saw how friendship is really not some kind of an extension of you...it isn't some kind of a clone who responds positively on everything your like, who reacts positively on everything you say or think or do...[...]they encouraged me and really, like they pushed me into that, that I start dealing with it and solve those problems." (Respondent 38, 2012)



In this way, a friendship has the potential to offer a unique contribution by bringing the social into the individual through the assessment and re-evaluation of one's self through other person's eyes. A friendship can be seen as a particularly interesting form of sociability in this sense because it is excluded from the institutionalized social structures. Reflective feedback in friendship is experienced as free from expectations accompanying the feedback from more structurally embedded contexts, such as family: "Because they are easier to talk to, it is easier to say some things to them. It is harder to do that with family, because they always have some kind of expectations from you....at least that is so in my case, a family has certain kinds of expectations, friends don't....I don't have such expectations of friends" (Respondent 27, 2012)

Thus, one can expect the reflective feedback given in friendship to be free from the institutionalized expectations. Benevolence, intimacy and the knowledge of other within a friendship ensure at the same time that the feedback will be of a different kind than the one within socially more distant relationships. All of this is experienced as the security that the feedback given will be oriented towards friend's best interest:

I think that friendships are some kind of relations which are not built on some kinds of interests, from one or the other side, but they are here simply because of some liking or a choice or a decision to be close with someone, and in as many different situations friends really...those people who are your friends, they somewhere offer you an another, different perspective of you, on life, of situations...mmm they often view the world from a completely different perspective, and that, in some crisis situations, or maybe not situations that are that much crisis, it might be crucial to gain a pair of new eyes with which, like, you can see the entire thing. (Respondent 38, 2012)

Furthermore, reflection will often be asked for the sake of evaluating one's own subjective social position. In this sense a friendship offers evaluation from a standpoint of a certain form of sociability, but not related to one's objective social position. Precisely because of this perception a friendship can be seen as a form of sociability which is simultaneously embedded into the social but also disembedded from it. Paradoxically, it is precisely because of this simultaneous embedding and disembedding of the individual that a friendship manages to integrate the individual into the society in a more subtle, but also more powerful way than socially more distant relationship such as acquaintanceship.

On a psychological level, if friends are taken as a particularly important intersubjective system for the functioning of the self through life, it can be proposed that this feedback from friends is taken by the self and internalized as a more prevailing set of ordering principles

than the feedback that one would get from an acquaintance. These sets of ordering principles are stored, and later put to use when one moves to other intersubjective systems – providing the connection between the individual and the wider social system. Responses from friends can thus become the continual source of re-organization of the self throughout life:

That you can see another opinion...that you have a spectrum of different thinking about your own behaviour and the behaviour of others...

Like some kind of feedback?

Yes. That you can be better as a person through conversations with those people. (Respondent 14, 2011)

It is through this continual internalization and re-internalization of the responses of friends as the significant intersubjective systems throughout life that friendship embeds the social into the individual:

How important do you consider friendships in life?

Very important.

Mmhm...because?

Because I think that it affects the person while he or she builds herself and that without friends there is no you (Respondent 24, 2012)

There is another equally important form of reflexivity which is uniquely provided in friendships. It seems that friendships affirm one's social worth, and in this sense, a kind of social recognition:"...If you don't have even one friend, you have to ask yourself what is wrong with you." (Respondent 37, 2012)

Within sociological social psychology, a positive self-concept emerges from the "reflected-appraisal process" through which significant others communicate their appraisals to oneself, which then influence the way one sees himself/herself (Gecas and Burke in Stets and Burke 2003, 131). The appraisals stemming from a friendship again hold a special position since they are based on a relationship formed upon a personal choice and not tied to one's objective social position in terms of social stratum. Thus, appraisals stemming from friendship provide special kind of social recognition for the individual: the feeling of being worthy just as one is, which then further positively influences one's self-concept. In this way, affirmative

reflexivity again has the possibility of embedding a social actor into the social structures, but beyond social stratum: “...at one very selfish level they give you some kind of affirmation of yourself, that you are a good and worthy person...[she laughs] at least I feel that way. Because if people love you, then they get that you are...that you are ok. That you are interesting, and people tell you that you are interesting and that you are great and...” (Respondent 13, 2011); “...simply, you know that you have some people which are, like, here and want to hang out with you...like..they show interest to be a part of your life...and then you have the feeling that your life, maybe, is worth something.” (Respondent 31, 2012)

More concretely, a friendship also functions as the source of one's worth-based self-esteem which is a part of the self-concept <sup>8</sup>. Good evaluation coming from a friend is felt as building one's own self-esteem: “I mean, if my friends think well of me, I feel good because of them and...my self-respect grows and my sense of worth also grows.” (Respondent 27, 29, Duga Resa/Zagreb); “...as much as it is said that it is an internal category that everybody alone creates the sense of one's worth, self-confidence, identity...that in reality that evaluation of others, in other words, the existence of steady foothold in evaluation of friends is for our society extremely important determinant of identity and that it is really extremely important as some kind of baseline, under which we cannot fall in our own eyes.” (Respondent 47, 26, Zagreb)

Pat O'Connor argues that the value of friendship's ability in helping the maintenance of a positive concept of oneself is particularly emphasized within the context of late modernity, in which the self is increasingly seen as problematic and unstable (O'Connor 1998). In increased temporal acceleration of late modernity it can indeed be proposed that real friendships are providing individual with the sense of continuity. The sense of continuity which real friendships provide indeed does come up in some instances when the respondents are talking about their real friendships: “I see my friendships as reflection of my own life...it means, like, something which grew together with me and which is like some kind of my, I don't know, root, a trace, and like...constant. It means, that someone knew you, hanged out with you and that there was some kind of mutual exchange of, like, anything. Thinking, help...and so I don't know, it simply...helps me to feel more secure about myself.” (Respondent 31, 2012); “My friends...I would like them to be a constant in my life, and there are some circumstances that change...and so, when I lived with my parents I invited my friends over the same as I invite

---

<sup>8</sup> Worth-based self-esteem: the feeling that one is accepted and valued, constitutes the self-concept (Stets and Burke 2003)

them now...and when I'll, I don't know, have a family and little kids, I'll invite my friends over or I'll meet them...I think it is some kind of a constant which withstands life circumstances..”  
(Respondent 28, 2012)

However, this function of self-regulation in terms of the affirmation of friendship is perhaps particularly significant in the context of late modernity because the definition of the self is increasingly left to the individual (Giddens 1991; O'Connor 1998). In traditional social settings the self-affirmation was related to group, while in early modernity it was tied to certain collective identities such as class or gender (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2001, Giddens 1990; 1991, Illouz 2011). It seems that late modernity individualizes the regulation of one's affirmation. In this sense, intimate relationships are a favourable source of this regulation. This is further linked with the support which friendship offers in the affirmation of one's life-choices and decisions.

- **Support**

Support is both implicitly and openly understood by the respondents as one of the main features of friendship. There are two kinds of supports which my respondents find especially significant within friendship: support in the sense of affirmation of one's choices or decisions, and support in the emotional sense.

Respondent 25: Aha. Emotional support, of course.

Respondent 27: Yes.

Respondent 25: But I mean, you also need this other in life.

Respondent 27: Yes.

Respondent 25: Business-like. For example, that someone tells you: „Ok, that's a good idea“.  
(Focus group 4, 2012)

The first kind of affirmative support is linked to a friendship being relationship based on a personal choice, meaning that it is also chosen in accordance with the possibility of authenticity within it. Because of this, the respondents sense that they are able to give and receive support within a friendship, regarding choices linked to their life-trajectory:

...a friend gives you support, you give it to them, you support each other and it's ok. The other day I called this 'hard-to-catch-guy' [refers to the story she told before about the friend with whom it is

often hard to synchronize the schedule for a meeting] and I told him ' I would apply to that and that job.' – 'That's right, apply, definitely apply. Let me know what happened. Ok, great, I've got to go. Bye.' And that was it, really ok...but also, vice versa...like, 'I would...I would cut my hair. ' - 'Ok, cut your hair. Let's go together to see how it turns out.' (Respondent 15, Focus group 3, 2012)

Through this kind of affirmation of one's choices, a friend implicitly affirms one's life-trajectory and thus gives support to one's identity<sup>9</sup>. This is linked to the affirmation of one's choices through which a friendship enables the establishment of the trajectory of the self which is not tied to institutional expectations. This is different than the previously mentioned reflexivity which provides affirmation in the sense of a self-concept, since this kind of affirmation is linked more to the one's identity, than the feeling of one's self-worth. However, this kind of reflexivity again makes friendship a psychologically rewarding social area.

Due to trust and affectivity, friend's support is seen as crucial in choosing one's life-trajectory:

Respondent 47: Yes, we love to hear affirmation that the decision on something was good, or did them good...that something is not just our *idée fixe*...

Respondent 25: Yes.

Respondent 47: Or like...

And why do we like to hear it exactly from friends?

Respondent 47: Like I don't know...significant others, it's not all the same if it's some kind of...a passer-by or...for friend, we, like, attach certain emotional meaning. We're back to that. That means, we're somehow...affectively tied to them. Even if they're not qualified and not invited to judge certain situations, but again...we attribute to them that they should be. They're...they're not just anyone, it's like 'hey, those are my friends.' (Focus group 4, 2012)

Another crucial part of support in friendship is emotional support. To which extent is evident from the fact that the respondents often include support in the very definition of friendship as a relationship, whereby friend is defined as someone you can "rely on" or "count on in difficult times": "That you can count on him, like, in different situations which you cannot handle alone..." (Respondent 19, 2012)

---

<sup>9</sup> The term 'identity' is used here as between two definitions: 1) one of the sociological social psychology which sees identity as a meaning which one ascribes to socially taken role (Burke in Stets and Burke 2003) and 2) the one of the Anthony Giddens, who sees self-identity as "the self as reflexively understood by the person in terms of her or his biography" (Giddens 1991, 53). Identity is thus considered to be both the meaning-making by taking a certain social role and the reflexively engaged in terms of evaluation of one's life-trajectory.

The feeling of being able to rely on friends in the emotional sense is sensed as one of the basic functions of friendship, as the discussion in this focus group reveals:

Respondent 6: To me it's also really like, I really now, a few months ago when my dad died....and I really told everyone: don't visit me, I don't feel like it...and a friend called me and said: hey, I'll come, just tell when I need to come. And they came. And I was really glad in that moment because I understood that it was my, some kind of *idée fixe*. And that, like...in the end you are glad because of that really...yes, support is the most important to me.

Respondent 15: It's that when you attend college...as we all did...and like, you take a certain exam and then you...you love it, or hate it, and similar. And then someone sends you a message or calls you. Or while you're at the exam. And you're back, the message waits you, let me know how it went...because someone really cares. Who is not your mother who will, of course, call you and send you messages...and things like that...to know what happened, if you succeeded. It is simply beautiful for me.

Respondent 17: Ok, well, without the support it won't go, it's really like, almost like a definition of friendship. (Focus group 3, 2012)

This is congruent with the findings that the support is an universal trait of friendship across cultures, since it is consistently found not only in Western conceptions of friendships, but also in cross-cultural examinations (Hruschka 2010, 44).

The expectation of support in the emotional sense is generally something which is implicitly understood within friendship:

Respondent 24: ...in the context of friendship...

Respondent 44: ...then it is self-understood, both trust and support.

Respondent 24: Yes.

So it means if it is a friendship, support is self-understood?

Respondent 44: Well, it is desirable, either way. (Focus group 1, 2012)

- **Fun**

Some respondents mentioned fun as important within the context of a real friendship. When I further probed this characteristic within the focus groups, most respondents argued for the need of having fun in friendship, in terms of what it subjectively means for them. Behaviours

which respondents find entertaining with a friend are diverse, ranging from activities organized around common interests to socializing with a friend in different environments and ways. However, the respondents find that a friendship must at least on occasional basis include common enjoyment, in terms of what it subjectively means to have fun for a certain individual: “Because it's supposed to be fun, I mean...at least a part of it. The good side of the friendship. I cannot be friends with someone who's not at least sometimes...to with whom I at least sometimes cannot have fun...because then I...it becomes very...burdening“ [laughs]. (Informant 4, Trial focus group, 2012); “That you can kid around or in other words...have fun with people. That is it. (Respondent 30, 2012)”; “...it is some kind of having fun and recreation...” (Respondent 28, 2012)

Why is fun considered an important part of a friendship? This can be better understood if we regard having fun in friendship as a form of a continuation of childhood play in adulthood. Stuart Brown and Christopher Vaughan identify play as an activity which is a purpose unto itself, allows freedom from time, diminishes consciousness of self and has improvisational potential which helps one to free oneself from a rigid state of mind and to enter the zone outside normal activities, in which one becomes more open to improvising and learns to navigate complex social situations (Brown and Vaughan 2009). Here, Randal Collins's theory of emotional energy which one gets from the interaction ritual chains (Collins 2004) can also be used to explain why fun is seen as necessary content of friendship. Namely, having fun can, in energetic terms, be regarded as Collins's interaction ritual where a successful realization offers a renewal of one's emotional and symbolic resources, which then further function as a form of social capital (Collins 2004). Due to authenticity which is allowed in a real friendship, this is of special significance. Namely, fun with real friends allows social actor to have a release of physiological energy which is limited in a more socially constricted situations which do not allow for authenticity. Indeed, my respondents often use energetic metaphors in these contexts from which it is evident that some form of interactions fill them with energy while others deplete them of it; “Laughter like...not to wear you out, not to drain you...” (Respondent 15, 2012)

Thus generally, ‘having fun’ within friendship in terms of what it subjectively means to have fun for a certain social actor, allows a special type of social interaction in which energetic resources are renewed, which can then serve as an energetic basis for further social contacts.

This also explains why a friendship without fun is considered burdening by the respondents, and which they do not choose to form or continue: “And when you about of it, the opposite of fun is boring. Why would you spend time with someone if you are bored? (Respondent 17, Focus group 3, 2012)

Friendships without fun do not offer the chance of the renewal of energetic resources which one expects to gain within this context.

Interestingly, some of the respondents link the lack of fun in friendship with the lack of reciprocity: “I broke up with two of my friends because they weren't fun. Ok, they talked only about themselves, there was no reciprocity...and they were extremely not-fun so I broke up with them“(Respondent 15, 2012)

Respondent 23: Well, it's important...because you'll hang out more with someone with whom it's always fun...not always, but often...

Respondent 21: More often...

Respondent 23: Than with someone who is always down.

Respondent 21: Who is miserable, pessimistic.

Respondent 23: And he brings you down, too...

Respondent 28:And he always needs support [laughs]

Respondent 23: Yes, then it's like, no reciprocity, because the other one always receives and you don't receive anything, you just give. (Focus group 2, 2012)

Furthermore, a subjective feeling of having fun is not only a prerequisite for a friendship, but a friendship also further fosters the subjective feeling of having fun. It is experienced that a friendship has the possibility of turning ordinary social practices into meaningful activities: “A lot of activities become fun in the circle of friends. Like, the usual coffee-sipping can be uproarious fun, if people get each other and if they pick upon each other's jokes and so on. As much as certain activity is fun, usually it has the tendency of being even more fun with a friend“(Respondent 47, Focus group 4, 2012)

Here, to build up on Collins once again (2004), a friendship manifests itself as an interaction ritual chain which fosters contagious emotional buildup and in this way acts as an energetic renewal of emotional and symbolic resources of the individual.



Thus, the social value of “having fun with friends” lays in its offering of energetic replenishment of emotional resources, which can then later be used for the enactment of emotional resources to further social interactions. “...like, you sit with someone, drink your drink, like, you laugh, have fun and you feel great. Like...when you feel good, it raises self-confidence. Good joking around.” (Respondent 19, 2012)

- **Reciprocity**

The research of reciprocity in friendship was of particular interest for this study because of Giddens's conceptualization of a pure relationship in which he claims that reflexive agents of self-modernity consciously assess what they get out of the relationship (Giddens 1991). However, the respondents in this study only occasionally bring up reciprocity as an important feature in a friendship on their own. When explicitly asked about it, they also give diverse answers; some consciously don't find it important and claim they don't think about it often, while others find it important and think about the proportion of giving vs. receiving in relationship. The ones which find it important are usually the ones who experienced the imbalance in reciprocity in their friendships: “Hm, for a real friendship there needs to be some kind of balance...rare friendships can be maintained if one person feels used.” (Respondent 13, Focus group 1, 2012); “...I think that friendships can exist even if equal reciprocity is not present....and that, again, depends only on if friends are bothered by it or not. I am concretely not bothered at all to give more than I get from friends, and I never find it hard to help someone if I can. And I don't look at what I get in return. Even if the disproportion is very obvious...I personally don't mind.” (Respondent 28, 2012)

However, when those respondents who claim they don't mind the disbalance of giving and receiving in friendship are probed further, it emerges that they find it important at a more of an unconscious level:

In the sense of reciprocal, that one gives and gets equally.

Basically...not. This means...when you have some kind of a friendship, when that is in the game, the point is to get something and not to give something in return...and if it is a real friendship, it will be like that from both sides.

Aha...and that is like, in long-term, is it possible to have friendship in which one side only gives, and other side only receives?

Not really. Like, that a real friendship...

So that means that in the long-term the reciprocity does matter, or?

Reciprocity doesn't...I mean, it is important but it also isn't.

What does that mean?

That means that if it is a real friendship it will always be present, if not, the friendship will vanish.

You mean, reciprocity will always be present if it is a real friendship?

Exactly.

So it does matter, then.

It is not necessary [he laughs]..it is necessary evil.

So it is not important to you, you don't think often about it?

I don't think about it at all. (Respondent 40, 2012)

This points to the direction of reciprocity being an implicit content of friendships, rather than openly negotiated or evaluated in a tit-for-tat manner:

That is, in principle, supposed to be like that, but that is impossible...[..]

Ok, but on some general level, is that reciprocity important?

I don't think it is. It isn't.

It isn't?

It isn't, yes. Because some people can give more, they have the possibilities for it...it doesn't matter what it's about...like, somebody has some kind of a job, or something so he or sh needs a favour...specifically, let's say...like, my friend needed this summer...he is good friends with all of us, and he is into agriculture and he needed some sort of favours from us, and we, twenty of us gathered every day to help him...that means he can hardly pay that back on the same kind of level...he, for example, made a party for all of us, but it is impossible to give that back but nobody, like, asked for anything in return...we did that because we are good friends with him.

Ok, good...but maybe you would, in some kind of situation in the future expect from him that he also, in the same way, pays you back...

Well of course, like, if I will have similar some kind of need, if I call him he will certainly respond...

Yes, get it, that's what I asked, if the reciprocity on the level of expectations was important, like...

Yes. Well ok, then like, it is important. But, it is important, but it is impossible that it is always, like, represented in equal lines. Very hard. (Respondent 48, 2012)

In accordance with this, some respondents even describe reciprocity in friendships as a sense or a feeling rather than a conscious thought: "Basically...if I felt that this level of giving and taking is not in some kind of equilibrium...I would automatically feel bad...that means, that is something that...you almost don't have to think about it, it is something which you start to feel automatically with the passing years..." (Respondent 22, 2012)

That the norm of reciprocity functions on an implicit level, rather than on conscious one, is also revealed in the answers of those respondents who claim that they don't think about reciprocity in general, but however, start to think about it when they sense that what they are giving into the relationship is not reciprocated:

I think that this calculation is in a lot of times present somewhere, as a matter of fact...that somewhere it hands that, like, implicit understanding who contributed more there, who gave more, who invested himself or herself more maybe, who initiated more of it and so on...but it is rarely called for...I think it is one of the things which are just like, in some conflicts, dragged to the surface and that, as a rule, it is tacit and that it is a certain simple modus operandi for each particular friendship...that like, as long as both parties are content with that, that it is more or less self-understood and it can be expected how much each of them will contribute... (Respondent 47, 2012)

Is it important to you [that altruism and selfishness are balanced in friendship]?

It is under that reciprocity...and you know, sometimes you are more of an altruist, sometimes more of a selfish person. It depends on the context, on life circumstances, sometimes you will be more of the one, sometimes more of the other. But when one prevails, then it is not good, it kind of pathology. But I would say, there are friendships like that, for sure...I mean I know people who function that way, based on inequality...like, someone always lends ear and is always a punching bag...and the other is one to be listened to.

Ok, and do you often question this in your friendships?

[very fast] Yes. And when I see that inequality is coming, I try to correct it.

In what way?

By a conscious action.

In what way?

Well you come and ask, hey, am I bothering you with this. Tell me if I do. Bla bla bla. Things like that. Or like, hey, don't bother me man. You are bothering me with this sh\*\* for a month now, back off a little...drink a beer... and let's talk about something else. (Respondent 19, 27, Rijeka-Zagreb)

It is not good if someone loses...then you know...

When someone gets less?

Yes when someone gets less, it will eventually come to the surface...with that contacting and all...and like, why does this person has to be chased that much? Maybe it means that he or she doesn't really care about you that much...as much as you care about her. If something interested her, maybe he or she would activate herself.“ (Respondent 21, 2012)

Graham Allan considers the principle of reciprocity a form of management of non-kin sociable ties, and argues that among other aspects of a relationship such as material exchanges or favours and services offered, it also impacts the commitment and the sense of worth each friend places upon another (Allan 1998, 77). I would argue that this is why my respondents tend to evaluate friendship when they sense they didn't receive enough from it; because they connect it with the extent to which their friend evaluates them. This is evident in the answers of some of the respondents:”I had some friendships in which I realized that this proportion wasn't even, and I've, for example, made too much effort about something that wasn't...I don't know, you simply feel offended...like, when a certain line is crossed you ask yourself, like, why do you need this at all...you have a feeling that this particular person doesn't care about you...that he/she uses you, so...” (Respondent 31, 2012)

However, in most cases reciprocity in friendship is not perceived in the manner of strict accounting. The norm of reciprocity resides more on the level of the possibility for reciprocity which friend offers in the faith that a friend will be there when needed, rather than any kind of firm accounting:

...for example, if I go to help my friend, I don't know, in Križevci, to pick apples, then I hope that he will also come to my home to help me, if I call him and ask him that he will come to my home, to help with the barbecue...

Like, that things are reciprocal?

Yeah. That they are in some kind of balance, I don't know. You get what you give. (Respondent 9, 23, Zagreb)

I think it is the best if someone gives the most that he or she can.

The most that he can, ok. And is it important for you, to equally give and receive?

No, it is important for me that that person gives the most he or she can. I won't force him or her anything, but...to know that he or she cares about me and that he or she tries. (Respondent 20, 2012)

It is also recognized by some respondents as something which is dependable on the possibility of giving and taking the other side has: "Mmhm, probably, yes, but I think you cannot that...not everybody always has the same possibility of giving as he or she is taking in a certain moment. But it definitely should be reciprocal." (Respondent 6, 2011)

In other words, the respondents find that the intention behind the behaviour of reciprocity is more important than the reciprocal behaviour. Also, reciprocity is activated situationally – if a friend helps the other friend, it is expected that the other friend will be available when the first one needs help: "Sometimes there has to be reciprocity, but that shouldn't be like, how would I say, an imperative...but like, simply, in a situation in which reciprocal reaction would be expected, there should be a reciprocal reaction..." (Respondent 41, 2012) As one respondent also notes:

It is not necessary, because often a friendship relation is not measurable in that way...you cannot say how much someone gave you or how much you gave someone...And also, there is a certain period in life, for example if you have problems with your girlfriend, then you will for a month, I don't know, hang out with someone to talk about it...

Aha, when you need more..

Well, yes...when you need more, and that is it. And then again, it can also be like that vice-versa...

Ok, but in general...

Some form of, like, the most general reciprocity is important, yes, of course...if it is not about some pathologies...like, I don't know, you like to be extremely dominant and everybody comes to you , so that you will be a shrink to everybody, it can also work, of course...if others are also willing to

agree to that pathology...for me that is a pathology...if that reciprocity is missing. (Respondent 19, 2012)

Furthermore, reciprocity cannot be accounted for in the short-term period, rather it is important in the long-term; it is considered a long-term process, not a one-time simultaneous activity: "It depends on a situation...but I think that generally some kind of a sum, in the end of all that...as a matter of fact, yes...that in the end the sum should somehow be equal." (Respondent 30, 2012)

Should friendships be equal, in the sense that friends give and get equally?

Well like, when everything is reconed yeah. In a long-term period, yeah.

Ok, and are they like that in practice?

Well I think that friendships mostly break precisely because...it's a classic, when someone gives something and gets nothing in return, but I also had the experience where people have issues with taking, like, they don't know how to take things from other people...so I think that as long as it is not in harmony, it isn't good.

Aha, so it means it has to be some kind of balance?

Yeah. At least in some kind of period of a year. (Respondent 17, 2012)

This finding is also in accordance with Graham Allan's theory; Allan considers the principle of reciprocity important in middle or long-term, not short-term (Allan 1998, 77). These findings are consistent with the findings from behavioristic experiments which also show that reciprocity in friendship is not important in a short-term period, but in a long-term, and is oriented towards a friends' need rather than towards a tit-for-tat reciprocity (Hruschka 2010). It is interesting to note that mutuality of behaviours is also cross-culturally the most frequently cited behaviour in friendship, described in 93 % of societies (Hruschka 2010, 57). However, there is also a group of the respondents who are very sensitive to the amount of reciprocity in friendships and who openly claim to consciously count the amount of reciprocity in a relationship. As was mentioned before, Anthony Giddens argues that people in late modernity are reflexive agents in terms of what they are getting out of pure relationships they are in (Giddens 1991). Thus, the respondents who exhibited this reflexivity were of particular interest for the subject of this study. As one respondent described this reflexive process:

Do you think about how much your friendships are equal? [we discussed earlier that equal was meant in the sense of equal giving and taking]

Yes. Pretty much.

What does that look like?

Well if I feel that, in a certain moment, that I give more than I take from someone, I won't give up on that person, but I will talk to him or her about it and I'll tell him or her that I see this problem, and if he or she doesn't see this problem, I think, we will work on that...if I simply feel that that is a constant in which I give more, then I start making less effort and I come to a certain level....because I don't see the point in making more effort... (Respondent 14, 2011)

This kind of reflexivity about the reciprocity seems to be very emphasized in the respondents who had the experience of not getting enough in friendships: "...because if it is one-sided, it cannot be good. Then one person exhausts herself, and the other feeds herself...and that in that moment has to burst, otherwise the person who only gives will lose it..." (Respondent 23, 2012). Also, a friendship seems to be evaluated in terms of reciprocity when it is being assessed whether it is worth continuing or worth breaking off. This then makes it rather an important characteristic of a friendship, albeit implicit or non-verbalized: "Like, those people wear me out...they were extremely...concretely women...this last with whom I „broke up“...they were like, disturbingly...I'm extremely bothered when someone doesn't ask me 'How are you?' You know, we like hang out for days, hours...and there is none of that...just me and my 'weltschmerz'...like, Werter was nothing compared to me...and for me that was awful...I felt exhausted and couldn't take it anymore...[...] A friendship is not one-way street." (Respondent 15, 26, Velika Gorica/Zagreb)

Also, in the context of plurality of existences of late modernity, it seems that one of the situations in which a friendship also gets evaluated in terms of reciprocity is when a person faces a lack of time for social activities and he/she has to "rationalize" the time spent with certain kinds of social bonds in a certain way, to re-evaluate time spent on friends and other kinds of social ties, such as romantic ones:

It is like, the basics of a relationship...if you perceive that someone gives less, that he/she is using you in some kind of way, that he/she needs you just, like, to talk about their problems, I don't know, then you definitely don't have the same relation as he/she is towards you, and you feel stinted and you don't really like that person anymore, and you don't feel like listening to his/hers problems all the time and so on...or like, if you feel used in any way you don't experience that

friendship like a great friendship. That is why this relation of taking and giving is very important...that you take into account that person when you need some kind of help, and that he/she also can count on you, that you all give and take equally...

So it means...I can see you've thought about this a lot..

Yes, I have [she laughs] I have, because...recently, as I had this one serious relationship in my life, I lost a lot of time which I had before...for maintaining tons of other relations with other people ...and as I devoted all that time to one person, a boyfriend...and then I thought about it, how much effort it required to maintain...and which friendships I want to maintain and which are not really important to me...[...]

I don't know, I worked a lot lately...and before that I was unemployed, so I really, moved people away from myself, literally, I stopped hanging out with them. And now I am in a position in which I have to really renew some relationships...I have to make some effort. Because people, like...let me out of their life and I am no longer the first person who will come to their mind for a party...so I have to establish myself somehow, somehow return again...

That sounds like friendship demands some effort, work...

In my opinion it requires awfully lot...

Really? In what sense?

In the same sense as a love relationship, you simply have to give yourself. You have to...if someone calls you for five times and you reject them five times, they won't call the sixth time. So you simply have to make an effort. You have to weigh things...you have to think, aha, look, I've been missing once, now the next time I have to be there, I have to make an appearance, even if it is 9 o'clock and I have to go to Maksimir [the other side of the city from where we have the interview and she lives] and I am tired, but I have to make an effort. Because, if you are always tired and always don't want to get out of the apartment, and never want to make parties for your birthday, and if you don't feel like it, then people don't feel like dealing with you either. (Respondent 13, 2011)

Thus, while some of the respondents don't think about reciprocity on the conscious level, thinking of the others does resemble Giddens's account of reflexive agents in pure relationships, in the sense that they put a lot upon equality in their friendships and that it is constantly reflexively questioned.



There is, however, also a minor group of four respondents who claim that reciprocity in the sense of equal giving and receiving is not and should not be important in a friendship and that they don't mind giving more than they receive.

Thus, the concluding answers about the importance of reciprocity in a friendship were not found in this research, but the discussion between two respondents on the opposing poles who confronted each other about reciprocity during one of the focus groups could put them in further context:

Respondent 28: ...That is also important to separate, a favour from help. This means, if you do a favour you always ask one back. And friends you don't do favours, to friends you help. That means, you give when he or she needs and don't ask back. And that reciprocity to me also isn't that necessary to be weighed....equal.

Respondent 21: But approximately it has to be.

Respondent 3: Yeah. I don't know, I don't think it has to be approximately, but I think, from my own experience, that it has to exist because I still think...not that you have to ask for it, but if in a friendship you are the person who gives everything all the time...

Respondent 28: So if you are a doctor, and your friend is a chimney sweeper, I'm only joking..[laughs]

Respondent 3: Ok, and?

Respondent 28: I'm joking [laughs]

Respondent 3: No, I mean, why not...

Respondent 28: You'll be a doctor one day...

Respondent 3: Yes, ok, and?

Respondent 28: You have friends which are not studying medicine.

Respondent 3: Yes, and?

Respondent 28: And they will call you, and they will ask you for things all the time...I'm in pain, can you do this for me, can you do that...because you are doctor, see?

Respondent 3: Yes, but will it be my friends?

Respondent 28: Friends who are already your friends. And they will become something else. Economists, anything.

Respondent 3: Well ok, but maybe I will need, I don't know...I will want to buy an apartment, and I will have a lawyer friend, and then I'll do the same, I'll call him and like, hey, listen, what do I need?

Respondent 21: Yes.

Respondent 3: ...where is the land register, what is cadastre...which is the law.

Respondent 28: That means, you have nothing against that?

Respondent 21: Well to me it's like...if I can help...

Respondent 3: I don't mean...you have certain experiences and that is ok, but on the other side like...especially on an emotional level...you cannot expect that I listen to your problems all the time and I don't get anything in return....to you I'm maybe your best friend. But you are not a friend to me, you are a...bloodsucker to me [laughs, all other laugh] I mean, what to say... (Focus group 2, 2012)

That reciprocity seems to be unimportant in friendship until the moment of the occurrence of disbalance in giving and receiving further points to the conclusion that it is implicitly important.

#### 4.1.3 Summary: Real friendship as social relation

Real friendship as a relationship is generally considered valuable by the respondents. Its value, it was found, is linked to its nature of voluntariness and the possibility of sharing one's life with another person in a manner which is perceived as not tied to social stratum. In other words, instead of being anchored in social structure, it is formed and maintained based on the content of the relationship. Furthermore, it is a social relationship whose formation is based on a personal choice to a greater extent than any other relationship. It is precisely these two factors – personal choice in its formation and the content of friendship in its maintenance – that are perceived as giving friendship a social value.

However, this does not mean that a personal choice in forming of friendship is limited. Real friendships are formed and maintained within the constraints of the social structure.

Social practices of friendship differ according to their time-space organization. Time-space organization usually corresponds to the ways in which social time is structured in late modernity and thus, when it comes to forming of real friendships, they are prone to forming within certain social pools that are characterized by a certain ways of shared social time.

Real friendship is characterized by the practice of the shared social time. Moreover, temporal organisation of friendship is crucial for the differentiation between a real friendship and the other kinds – the formation of a real friendship requires time in the sense of long-term spending of shared time or intensely spent shorter periods of time. In real friendships time is what allows the possibility of the organization of friendship through shared experiences, which foster forming of trust, and consequently, the establishment of intimacy. Accordingly, most respondents find that most of their real friendships are chosen within the areas where they have spent significant amount of time in institutionalized settings of late modernity. Those are usually shared educational backgrounds or foci of activity based on similar interests. Shared networks are also mentioned in the context of forming of friendships.

Shared experiences are one possible social link on which emphasis is put in the context of the formation of a real friendship. However, a real friendship can also be established on the basis of two other kinds of social links; shared interests or shared worldviews. Shared interests are important in the sense of constituting the basis for further spending of time organized around certain foci of activity related to shared interests. Shared worldviews are not necessary precondition for friendship, but can serve as social link which forms the friendship. All three possible shared social links serve as the foundation for the establishment of two-person sociability and further, of maintenance of friendship. ‘Click’, in terms of emotional and cognitive resonance which fosters forming of an affective bond between friends, is also often mentioned as a precondition which fosters a real friendship.

Regarding the content of a friendship, there are certain characteristics which it has to contain in order to be experienced as a real friendship. As was already mentioned, personal agency is the decisive element in forming, maintenance and dissolution of real friendship. In the context of late modernity in which identities are individualized and are no longer defined in terms of collective identities, this allows one the possibility of self-determination through friendships. This is, however, intrinsically linked to other characteristics of a friendship; authenticity and acceptance. A friendship offers the area of authenticity which, through personal choice of a friend who accepts one authenticity, leads to self-affirmation.

The precondition for the establishment of friendship is also trust. Trust is established through shared experiences, which enables affectivity and the possibility to test trustworthiness of a friend. From this the faith in benevolence of a friend, the sense of his or her commitment and the capacity of his or her acceptance of one's authenticity are established upon which trust in a friend is based. Trust then functions as a form of implicit insurance against disclosing friend's intimacy with others outside the relationship. Intimacy is the main *differentia specifica* which distinguishes real friendships from more superficial ones which are considered more socially distant. The crucial dimension of intimacy is self-disclosure; putting one's intimacy at friend's disposal and getting the same in return. This then creates mutual knowledge of each other, which further allows one to be able to elicit certain sorts of responses from a friend and to predict friend's responses and thus to navigate the relationship more easily. However, real friendship can be built upon closeness or familiarity instead of intimacy, which grow from shared experiences without the necessary self-disclosure. Sincerity is one of the most important characteristics of a friendship, to the point where it is also often mentioned as *differentia specifica* between real friendships and other socially more distant relationships. A real friendship is thus characterized by honesty which sometimes even requires to have the potential to emotionally hurt a friend, if the intention behind this kind of honesty is benevolent. This is what gives real friendship an unique value, since it allows the content of reflexivity in terms of evaluation of oneself. In this way a friendship offers building blocks of the one's self through reflexive evaluation. Friendship is also a source of reflexivity in the sense of self-affirmation which strengthens one's self-concept and self-worth. The reflexivity which is offered within friendship, however, is of special sociological significance since it is linked to the content of one's authenticity which is accepted within friendship. This means that it is not tied to one's position in social stratum, but nevertheless it gives value to one's subjective social position. It further also means that a real friendship has the strong possibility of embeddedness of the individual into the social, but beyond the objective social positions in social stratum.

Benevolence towards a friend is also one of the crucial normative characteristics in real friendship. Having friend's best interests in mind, both in his or her presence or absence, ensures the formation and continuation of trust. On the level of the behaviour benevolence can also manifest itself as tactfulness; as a protective practice which manifests itself as the attunement to emotional needs of a friend and to protect him or her against emotional hurt.

Reliability is needed in a friendship on a general level; in the form of trust in friend's support when it is needed.

A real friendship can only thrive in the condition of authenticity; of open invitation to both the front and the end region of friend's social performance. It is also linked to acceptance; it implicates faith that a friend will savour both the front and the back. The precondition of authenticity is also understanding; it provides a safe context for the emotional release.

Support is also one of the main features of friendship, to the extent that a friendship is often defined as a relationship offering support, among which emotional support and the support regarding self-determination are crucial ones. Support regarding self-determination is linked to one's identity-project which in this way gets affirmation from a friendship.

In the context of the maintenance of a friendship, a personal agency manifests itself as effort. Effort invested in a friendship is expected from both sides to overcome the possible intrinsic or external hardships which the relationship might face. This aspect of personal agency is especially emphasized in social conditions of late modernity which are unfavourable for friendship maintenance, such as scarcity of time or living in geographically remote areas.

Fun is also experienced as necessity in friendship, in terms of subjective meaning of fun for the participants of every particular friendship. Fun offers energetic replenishment and builds one's capacity for further social interactions. Reciprocity is another ingredient needed for a real friendship, in terms of equally giving and taking, but however, not in a tit-for-tat manner. A tit-for-tat reciprocity is rarely typical for real friendships, and is usually considered a sign of disbalance. Instead, reciprocity is something which is implicitly understood as a long-term principle underlying real friendships. In accordance with this, it should occur spontaneously and not simultaneously, and is rather situational in the sense of the expectation of friend's reciprocation when it is needed. The implicit character of the principle of reciprocity in friendships becomes obvious by the rupture which tends to arise in friendships if the principle is not practiced.

When all these characteristics are perceived as entangled, a real friendship reveals itself as complex and delicate social relation whose characteristics often pose delicate demands on its participants. It can also be suggested that its main value lies in the potential social embedding of the individual while it simultaneously gives him or her the space outside of the social

stratification. The integrative social potential of this kind of sociability which extends beyond the social stratum should not be disregarded.

## 4. 2 Social friendships

As was already mentioned, during the interviews I often noticed that Croatian emerging adults use the strategy of differentiating between real/close friendships and other kinds of friendships. Some respondents automatically differentiate between the types of friendships:

...[laughs] on Facebook there is this situation with birthdays...I see that someone has a birthday and if I am really good friend with him or her, I will phone him or her....like, if I don't have a good relationship with him I will send him a message...

Aha, wait, if you are really good friends you will phone him?

Yes. If I am really good friends, I won't need Facebook, I know that birthday is that day...that is maybe a contemporary approach [he laughs] not to the ranking of friends, but like, some kind of feeling... (Respondent 46, 2012)

Other respondents consciously notice that there seems to be a category of friends between 'real friends' and acquaintances. They also note that the precise linguistic designation for this category of friend seems to be missing: "You always have that one or two who are real friends, with whom you hang out and share a lot of things with them...the difference between frend and friend [she laughs].

[...] What is a frend, and what is a friend?

Frend<sup>10</sup> is...hmm....a better acquaintance. [laughs] (Respondent 20, 2012)

When I decided to further explore the topic of social friendships through focus groups, the discussions also often ended in a consensus that there is a category between a friend and an acquaintance, which has some characteristics of both relationships, but is still considered a friend:

Respondent 44: That means friend-frend-acquaintance.

---

<sup>10</sup> 'Frend' is a Croatian translation of English word 'friend'. However, it was noticed during the research that Croatian translation is used in a slightly different context than the English word. Thus I have decided to leave it as 'frend' in translations, underlining it so there would be a visible difference between the English word and its Croatian counterpart.

Respondent 30: Well a frend and an acquaintance might be even the same...I don't know, or they overlap a lot.

So that's used in a speech?

Respondent 30: Yes, yes, yes.

Ok, and in practice...like, I mean in practice you make a separation between friend or a frend, or?

Respondent 30: Yes, simply by your certain impressions or feelings...I don't know.

What is a frend then?

Respondent 30: Well a frend is...a person you know a little or nothing, but let's say we had moments of fun, something like that, let's say...or we went for three coffees together, and there it is, I can call him/her a frend.

Mmhm.

Respondent 30: I don't know, and a friend is what we had now on these papers [talking about characteristics of a real friendship] [everybody laughs]

Respondent 7: Yes, yes. Friends include papers, everything that is on the papers, and friends are like, frend from college.

Respondent 44: Yes, indeed.

Respondent 7: I know him only from college, like, and that's it. So...

Respondent 24: We call that college-frend [laughs]

[...]

Respondent 42: ...but again you have some people who are exactly, aren't either friends, or acquaintances, like...at least I have lot of those...

Respondent 30: Which ones...

Respondent 44: [laughs]: Which are 'friends'.

Respondent 42: Lot of such. Such...relations. That means in which, like, I don't hang out with people really intensively, but we see each other now and then, we meet, we share certain things...but I cannot really say that they are my friends-friends.

Aha. Aha.

Respondent 42: Yes. That's how it works with me.

Others? Do you have such friendships?

Respondent 44: Yes, it's true, there is some kind of term missing for something between friends and acquaintance. (Focus group 1, 2012)

The respondents in other focus group experience Croatian translation of the English word frend as filling the lack of designation for the category of friendship between real friendship and acquaintance:

Respondent 13: And that's where a frend sneaked in.

Respondent 26: Yes.

Respondent 41: It did.

Respondent 13: Frend slipped in.

Respondent 41: I think that frend filled a colloquial hole, yes.

And a frend is...?

Respondent 13: A frend is...

Respondent 41: Between an acquaintance and a friend.

Respondent 13: Yes.

Respondent 41: Someone with whom you hang out often, but which...with whom you don't have that certain intimacy. (Focus group 5, 2013)

Thus, the respondents often use the word frend to describe the relationship which is neither socially as distant as acquaintanceship, nor as close as real friendship. What are the features of this kind of friendship?

#### 4.2.1 Features of social friendship as opposed to real friendship

- **Contextuality vs. substantivity**



The respondents experience social friendships as relationships which are practiced in fleeting kind of contexts or are organized around certain activities which are conducted in their lives, such as college, sport activities or workplace. Thus, in opposition to real friendships which are substance-dependent, social friendships are context-dependent. In other words, while the emphasis in real friendships is on organization around the content of a relationship, the emphasis in social friendships is on organization around the context in which they are practiced, or the activity which is practiced in it:

Respondent 6: It can be in the sense, I don't know, someone is a friend with whom you go out, I don't know, you attend some kind of activities which you don't do with someone else, but it comes down really to that sort of activities, how to put it...

Respondent 1: Or if you have fun with someone.

Respondent 6: Yes, entertainment. (Focus group 3, 2012)

From this, the different temporal organization of social friendship as opposed to real friendship arises. More precisely, unlike real friendships, contextually organized social friendships have greater possibility of ceasing when the context around which they are organized ceases to exist: "...and I think they change pretty quickly as you change the environment...we were a crew in high school, and there are three persons left..." (Respondent 2, 2011)

Social friendships organized around having fun, however, are based on occasional encounters: "I have some people with whom I meet, like, once a month, but..."

What is the difference?

...that is the only time we spend together. Like, we meet for coffee...it's not like we share anything else." (Respondent 42, 2011)

In opposition to this, real friendships are characterized by continuity. While real friendships are often characterized by the sharing of experiences significant for one's life-trajectory, social friendships don't necessarily have this characteristic. Instead, they are often organized around shared interests: "...friends with whom you'll go to a football match or to see a movie or what not...Outside of that again you won't, I don't know, call them for a christening of your third child and so on." (Respondent 3, Focus group 2, 2012)

- **Different contents; socializing vs. intimacy**

In social friendships many of the characteristics which were previously named as substantive characteristics of a real friendship are not necessarily present or expected since many of the normative characteristics of friendships which enable them are also not present.

For one, while trust is seen as a prerequisite and a basis of real friendships, it is not necessary for social friendships which can also function without it:

Can friendship exist without trust?

Respondent 1: Hardly, I don't think so.

Respondent 14: Well, real and sincere no, but some like superficial totally.

Respondent 1: Yeah, more like...like acquaintanceship. [..]

Respondent 4: It can be in the sense, I don't know, someone is your friend with whom you go out, I don't know, you attend some kind of activities which you don't do with someone else, but it comes down more to those activities, I don't know how to say it...

Respondent 1: Or if you precisely have fun with someone.

Respondent 4: Yes, fun. (Focus group 3, 2012)

Furthermore, intimacy is often mentioned as the *differentia specifica* of the content of a real/close friendship and social friendships. While real friendships are experienced as oriented around the content of a friendship in the form of intimacy, authenticity, understanding, reflexivity, support and fun, social friendships are experienced as oriented towards socializing:

With frend you can go out every weekend, like, Friday, Saturday, drink, go to excursions together, go to Sljeme, go bike riding...but you won't tell him that your mom is ill, like, for example.

Respondent 41: Yes, let's say, yes.

Because?

Respondent 13: Because you don't have the relationship of intimacy and like, sincerity, sharing of anything but joking around, fun. (Focus group 5, 2013)

Consequently it follows that the knowledge of the other is not necessarily present in this kind of relationships: "...you can have a frend [laughs a little cynically], which is today taken over

from English...with whom you go out, with whom you hang out, but who doesn't truly know you“ (Respondent 3, Focus group 2, 2012)

As it also follows, authenticity is also limited in the relationship with social friends: “Circle of people in which I'm currently...and then, like, this group of people who I've volunteered with and like that, them I experience as friends in this part, and I don't talk to them about some emotional part...but most of all, I consider friends those whom I can, I don't know, whom I can that show part of me, like, when you're feeling bad, when you're down, when there are problems, that is really the most important thing.“ (Respondent 33, 2012)

Namely, since trust has, as we have seen before, a protective role against failure of intimacy in a relationship, non-existence of such trust in social friendships leads to more caution when it comes to the revealing one's true self and removing one's, in Goffman's terms ( Goffman 1990), the front : “In my personal case, it is rarely reflected, so I have maybe one friend and a girlfriend who is my friend which means that I feel that...mmhm...free with them to be what I am. And already outside of that circle, if in your mind you always....I admit also, that I think about my words a little bit more, and I see that others behave the same way towards me.“ (Respondent 11, 2011)

Sincerity is also not necessarily present within social friendships, which is to be expected since there is no knowledge of the person and also no necessary belief in other person's benevolence: “It's like, sincerity is zero points, it is only important who tells a better joke...” (Respondent 9, 2011)

Linked to the lack of intimacy and authenticity to the extent to which it is practiced in real friendships, there are also differences in expectations one has from a real friendship and from a social friendship. While one socializes with latter, one does not expect them to provide support when it is needed. Namely, the need for support arises in conditions where quality goes beyond the front of the social performance. To ask for support, one has to minimize the front of one's social performance and the respondents find this hard to do when there is no intimacy in a relationship: “That looks like that... that you hang out...you hang out and go out, you go out together, you have a dinner at someone's, but...he or she is not the person you will call at 4 AM when you are stuck at the Central station...for example, I have 90% friends like that whom I would not ask for help in that kind of a situation. Like, people you don't want to incommode because you feel uncomfortable.“ (Respondent 13, 2011)

Reflexivity is also not as meaningful in the context of the social friendships, as it is in the context of the real ones. Namely, the opinion of social friends does not have the same significance as that provided from real friends: “I care great deal less about ...correcting myself in relation to them.” (Respondent 35, 2013)

Following all this, interaction is also experienced as different in regard to the type of a friendship. Since trust is not present in social friendships, communication is less organized around intimate topics and more around fun or mutual information flow:

Respondent 47: It actually comes down to that more – what's up with you, what's up with me...

Respondent 25: Yes.

Respondent 27: Yes.

Respondent 47: More to some kind of an exchange of information, than to some kind of emotional relating... (Focus group 4, 2012)

Thus, social friendships are experienced as mostly organized towards the content of socializing, while real friendships are experienced as organized around the content in the sense of intimacy or closeness: “...sometimes they [friendships] are really good when they are in a certain phase of life, just in college, now it's great and later it doesn't make sense anymore. And sometimes even long-termed...I think some other things are important. I don't know...I think that those with whom you have similar interests, that is one phase in life. And others which are in fact a support and love you the way you are, they will always be...” (Respondent 10, 2011)

- **Instrumental character vs. uniqueness of the relationship**

Since social friendships are seen as organized around socializing in a certain context, it can be said that they are in this sense of instrumental character. Namely, they are not organized around the content of the relationship, but instead around the certain benefit which individual gets out of the relationship, such as socializing or shared activity-doing:

Respondent 25:...it is in a moment, in some situation from which we both get, let's say, something good, more than something bad, like.

Respondent 27: Yes.

Respondent 25: That friendship, exactly that. I think that in college they are maybe the most...maybe in the business also, pretty often and pretty useful, so...

Useful in what sense?

Respondent 25: Well what do I know...in that you have a colleague, which will help you in college with scripts, with, to spend time with someone on a break, mostly for information...

Respondent 27: Mmmhm.

Respondent 25: I'd say information is maybe crucial here.

Mmmhm. Ok. Anything else?

Respondent 27: Well...yes, for example, to me those are, quote-unquote, friendships at work...purely for some information exchange. I mean, I don't hang out with those people...outside of work, but at work we really talk about a lot of things and that flow of information is important.

Ok, that means those would be friendships we have certain benefit from...

Respondent 27: Let's say.

Respondent 25: Yes.

Respondent 27: Let's say, yes.

Respondent 47: I...

Respondent 27: Not even consciously.

Respondent 47: Sorry.

Respondent 27:...it's not even that we consciously draw benefit from it.

Spontaneously?

Respondent 27: Spontaneously, yes. [laughter]

Respondent 47: Yes, it seems to me that in that circle of my friends lots of things are in fact superficial. Lots of things are purely like, we meet and we do something, without necessarily becoming any closer through it or...but, simply, like, maybe even a matter of habit a little, maybe simply...like, the wish to do something together, any kind of silly things and the content doesn't matter to us, or some deep involvement in that... (Focus group 4, 2012)

In other words, social friendships do have an implicit goal of a certain benefit to be gained out of a relationship, although a relationship is not necessarily consciously entered with the aim of gaining something:

It depends on whether they are the best friends or just friends...I mean, to best friends you reveal everything, to others no.

Mmhm. And what do you do with those, only friends? What is the difference between best friends and only friends?

Well to best friends you reveal everything, and with others you just hang out and go out, for example. (Respondent 45, 2012)

In opposition to this, real friendships are organized around the intimate content of a relationship with a particular person. Since social friendships are not organized around the intimate content with a particular person, but their goal is a certain benefit which one gets from a relationship, it can be said that they are less organized around the uniqueness of a friend than real friendships:

Mmm...I separate them like this: I have friends. I often call it precisely like that exactly because the language is very important for me, because it's my profession. Friend I use for like, people who I'm fond of or something...but I distinguish, like, friends, real friends I often call by name. It means, I say that it is someone, I call him precisely by name. I say Marko, and other people often call him by his surname, and I always say Marko, and then people ask me who he is. It means, I make an effort to say even two sentences about him, on purpose, no matter how many times... (Respondent 12, 2011)

Similarly, Simmel argues for the difference between the acquaintance as “superficial relationships“, which are centered “around clearly circumscribed interests that must be fixed objectively“, and friendship relationships which are, in contrast, based on the person in “its totality“ (Simmel 1950, 324-325). Following the similar logic, it can be said that in a real friendship a relationship is based on the totality of the person, while in a social friendship the emphasis is not as much on the person with whom one socializes, but the benefit one gets out of the socializing process: “..if I know that she is on some kind of a fifteenth place, and like, if I can't go with five people, then ok, I'll call you. But if she is very important to me, and I want to go see a movie with precisely her...and it is important to me...and I see that she gets it like yes-no...then it's awful for me and in that sense reliability is extremely important for me.“ (Respondent 17, 2012)

#### 4.2.2 Types of social friendships

There are different types of social friendships which respondents identify. Based on the temporal organization of a relationship, two types of social friendships can be distinguished: contextual and situational friendships.

Contextual friendships are social friendships organized around the time-limited context in which a social actor finds himself or herself. They are formed with the aim of socializing within the context, or benefiting in some other way from a relationship. Within contextual friendships, there are different subtypes regarding the temporal organization that can be differentiated.

The first subtypes are contextual friendships. In these contexts the development of a social friendship is based on the need to pleasantly spend extended periods of time in a certain life-phase with other people: “It means, at work, at college...you like someone for their attitudes and you are comfortable. You spend part of your time together. Often with friends who are not friends you spend more time than with those who are really your friends.” (Respondent 12, 2011) Thus Croatian emerging adults acknowledge that there is a need to socialize even in those areas of life which social conditions of late modernity, such as an increased mobility and the plurality of experiences, make fleeting; “You enrol into a college and you need a crew because one simply cannot be alone. And...you hang out with people, and sometimes you even hang out with people only because you don't know what to do with yourself.” (Respondent 9, 2011)

Such contexts are usually of a fleeting nature and cover only a certain life-phase in the lives of young adults. Namely, often it happens that such friendships end after they have served their purpose, in other words, after the social situations in which one has spent time together on everyday basis end:

I was a major in college on which there was a five of us. And...it was very popular, which is very obvious since there were five of us. I didn't know any of those people...and we befriended greatly, we went to the same lectures together, and we named ourselves after one professor as a group...as his group...it was ‘mui simpatico’. We hanged together awfully lot, we went out, we drank, we gave each other gifts for birthdays, e-mailed each other, cared for each other, this and that. We all graduated. We all talk to each other now and then. It is very hard for us to meet, five people, I'm not talking like, about the whole class. It is very hard for us to meet, we haven't met once since the

graduation...mmm...we still talk to each other, we're in contact, this and that...you know, that cohesion is not there. It was a group. I cannot say those were my friends. Those were a kind people with whom I studied and with whom I'm still in contact...(Respondent 17, Focus group 3, 2012)

Respondent 7: ...friends are like, friend from college.

Respondent 24: Hey, yeah.

Respondent 7: I know him only from college, like, and that's it. Thus...

Respondent 24: We call that college-friend [laughs]

How do you call it, college-friend?

Respondent 44: College-friend.

Respondent 24: Yes, yes, yes. It really is, we have that exact term, that exact." (Focus group 1, 2012)

There exists a certain overlapping between social contextual friendships and acquaintanceship. Some respondents do, after the ending of the context around which association was organized, start considering contextual friends as only acquaintances. There is however a difference in the level of familiarity between an acquaintance and a contextual friend. Contextual friendships are not primarily organized around intimacy. However, at a certain point while the context in which they form lasts, and thus due to the large amounts of time spent together and thus shared experiences and knowledge of the other, develop certain level of familiarity. However, if maintenance of friendship does not continue after the context ends, then a friendship can be considered contextual:

Those short-term friendships, they are more like acquaintanceships, maybe. I, for example, socialized with some girls from college from which I haven't heard in a year and a half. Now I see those were interest-based associations, and some common things...although those associations at the time went to a wider spectrum, so we talked about everything, and then it was very intensive, going out and all that, but it didn't continue. (Respondent 4, 2011)

Among contextual friendships some of the respondents also identify friendships which are organized around a certain activity or locality which repeats in time. Such friendships happen in isolated contexts in certain intervals, for example at the seaside or at conferences which repeat periodically: "I mean those seasonal could be, I don't know, people at the seaside you see every year...and then you like, hang out with them because you are at the same place



and...but you don't hang out together back at home. That would, for example, be seasonal.“  
(Respondent 44, 2012)

They lack the continuous spatial social context in which they would be maintained and are thus, in terms of the time-organization of a relationship, of repetitive nature in certain time periods, or as one respondent terms them, ‘seasonal friendships’. One of the respondents who acquired lot of such friendships through an international organization, in which he volunteered, describes it:

It is not one conference, there are a lot of them...and on the other hand, I also know that sometimes the thing was not in two weeks, but in three days. Of very intensive conversations about different topics and...that is a person who...maybe you won't see each other physically but in that certain short period, because they are...in my case those are really tough topics, from like...since it is international organizations of volunteers, you talk about everything from medical ethics to what not...like, you realize that your worldviews are very similar and that a potential for a friendship exists....[...] and they're my friends, I don't know, when I go to Istanbul I always contact them...I contact those who are from Istanbul, we sit for coffee, we are glad, we talk, we always have something to talk about and we know each other...but we don't spend enough time together. Which I also think that it is important for a friendship, as much as we can not see each other for six months and still be great friends, but I think that for like, real friendships it is still important that people spend time together... (Respondent 3, Focus group 2, 2012)

The maintenance of seasonal friendships is in late modernity often fostered through online space of flows. Friendships made on social occasions such as conferences or seminars are maintained through online space of flows in between of the occurrence of the spatial social context around which they are organized:

Yes, I look at like, I don't know...what happens, where other travelled, maybe some photos of kid I wouldn't even see...get it, where they were, we comment on each other a little bit and that's it...especially if they're strangers...

And you have some friends which are strangers?

Yes, yes.

Oh, and how do you hear from each other most often?

Well through...through Face.

Through chat...and through Skype.

You hear from each other often?

Not really, maybe 2-3 times a year.

2-3 times a year? Ok...and where do you know those people from?

I mostly met them when...when in Ferrero [company where she worked] I went, for two months to some...I call that Big-Brother [laughs]

Like a team-building?

Like a team-building, yes. And like, we met there and it was really great and...I am mostly in contact with them...not with everybody, but with those I befriended the most. (Respondent 21, 2012)

Thus, online space of flows, and particularly Facebook, together with occasional meetings, allow incidental friendships to continue at the level of social friendships.

There is, however, another kind of a social friendship which is not contextual, as identified by the respondents. Those are friendships organized around association for the sake of socializing, having fun or doing certain interest-based activities with friends. Unlike contextual friendships which are organized around an often institutionalized context not based on the social actor's own initiative, these friendships are organized around occasional meetings on the initiative of a friend:

Respondent 17: What is then a friend for pilates? Get it, what is that?...Like, what is that?

Respondent 4: No, I don't know, I don't have these kinds of friends, but I know that people do have...

Respondent 17: A friend for a walk..., I mean I do have such friends, so I ask myself what is really the function of those people.

Respondent 1: To walk on Jarun [laughs]

Respondent 17: Yes, but it is still somehow cold, it is really cold, like, you know, this is my friend with whom I solve problems in love relationships...this is my friend with whom I go to movies on Wednesdays, this is my friend to go for coffee in my neighbourhood, this is a friend for drinking...like, to me it is really...to me it seems cold. I mean, I have lots of these friends because I cannot get it all in one person, so I compensate somehow, but sometimes it turns out...like that, when I think about it a little, it isn't really nice.

Respondent 1: It is the fact that you find some people are good for certain activities, but as great as they are for that, for something else you simply don't get along. And vice versa. (Focus group 3, 2012)

Situational social friendships can be long-termed and can even include the aspect of intimacy. They are in this sense similar to real friendships. However, they differentiate from real friendships since they are not experienced as organized around the content of the friendship in the sense of intimacy. Instead, the socializing aspect is at the forefront of these friendships:

What are those friends for, then?

Respondent 50: Well shared interests. To go to the seaside with them, to go swimming with them, to...to kill people [he is joking, laughter]

Respondent 41: If you want to return to 'having fun'...fun is a key feature of those, let's say, while for others, maybe, the highest level, intimacy is a key feature.

Aha, aha, aha, ok.

Respondent 41: It seems to me that way.

Ok. Others, do you agree?

Respondent 13: Yes, fun, absolutely. (Focus group 5, 2013)

Why is social friendship not acquaintanceship? As I have already mentioned, some of the respondents do talk about some of the relationships which I gathered under the designation of 'social friendship' as 'acquaintances'. Also, social friendships do to some extent overlap with acquaintances in their characteristics. However, when specifically asked, most of my respondents differentiate between the two. The difference is felt in the feeling of social closeness resulting from the level of familiarity which is experienced as different for social friends and acquaintance. An acquaintance is rarely seen as a person with whom one has spent time alone and is felt by the respondents as a more distant relation:

Respondent 4: ...there should be a word for something between a friend and an acquaintance...

Respondent 15: Mate.

Respondent 4: Yes, I find acquaintance really cold, an acquaintance is someone whom I know that he exists, I say to him or her 'hi' on the street and I don't want to talk to him further, I don't know...

Ok, and this category in-between is?

Respondent 4:..is a kind of a person I know a little more about and who has some kind of...is interesting because of something, we can hang out now and then... (Focus group 3, 2012)

Acquaintances are also described by the respondents as people with whom they are not in immediate contact, meaning that the meeting is rarely or never on one's own initiative: "...a boyfriend of my friend asked me, for example, if we're friends...I said, we don't share intimate secrets and we don't go for coffee alone so like...I think we're still acquaintances [laughs]" (Respondent 6, 2011); "I'd say that the acquaintance is someone to whom you haven't even talked yet, but you simply know them through someone else." (Respondent 44, Focus group 1, 2012)

However, certain overlapping of two terms, characteristics for relationships, does exist. Namely, since there is no adequate term for a social friendship, they're sometimes defined by my respondents as 'better acquaintances': Frend is a better acquaintance [laughs]" (Respondent 20, 2012).

Further on, similarity is experienced as the difference in organization of a relationship. Both relationships are not perceived as organized around the content of intimacy and are not oriented towards the uniqueness of the participants. However, the respondents recognize the difference between an acquaintance and a social friend in the occurrence of socialization. Social friends are considered as people with whom they repeatedly socialized in the past or currently socialize with:

Respondent 41: ...for me it is enough that I got drunk with a person on one evening and that we like, we really had a good time [laughter]. If we did that than we can be friends. If it happened once – that's it. If we spent, like, we had a good time once. That is already enough to consider someone a friend.

Aha, ok.

Respondent 13: To me that are friends of friends.

Respondent 26: That also.

Respondent 41: That also, let's say. Also that...But, with whom you hanged out sometimes. Not just those you like, saw but...

Respondent 13: Yes.

Respondent 41:...with whom you hanged out on occasions.

Respondent 13: Yes.

What is then the difference between a frend and an acquaintance?

Respondent 41: Well...with an acquaintance you didn't hang out, you just know him... (Focus group 5, 2013)

Following from this, unlike acquaintanceship, social friendships are characterized by at least occasional encounters:

Respondent 3: ...those are people with whom you hang out now and then, but...

Respondent 21: Maybe little more than acquaintances.

Mmhm, in what sense?

Respondent 21: Maybe you see them a little more often... (Focus group 2, 2012)

Respondent 42: ...you have some people which are exactly that, they are neither friends, nor acquaintances...at least I have many like that...

Respondent 30: Which ones...

Respondent 44: [laughs] Which are friends.

Respondent 42: ...many like that. Relations...like that. That means in which I, like, don't hang out with those people really intensively, but we see each other occasionally, we meet, we share some things...but to say that they're friends-friends would be an overstatement. (Focus group 1, 2012)

When it comes to contextual friendships, the line between acquaintanceships and friendships seems to be more blurred, since the contextual friendship is prone to ceasing after the context which has enabled it, ceases. Why do I consider them friendships, then, instead of an acquaintanceship? Because in the life-phase in which they are practiced, they are characterized by a large amount of time spent together. This, however, brings a certain amount of shared experiences and a certain level of the familiarity with others. These, albeit not existing to the extent to which they exist in real friendships, nevertheless differentiate a relationship from an acquaintanceship in which they are minimal or non-existent: “...friends which I have at work, with whom I go out now and then and so on...we have good relations, we see each other every day, hang out at work...” (Respondent 41, 2012)

...for example, you enrol into a certain course and now you have practice sessions, I don't know, three or four times a week and after each practice session you go to drink beer together. Those are practically people which you see most ...[...]those are people which you see that like, that often, and you go together...'now we are hanging out a lot, let's go to the seaside together this year', or something like that. To me it happened that now, two or three years after that I no longer train that, and now I just gradually remove those people from Facebook because like, aha, we haven't seen each other for a long time...that means, shared interest at this one point in time, gone, over.  
(Respondent 13, Focus group 5, 2013)

However, it also has to be noted that types of friendships which are described here function as ideal types, used to build the methodology of friendships in late modernity in order to understand challenges friendship faces in social conditions of late modernity more easily. It should be noted that the complexity of the social reality in late modernity and the creativity of social actors in deploying strategies of action in their methodology of relationships makes it safe to assume that in a more complex social reality there are also variations of these types of friendships. These would, for example, be friendships which exhibit a mixture of characteristics of the two ideal types of friendships.

## **5 REMODULATION OF FRIENDSHIP IN LATE MODERNITY**

### **5.1 Durability of friendships**

One of the objections of this research was to establish the experience of durability of a friendship in late modernity. In other words, the intent was to explore the experience which emerging adults have with temporal organization of a friendship relationship – if they see it as a bond which is durable or increasingly transient. The intent behind this was to explore whether a friendship in late modernity is experienced as easy dissolvable or as resistant to fluctuations in social conditions of late modernity.

However, as was shown in the previous chapter, the initial concept of a friendship deployed in the research proposal proved to be too general. Friendship is, instead of as a unified concept, experienced by Croatian emerging adults as existing in variety of organizational forms which differ mostly in their temporal organization. From this it follows that the experience of durability of relationship is linked to a type of friendship.

A real friendship, characterized by the aforementioned characteristics, is experienced by most of the respondents as a tie of durable nature. Namely, time is central to the organization of a real friendship. A real friendship needs either a longer period of time (at least a few months), or intensively spent shorter periods of time in order to develop at all, through the establishment of trust. Thus, since trust develops over time, it is generally expected that mutual personal effort will be involved in the forming of friendship and that, consequently, a tie will be of a long-term nature: “...friendship is like a sort of an emotional connection...that means, we get attached emotionally to certain people, that means, we get attached in the way of having certain expectations and like, we want them to fulfil those expectations for a longer period of time...because, basically, if we thought that it was short-termed we wouldn't like, hang out together too much, or make efforts to maintain a relationship...” (Respondent 22, 2012)

Furthermore, if a tie is not considered to be long-termed, the personal effort invested in a friendship is often reduced: “I don't even wanna go into something that doesn't have the potential to be long-termed. Then, I am not interested in it.” (Respondent 24, 2012). The significance of duration for a real friendship is evident in the already mentioned way in which the respondents talk about it, as opposed to social friendships. They often evoke temporal metaphors which invoke a large quantity of time shared with a friend, and the enduring

character of the bond, such as a 'shared journey' or 'a person which accompanies you through life': "...friends are not just friends...a friend is like, a part of the life. It's not someone with whom you, like, drink, talk, I don't know, play football...he or she is the one who always walks with you...that means...are real friends some people which you don't see for a long time, you don't know them well?...In my case, they are people who walk through life alongside me..." (Respondent 16, 2013)

Here, the emphasis is put on shared experiences. Some of the respondents even claim that in order to develop a real friendship, it is not enough that one talks about one's own experiences, but one has to share the experience with a friend:

Respondent 28:...in some life situations. That means, not the time which we spent corresponding on Facebook, but shared time where...

Respondent 21:...you live through...

Respondent 28: ...you live through situations, yes. Some shared experience.

[...]

Respondent 28: ...there are people with whom you live through some life moments, and then there are people with whom you sit having coffee and then talk about those life moments in which you were with someone else. (Focus group 2, 2012)

Some of the respondents differentiate between the duration of friendships according to social source of their formation, whereas friendships made within early educational contexts such as elementary or high school, or sometimes even college are considered more durable, while others are considered more fleeting:

What do you think, in general, are friendships long-termed or short-termed relationships?

It depends which ones.

In what sense?

Well..

I mean when you say which ones, it somehow implicates that there are more kinds ...

Yes, there are some which can last for almost a lifetime, for example...

Aha, what kinds are those then? Long-termed?



For example, childhood friendships.

Aha, ok...and those others?

Those are mostly not... (Respondent 46, 2012)

Here, a special category emerges; 'a friend from childhood'. This kind of a friendship is experienced as especially durable, since the shared history around which it is organized results in a special kind of knowledge of the other which results in familiarity which is similar to those in pre-given relationships such as family:"...like, my best friend, I always introduce her as 'this is my sister'. Because we grew up together and so on..." (Respondent 3, Focus group 2, 2012); "Definitely most long-lasting are those, certain kind of friendships, which have a certain kind of history, I would even single out high school as a kind of place where you gain a friend who knows you...knows you the way you've been and the way you will be, I don't know, knows you very much in depth...like, when you are a kid, like 15 years old, then you go through all those things together and then it transfers to a relationship like 'whatever you do I won't leave you'" (Respondent 13, 2011)

Social friendships are, however, not necessarily experienced as long-termed.

Contextual social friendships are retrospectively seen as short-termed. In fact, it is precisely their function which is established through this short temporal organization since they are formed within a social context in which one has to spend a definite amount of time, and for the sake of socialization during that period, without the necessary expectation of longevity:

...for example, you enrol into a certain course and now you have practice sessions, I don't know, three or four times a week and after each practice session you go to drink beer together. Those are practically people which you see most ...[...]those are people which you see that like, that often, and you go together...'now we are hanging out a lot, let's go to the seaside together this year', or something like that. To me it happened that now, two or three years after that I no longer train that and now I just gradually remove those people from Facebook because like, aha, we haven't seen each other for a long time...that means, shared interest at this one point in time, gone, over. (Respondent 13, Focus group 5, 2013)

However, contextual social friendships are considered by the respondents as a social area from which a real friendship might develop, which is then expected to be long-termed:

Well long-termed of course, but...I think that some friendships are by all means condemned to a short duration, depending on the life-phase you are in. I think that at the college you can eventually

find someone with whom you are friends for life...but that... I think that everything moves too fast, a lot of things are expected from you, to progress in everything and then I have the feeling that you look for someone to be ok with only because of the situation you're in, and when that finishes so does the relationship...at least I get that feeling...And at college...I somehow experience those who I'm now very close with...I think that this eventually...and some friends from childhood, but which are not on this intensive base. (Respondent 33, 2012)

Special type of contextual friendships, in regard to its temporal organization, are seasonal friendships. They are not seen within the parameters of durability since they are organized around repetitive encounters in certain time periods.

Situational social friendships can be both short-termed and long-termed. Since their emphasis is on socialization and fun, they last as long as they fulfil their purpose: "...if you have the same interests and that binds you, if that disappears, so does the friendship" (Respondent 28, 27, Focus group 2, 2012)

Thus, the difference between contextual and situational social friendships, regarding the range of their duration, is that contextual friendships are organized around a certain context and tend to cease when the context ceases, while situational friendships have the greater possibility of being long-term and are in this sense similar to real friendships, regarding their durability:

Respondent 41: Let's say you have- I have, for example, four friends and I have a circle of 20 friends who are friends to each of the four of us, let's say. And when we go, I don't know, to the seaside, when we hang out...so it's always the same group. But from the whole group it's only the four of them with whom I have gone over the threshold of intimacy...so there, that's it, I think. That means...That's again a higher level from, I don't know, friends who I have at work, with whom I go out every now and then and so on...we're good, we see each other, we hang out at work...

Aha, so you think there are gradations among friends?

Respondent 41: Well, I think there is the one which is a key one – others are maybe for life, but aren't in intimacy – and there are these floorwise...

Ok, others?

Respondent 41: Maybe, at least I think so. At least it's like that for me, I don't know how your situation is.

Respondent 26: Well yes...

Respondent 13: I think that you can really have friends for fun, for going out for a looong, long time. (Focus group 5, 2013)

However, some of my respondents perceive real friendships as becoming increasingly prone to disposability under the pressures of social conditions in late modernity. Increased mobility and pluralisation of experience are seen as factors which contribute to difficulties in the maintenance of a friendship, which eventually potentially leads to its dissolution. Thus, whether a particular real friendship will indeed prove to be long-termed depends on its structural availability. Social conditions of late modernity prompt young people to focus on pursuing their own life projects (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002). In the context of the pluralisation of life-worlds and increased mobility this can lead to the experience of increased disposability of friendships due to their rearrangement along different structural contexts. One respondent describes the experience of distancing from a friend due to her moving to another country:

Ok, and what do you think how long do friendships last...you've already partly said that, that you can not see each other, and...

And they can still last, yes.

Ok, and are real friendships long-termed or can they also be short-termed?

That depends on other circumstances...those other circumstances have a big influence, not the biggest...but I think they can influence...there is an example, Nina [a friend who moved to Hungary for work]...or someone else, gets a job somewhere in some foreign country and I don't know, you can be ok, but what good is it when you cannot see each other, talk, except in a time period when that person is back or like, literally comes back...that means, you are limited in that way, I don't know, by distance because of business or I don't know with what else, maybe.

Ok, but you told me that Facebook helps, or the internet, or?

It could help, but it wouldn't be enough if the relation came down to relation only through the internet. I mean, some kind of physical contact is needed, I think. At least once in, I don't know...you know, like, we haven't seen each other in a hundred years...and maybe like 10 months passed. (Respondent 7, 2011)

However, a personal agency is often emphasized as an important intervening condition in the further development of a friendship or its dissolution. This will be explored in more detail in the subsequent chapters.

Some of the respondents thus see friendships as increasingly short-termed:

I think they are shorter than before....but I'm not sure, I cannot say with certainty...

How do you mean that?

Well it's simply like that, the tempo of life is like that, everything is faster and the values are different...

What do you mean by that?

People no longer have the interest to get to know someone deeper. (Respondent 23, 2012)

The orientation of the individuals towards their own life-project, which Beck and Beck-Gernsheim (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002) recognize as one of the most important hallmarks of the process of individualization, is recognized by some respondents also within personal relationships. The orientation towards oneself, which individuals in late modernity often exhibit, can orient individuals towards their own life-trajectory and remove the effort from the area of personal relationships. Since, as we have seen, personal effort is the crucial ingredient in the active maintenance of one's personal network, this can foster increased disposability:

...it is possible that people...like everything else, they take it little too superficially...I think it is like, a syndrome of contemporary time, I don't know.

In what sense?

Well, it seems to me that also relationships and marriages, and all those, some kind of close relations...I think it kind of became unsettled...

In what sense unsettled?

Well exactly in that sense...I think that people maybe don't put in as much effort as they should.

And?

Well, they take it for granted. And even, even, even don't feel sorry, simply...it seems to me that they turn away too easy, without too much remorse.

Aha, and why do you think that is?

I don't know...I think we are somehow spoiled by the present lifestyle.

How?

Well it seems to me that...today it is somehow easier to live without a neighbour...with whom you are in good relations...and without a friend in the real sense of the word...in a way that everything is somehow more available from practical life reasons...and people have become more turned towards work and so on...it seems to me that simply...that they are too lazy and too self-indulgent to even put in too much effort.

Aha.

And I mean, also what I've already said, like, being focused on some other things in life simply leads to that there is no time...or anything else. Like, from my own example, since I've began working I can't manage to...maintain some kind of relations with the same frequency as I used to. And it kind of poses a problem for me.

What does it look like?

Well it looks like, I don't know, someone with whom I drank coffee every day or every other day, now it is once in a week, or once in two weeks and we're all kind of...everybody has a lot of other people in life and all that balancing is, let's say...a little problematic. And then you limit yourself only to that what you can handle.

And does it somehow influence relations or?

Of course it does, I mean.

In what way?

Well, you simply grow distant, you don't feel that you can say some things anymore or bother someone with some of your problems, I don't know...simply...I mean, it is clearly that if you don't meet someone often enough, or you don't work on that relation enough, that it comes to...the separation. (Respondent 31, 2012)

The diversification of life-paths is experienced as another possible strain on the durability of relationships:

Did your friendship list significantly changed in the past five years?

Significantly...I have to say it did.

And what is the cause of that, what would you say?

Well, the change of life-style, because with 23 I graduated and started working...and it was some kind of a turning point, then I lived in Split for a year...and then for some time I lived between Zagreb and Split and then I made a lot of friends in Split....then I met some people through work...I have to say it changed a lot. (Respondent 32, 2012)

This respondent seems to draw from her experience the belief in increased disposability of friendships:

...today people move, they change interests...and when a friend gets a job which you wanted he is no longer a friend [laughs]

He is not, huh?

I mean, it depends simply...those external life conditions dictate who your friend is, and how, and for how long. (Respondent 32, 2012)

What possible paths this process can take and which social conditions of late modernity foster will be further explored within the dynamics of each of types of friendship.

Furthermore, there was also one respondent who surprised me during the interview by bluntly stating her own tendency towards the disposability of friends. According to Bauman, in the late phase of modernity, the consumerist logic pervades the logic of life to such an extent that it transfers to other areas of life except consuming; the logic is contained in the logic of an instant gratification and waste disposal of what does not instantly function, instead in the logic which emphasizes commitment and the effort to make something function (Bauman 2011). The lack of effort and the will to terminate relationships when they become inconvenient in a manner of Bauman's consumerist logic could be sensed in the answer of this respondent:

Do you ever feel like friends don't understand you?

When it comes to that, I change them... (Respondent 17, 2012)

It is the Bauman's critique of Giddens's pure relationship that becomes evident in this kind of account of a friendship (Bauman 2003; Giddens 1991). If pure relationship is free to leave upon one's convenience, when one of the participants feels it no longer serves his or her needs, then the commitment upon which it is supposed to be based is indeed very frail (Bauman 2003). Here, the consumerist logic can be sensed; if a relationship disappoints and the expectations are not fulfilled, the effort invested in the maintenance of relationship is

minimal – they are instead disposed of. However, most respondents did not exhibit this kind of logic in their thinking about real friendships.

However, simultaneously and paradoxically, late modernity is the age in which collective solidarities deteriorate (Bauman 2008; Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002). In such a context it is safe to assume that personal relationships such as friendships become increasingly relied on as a personal safety net (Pahl 2000). This would then consequently imply heightened expectations of friendship relations. However, in the age which puts individualized life-trajectories at the first place of an individual's life (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2001), this can sometimes be so energy-consuming that to find energy or time for friend's needs or expectations becomes an overstretch: "...and you simply don't have time for some people and sometimes it happens to me and I know it is wrong because you can always find time...but somehow, you get carried away by life...it sounds awful, but that is how it is." (Respondent 33, 2012)

The experience that friendships are disposable in late modernity can thus be attributed to the three phenomena of late modernity. One is the energetic minimalism (Rener 2002) to which individuals are sometimes forced in late modernity by demands of their own life-project. The second are heightened expectations of relationships, which are if, due to the same logic, one's friend is also possibly occupied with one's own life-project, sometimes hard to fulfil. The third is the increased reflexivity (Giddens 1991) which also transfers to area of relationships and makes the individual increasingly sensitive to possible obstacles for the satisfaction of his needs in a certain relationship. It was indeed very interesting to note how many problems in relationships the respondents in the research attribute to the personal agency in terms of effort and understanding. These properties of the personal agency, which the respondents consider crucial in maintenance of friendship and which they reflexively negotiate in friendships, can be interpreted as the manifestations of heightened awareness of one's own need in a friendship, and thus expectations which are ranked accordingly: "Yes...friends often say, I'm in a hurry, I have this and that, I have to do many things...but then again, it seems to me that if you really want to make an effort, and that you find an hour of your time, that you can see each other in spite of all the hurriedness." (Respondent 1, 2011)

However, these three phenomena together create potential conditions for the increased disposability, since heightened expectations and simultaneous need for instant gratification create a situation where demands in friendship are generally harder to satisfy, and friendship

is thus prone to disposability: “I expect a lot more from real friends and f\*\*k it, if they disappoint me, they're not friends anymore...they let down my expectations which were on the level of friends...” (Respondent 24, 2012)

Furthermore, it is not insignificant that some of the respondents' experience that friendships which tend towards short-term period of duration – social friendships- are gaining momentum in late modernity, because of the pluralisation of life-worlds and the lack of time needed to foster real friendship:

Do you think that long-term or short-term friendships are prevailing?

In the number of people?

Mmhm.

Short-termed.

Short-termed?

Yes, definitely short-termed.

Because?

Well because...for the maintenance of friendship one has to invest time.

Ok...?

And...you don't have that much time in life to dedicate yourself to as many people as you would want to.

Mmhm.

So it basically comes down to short-termed friendships. (Respondent 50, 2013)

To sum up, when it comes to durability of friendships under social conditions of late modernity it can be concluded that Croatian emerging adults differentiate between a real or a close friendship which usually consists of only a few people and is generally considered a long-termed relationship. Most of my respondents thus experience that close friendships are not easily dissolvable, but have the potential to resist the fluctuations of late modernity since they are organized around time and effort, latter being especially important in resisting threats which social conditions of late modernity can pose to friendships:



...maybe I'm an idealist in that sense, but I think that this alienation and separation without a reason, that it happens only if one lets it happen. That means, if he or she literally emotionally doesn't care anymore, he or she simply watches it go away and does nothing...that it happens like that. With some people...with some people you will never allow that, wherever they are. For example, my best friend is in Spain...that means, she moved there, not to another city, but across, like, half a continent...and we make an effort, of course it's not the same. It's not the same as what we had every day...we lived in the same neighbourhood, two streets away...we have to make more of an effort, to use different mechanisms and so on...but we make an effort because we both want to. If we didn't want to, we would let it go and we'd say well, we simply became estranged, alienated, time, chance..." (Respondent 28, 2012)

In this sense, real friendships among Croatian emerging adults indeed have a subversive character against the fluidity (Bauman 2000; 2003) of late modernity.

Furthermore, when explicitly asked, however, most of my respondents claim that their list of friends has not significantly changed in the past five years. From this it can be inferred that the area of social friendships has taken upon itself the disposability of ties, while real friendships are savoured as the source of continuity in one's life. However, short-term friendships are sometimes seen as gaining momentum because of the life-style in late modernity which favours them. Together with this, certain structural conditions of late modernity pose threats to the maintenance of real/close friendships and have the potential of making them disposable. Specific social conditions of late modernity which foster social friendships and pose threats to real/close ones will be analyzed more thoroughly further on.

## **5.2 Partiality of late modern friendships**

It was already Georg Simmel who first proposed that modern man has relationships of partial nature (Simmel 1950). Simmel claimed that, with social differentiation in the modern society increases, a modern man has too much to hide to sustain a friendship in the ancient sense, and that personalities in modern times are too individualized to be able to fully understand each other (Simmel 1950, 326). Due to the erosion of the boundaries between different social groups that accompanied disintegration of social structure, social selves were starting to become increasingly pluralised (Van den Berg in Stivers 2004). As a result, the number of groups to which individual belonged to and potentially contradictory demands

which different groups made on the individual increased and resulted in the multiplicity of social selves of the individual (Van den Berg in Stivers 2004, 58). This, however, has reflected also on the individual's relationships, in the sense that they also became differentiated, meaning that they covered only one side of the individual's personality (Simmel 1950). In late modernity, the differentiation of the society is even more increased (Luhmann 1998). Thus, it can be assumed that the self, together with its relationships, is even more differentiated. It was one of the intentions of this research to explore whether friendships in late modernity undergo this differentiation. Does the individual, due to the multitude of social settings to which he is subjected to on a daily basis and the diversification of life-trajectories which leads to individualization of experiences, enter friendships in a partial manner? Does he or she invest different part of himself or herself into different friendships? It was proposed that, in the context of constantly changing late modernity social settings, investing fully in a single relationship may be too demanding.

Barry Wellman has in his research of the community of East Yorkers in Toronto found that their social lives are indeed divided among multiple networks (Wellman 1979). Furthermore, he has found in his research that individuals no longer feel that they can be identified as members of a single group, and that they often switch between multiple networks (Wellman 2001a, 237). The switch between multiple networks could also often be identified in the answers of the respondents in this study:

I have, let's say, four closest friends...which are like, really different people, each in their own way...and we're mutually close, so I think it functions great....because I don't know, one is an emotional support, other is like, great for fun...and on the other hand, I have friends from college, with whom I am connected through college...And then, I don't know, you have friends from elementary school, from high school, from this, from that, from that circle, from training...(Respondent 39, 2012)

It seems that the initial assumption that friendships tend towards partiality is on the right track. Most of the respondents indeed experience the partiality in most of their friendships. Most of them either report generally having partial friendships (23 of 50), or report having several wholesome friendships, and all the others partial (22 of 50). In describing the partiality of their friendships, they often use phrases such as 'specialized friends' or metaphors such as 'small worlds of friends', meaning that friendships are usually used for different purposes according to different interests or that friends stem from different social settings: "Yeah...you have a crew from like, I don't know...you always have a few people

from work who you can call friends, friends from football...then those you know from, like, ...you know, high school....friends from Zagreb, here at college...so absolutely yes.” (Respondent 37, 2012) As one other respondent notes:

I have different subjects with everyone, I cannot put my friends at the same table because there would be chaos...

No?

No, no, each one is the world for itself...

Each is the world for itself. Ok, and how do you handle that?

I usually don't meet them at the same time [laughs]. (Respondent 32, 2012)

Barry Wellman argues that contemporary personal relationships are “compartmentalized”, in the sense of persons offering multiple personas to different compartments of their personal networks (Wellman 2002). This is on the trail of Simmel who has described the modern society as so differentiated that it makes socializing with whole personality difficult, since “personalities are perhaps too uniquely individualized to allow full reciprocity of understanding and receptivity”(Simmel 1950, 326). The respondents indeed often note this multiplicity of social circles, social settings and diverse experiences stemming from different life-trajectories. The lack of the same kind of socializing due to different experiences is something they see as natural due to diversified individualized experiences: “Look, you'll always...I mean, with a crew from your neighbourhood you'll always talk about different things... I mean, the crew from the neighbourhood who never went to college...I won't bother them with stories from college...I mean, that doesn't mean anything to them. They are neither interested in that, nor they even understand what I'm talking about.” (Respondent 49, 2012).

In accordance with Simmel's theory (Simmel 1950), the individualization of experiences seems to indeed favour socializing with only one aspect of the personality, as the respondents often describe: ”...that means more like a friendship according to the need in certain kinds of situations, I'd say...it turned out that we're...specialized friends [laughs] (...) for example, you have friends which are going to the movies, or for some kind of cultural events...that means, I know they have an interest in that sort of things...there we'll find a common language...an other friend, for example, for a certain kind of an action movie...that means I won't talk to him about music, theory, sociology, and similar...instead we'll talk about let's say, Star Wars, that's what we follow...” (Respondent 18, 2013)

This aspect of personality is usually the part which is in accordance with the social link which constitutes the foundation of friendship:

No really, I have categories [she laughs] I have specialized friends...yes, that really yes, I have to admit...and though some even maybe, I won't say get angry, but they notice that we don't cover all topics, I think that it is maybe like that for everybody...or for most people that...I look at it in the sense of not burdening all of my friends with all my problems if they really...if I don't think that they find it interesting, even when it comes to listening to me in some of my problems...so friends from college, I burden them with exams and so on...and friends from work, there we kind of go through related problems together, and then, when I come home, I try to bother some other friends with like, the crisis at the clinic that day, to that...maybe I look at more like that, I try not to burden friends with some segments of my life they're not part of, or wouldn't find them interesting... (Respondent 28, 2012)

What are the possible social links according to which friendships are then compartmentalized? Some respondents compartmentalize friends according to the social setting to which a certain friend belongs: “With some I talk maybe more about college because it is a common subject, it depends...with others I will talk more about people I know, meaning relations...it depends on where we hang out, in other words in which surrounding... „ (Respondent 29, 2012)

Others compartmentalize friends according to the common interests they share: “I have separate friends [...] I have friends with whom I, I don't know, talk exclusively about philosophy, for example [she laughs] or like, friends with whom I talk about some personal stuff like my love life, friends with whom my friendship is not based that much on conversation as on spending free time together....in case of some friends more of these things are present, but....yes, I often have situations where I have different friends for different things.” (Respondent 38, 2012) As one other respondent also notes:

It means, something is number 1, something is number 15, number 10, more in the sense...

In the sense of quality?

Not in the sense of quality, more like abc.

Aha...and what is abc?

It means they are parallel things, that...they are not deeper or shallower, because that is...

I get it, it means not hierarchy based on quality, but...but how does it differ if they are parallel?

They are different...

Like what...one for having fun, is that..?

Well...yeah, yeah, yeah. Exactly that.

Describe it to me a little bit. [...]

Well, I have people with whom I used to do things like Normalnofobija...I don't know if you ever watched Normalnofobija...have you ever watched that? Like they stick eggs to their faces and then...I mean, not everyone is for those kinds of things...then again you have those which are for more serious conversations...but that does not mean that it is better or deeper in any way, because you still have to have...certain dose of closeness and knowing of a person to do things like Normalnofobija.. (Respondent 30, 2012)

Compartmentalization is also done according to specific lifestyles which friends share:

...yes, I talk about different things with different people...

Mmhm...only when it comes to emotions or?

No, when it comes to some attitudes in life, lifestyles, they are simply...friends like persons are different so that...We simply don't share similar lifestyles so there is no point in talking about them. They just don't get it. (Respondent 26, 2012)

Then, there is a kind of compartmentalization which includes different levels of friendship. This is usually used by the respondents who differentiate between a few wholesome friendships, usually friendships which are seen as real ones, and the other more superficial friendships which usually correspond to the characteristics of social friendships. Usually the communication is seen as wholesome with these several friends, while it is seen as partial with others:

I have a lot of that kind of people, but I don't put them in that exclusive, like that one, with him I really don't choose subjects...that is why it is cool to talk to him about everything...and I really search for, I think, 90% of the coverage, that is why that friendship is really intensive and can be tiresome...but yes, I search in almost every field something that we can...

Ok, and do you have in these other areas someone like that?

Yeah, I have people, mostly from the music field...with whom I talk solely about music and people who are into sport, and we similarly talk about sport... (Respondent 11, 2011)

How do the respondents experience this differentiation of friendships? Simmel claimed that differentiation would lead a modern man to not be capable of knowing anyone entirely, or to be intimate in a wholesome way with friends (Simmel 1950, 326). However, in the interviews this kind of compartmentalizing of friendships was more often related to the divergent lifestyles or interests than to the levels of intimacy. This fragmentation is often done to the advantage of the social actor, who, in this way supplements different resources available in different relationships with each other, often in a very reflexive manner:

No, I think I direct friendships in that way...in other words, that it really suits me...to have different people for different things...for example, I have friends with whom I've never talked about some things about which I've talked a lot with other friends..

Why does it suit you?

I don't know frankly...maybe because I see those people to...it means, things that our relations are based on are things which...which I obviously see in those people as best...the most put forwards, the most obvious...in other words, I see them as most competent, so to say, for those subjects.  
(Respondent 38, 2012)

These experiences of the respondents can be seen in the context of findings of Wellman's research, which describe spatially heterogeneous relationships in late modernity, or in other words, individuals moving between different networks for different kinds of resources, in opposition to communities more bound to locality in which usually that community provided all kinds of resources (Wellman 2001). Following this line of thinking, it seems that this kind of differentiation of friends offers to young people the possibility to find different circles which match their divergent interests. This kind of socializing is fitter to satisfy multiple needs of an individual than a more homogeneous, local-bound kind of socializing in which one person offers all kinds of resources. This kind of socializing is, I would say, more suitable for the age of late modernity, with the high rates of mobility and changing environments, in which one is forced to move quickly among different social spheres. It can be regarded as a strategy of action used in socializing in late modernity.

Simmel further proposed that in modernity experiences will be that uniquely individualized that it will be impossible to reach complete intimacy (Simmel 1950, 326). Furthermore, it is proposed that in the context of late modernity with its high mobility and fluidity, individuals are even more increasingly subjected to multitude of experiences on an everyday basis due to constant technological mediation of experience and the increasing number of culturally

diverse environments (Gergen 2000; Honneth 2004; Stivers 2004). One of the initial propositions of this research was that this means that they also increasingly have to deal with those experiences in an individualized manner. Would this make young people feel as not being entirely understood within a single relationship? Indeed, emerging adults do only rarely feel wholly understood within a single relationship. However, their perceptions of this phenomenon may vary.

Most of the respondents once again use this situation to their advantage. Within the strategy of action of compartmentalizing of friends, the respondents also further compartmentalize understanding. In other words, if they feel like they lack understanding in one friendship, they'll search for it within another friendship:

I talk differently with different people, I mean, it is primarily about topics, you cannot talk about everything...I mean...I really love that kind of discussions, but you cannot do that with everyone...

Ok, and those with which you cannot, does that bother you or?

Well, no, because you compensate it in a different way...through other relations. (Respondent 6, 2011)

How much partiality is embedded within contemporary relationships can be seen from the example of one respondent who even goes as far as not believing in being wholly understood within a single relationship:

I think that everyone is a complex person and that there are, like, people who understand different parts of you, different aspects...it is in principle illusory to expect that someone...I mean, maybe someone thinks that he or she understands you completely, but to expect that is somewhat illusory. I mean, everyone understands you in certain part and that is great. Like, it would be even weird if someone understood you completely. (Respondent 34, 2012)

Some respondents, however, do argue experiencing wholesome understanding within a single relationship. Those are usually the ones who locate this wholesome understanding within few real friendships, and mostly do not expect it within other partial friendships : “Most commonly it is like that in practice, it is somehow the easier way....you have like, a friend who likes movies a lot, so you will go to the movies with him or her, someone who likes to listen and to talk about problems, so you will share your problems, someone who cannot accept your happiness, so you will hang out with him/her only in bad phases, there are people like that...but basically when it comes to that certain THE friend, then he/she usually satisfies

all of my needs” (Respondent 17, 2012) Those respondents find partial understanding insufficient: “...and then, get it, I find myself hundreds of friends, or how do you call that, drawers, the term is irrelevant, and then in the end I am not satisfied because I have the feeling that I scatter my energy around and everything is like that [unsatisfied].“ (Respondent 17, 2012)

Furthermore, there is a minor group of the respondents (5 of 50) who do argue not practicing partial friendships: “Basically I can talk with everyone about everything...” (Respondent 9, 2011)

It was initially proposed that friendships in late modernity entered in a partial manner. Emerging adults in Croatia do experience investing different parts of themselves in different relations regarding the particular shared social link which characterizes certain friendships. They further utilize different friendships for different purposes, whether related to activities such as shared interest-pursuing, or to the substantial contents of friendship such as understanding. In this sense, Croatian emerging adults experience friendships in late modernity as highly differentiated.

### **5.3 Linguistic 'emptying' of the word 'friend'**

The respondents notice what they describe as the uncritical and unselective use of the word 'friend' in the social life of late modernity. They complain about the word 'friend' being trivialized in the sense that it is often non-critically used for a wide range of friendships and even-non friendships. In other words, it is often used to express a wide range of social closeness within relationships, from the ones considered real friendships to the ones which are considered only acquaintances:

Well what we perceive as friends today is relative, especially in the sense of Facebook generation...the word friend became almost like a prostitute [laughs]

How do you mean that?

Well the word friend is today used in a very general way and is generalized for a wide circle of acquaintances... (Respondent 3, 2011)



When talking about this, some of them automatically link this to the emergence of the social network Facebook, whose design has a designation of a 'friend' for all of the contacts on one's profile page. Thus, it is felt that the terminology of a 'friend' is on this social network enforced upon the variety of relationships:

Respondent 44: Well...Facebook for example, where you like connect to people, like, who are closer and further from you...it calls them all „friends“, so it's like some kind of an enforced terminology...and now personally like, in life, yes, I have friends and acquaintances, so there it is. Friends a lot less [laughs]

Respondent 7: That's what I wanted to say. (Focus group 1, 2012)

The extent of the generalization of the word 'friend' on Facebook is expressed through the fact that even ascribed relationships such as one's parents can become friends on Facebook:

Respondent 23: Maybe it has something to do with social networks...

You think it is linked to that?

Respondent 23: Well you have like thousands of friends on Face...

Respondent 28: Or when your mom sends you a friend request on Facebook, which happened to me recently...my mom is a friend.

Respondent 3: You stare at your computer for half an hour, like, surprised...

Respondent 21: What mom, if your mother-in-law sends you one...

Respondent 28: And then, now your mom is your friend....do you understand? (Focus group 2, 2012)

In other words, the respondents notice the phenomenon of the attribution of designation for friendship to a variety of social relational practices, but they themselves report generally recognizing the difference between a 'Facebook friend' and real friends:

I have four hundred Facebook friends, I am very popular.

Are those your friends?

No, I have three friends [laughs]. Do you understand? (Respondent 35, 2013)

The respondents attribute the generalization of the designation 'friend' to two social conditions that they don't see as linked to the practices of friendship outside of the linguistic practice. First, they notice, is the lack of the designation for the practice of social friendships. In other words, the designation for the cultural practices of a superficial kind of friendship between a real friendship and acquaintances is non-existent. Therefore, social actors are forced to use designation 'friend', although in a social practice they recognize the difference:

Respondent 15: ...Friend has prostituted itself very much. Acquaintance is like, cold, and what is in between...'comrade'?

Why has this 'friend' prostituted itself very much?

Respondent 15: Well, because you can't have ten friends. They are...not all of them are your friends.

And why do you call them friends?

Respondent 15: Well, because obviously there isn't such a term in Croatian language...if we said 'comrade' we would be f\*\*\*g 'Yugonostalgics'.

Respondent 17: I advocate for saying a 'friend for a walk on Jarun' [laughter]

Respondent 15: In my opinion, that's like, you know, in my opinion...I don't know...

Respondent 4: A person for a walk.

[laughter]

Respondent 17: Do you understand? That's a friend with whom you go get hammered.

Respondent 15: I don't have at all...what you've said all, I don't differentiate friends in that way at all, not because I am better or worse, but because I am different and I don't have that mindset. What do I know, I don't experience people in that way....I go to the movies with people with whom I always go to the movies, because, I don't know, you don't want to go to the movies with anyone. That's more like my perception. Like with someone is not, because with someone it is more pleasant...I don't want to go with anybody.

Respondent 17: Ok, of course, I won't go with a person I don't know [laughter]. But...it's a different thing...I want to say...most often you go to the movies with a friend. But you cannot go to movies with all of your friends, because maybe somebody doesn't want to go to the movies. They don't care about the movies, but they're a good friend in a certain other aspect...I mean. How do...

Respondent 15: No, but I have those...I have those few people who are my friends and that's it. And that they don't like to do certain things with me, it's not that I compensate that with other people...simply, you do that with somebody else, who is not necessarily your friend, for example, walking on Jarun...

Ok, and who are those, what do you call them?

Respondent 17: Exactly, what do you call them?

Respondent 15: You'll say, like, people I hang out with. A person you hang out with.

What will you say...

Respondent 15: Maybe you'll even use a term 'friend'...

Ok?

Respondent 15:...but by that you don't mean the real meaning of the word friend. Like, you use one term, but...

Ok, why will you use the term 'friend'?

Respondent 15: Because it is much easier than saying a 'person', people...(Focus group 3, 2012)

As was previously noted, the respondents notice that in Croatian the Anglicism friend fulfilled the linguistic hole related to the cultural practice of social friendships. Thus within Croatian language thus Anglicism friend took over this empty linguistic space, as was previously noted.

However, this kind of practice has to be differentiated from the one in which friend is, together with the word 'friend' also used for addressing acquaintances. In this sense they are used as protective practices:

Respondent 30: Ok, maybe it's simply some kind of a limitation of our language...

Respondent 44: Yes.

Respondent 30: ...because I don't know...when you say for someone like, „this is my acquaintance“...it sounds a little weird.

Aha.

Respondent 24: Yes, it sounds lame [laughs]

Respondent 7: I've never used that.

And then you say?

Respondent 30: "This is my friend or frend...let's say that frend took over that meaning..." (Focus group 1, 2012)

The term frend is also used in the sense of Goffman's protective practices as a technique which allows the social actor to save his performance (Goffman 1990). In other words, it is used also for those relationships where an actor does not necessarily experience as real friendships, in order to save face of the other actor in the interaction; "...in a conversation, you are ready to call a lot of people your friends, because it is a word that was somehow emptied of meaning, I'd say...you'll call associates friends, because 'associate' is a little harsh ..."( Respondent 25, 2012)

In other words using a designation for a friendship in relationships which are not understood as such is a technique of saving face of the collocutor in this interaction: "... maybe it is simply awkward, I don't know, I wouldn't want to be presented to anyone as 'an acquaintance'." (Respondent 30, Focus group 1, 2012)

In the protective practice the audience is not invited to the back region of the social performance (Goffman 1990). This is what occurs in interactions when one social actor calls another a 'friend', albeit not experiencing them as a friend. In this action, the former protects both one's own back region and the one of the other, by not defining him as someone who is more distant in terms of social closeness: "I think that this is the word which did not spread in the interaction between those people, but towards the third. That means, I'll say FOR someone 'he is my frend', because I really don't feel like explaining the whole nature of our relationship to the person I'm talking to, because maybe he is not my frend or he is a frend on a different level. But I think that every person for himself or herself knows who is his friend to which extent...and that, if he/she wants to make it clear, he can...articulate it clearly to someone. (Respondent 28, Focus group 2, 2012)

This shift, however, mainly is thought to be occurring on the level of the discourse. Namely, young people see the difference between the linguistic practice of usage of the term 'friend' and of social practices of friendships: "I think that it is more lost on the level of the language...but that people in fact still experience a friend as something intimate and so on..." (Respondent 41, 2012); "...people who use this term in a wide sense or too wide sense...then again find some attributes for the distinction of those close friends...someone who says that

everyone is a friend will say 'this is my best friend'...or I don't know, this is a less close friend, she/he will still find attributes to clear up those relations, sooner or later..." (Respondent 28, 2012)

Thus, the emptying of the word 'friend' is experienced as a purely linguistic practice, with a meaning divorced from the actual social practices of friendship.

## **5.4 Mediating friendships; friendship and technology in late modernity**

The research was started with the assumption that modern online technologies of communication have an impact upon the ways in which emerging adults form and maintain friendships in late modernity. However, the relation of the technologies and friendships was regarded in the form of a mutual influence, rather than the one-way impact. More precisely, the way in which certain technology is used is limited by its design, which to some extent determines its usage (Postman 1993, 7). At the same time, users adapt technology to their needs by using it in certain ways (Byrnin and Kraut 2006). Thus, the agency of users is evident in the sphere of unintended consequences of their technology use.

The research was started with the generalized assumptions about the way in which technology and friendships influence each other, but there were no clear assumptions about the prospective results. Thus the grounded theory was used in this part of the dissertation. The themes which emerged during the first interviews then served as guiding principle for the rest of the interviews.

How embedded the technology is in young people's relationship maintenance became evident very early in the interviews, when they would very often and in the midst of the conversations about friendship mention a particular internet tool on their own, usually Facebook<sup>11</sup>. It seemed that they also usually experienced all internet communication tools as somewhat unified. Namely, they would usually mention the one or some other kind of tool, and generally did not differentiate among them extensively. Instead, all of the internet communication tools were regarded as tools for the maintenance of a friendship: "...I look at it as a useful tool for the maintenance of a friendship. Concretely, in my case, my best friend moved to Spain, so all

---

<sup>11</sup> The application for a social network which serves as connecting device between profiles of different people on the Internet

those technologies are very useful...to talk to each other or at least see each other through Skype and so on..." (Respondent 28, 2012)

Because of this, all the internet tools through which a friendship is maintained and/or formed were in the analysis unified in the context of Castells's concept of "space of flows" as "the material organization of simultaneous social interaction at distance by networking communication, with the technological support of telecommunications, interactive communication systems, and fast transportation technologies" (Castells et al 2007: 171). Their structure and meaning are not tied to a certain place, but are instead organized around the network processing flow of communication and are defined by their content (Castells et al 2007:171). In this context thus "online flows of friendship" are defined by their content; the forming and maintenance of friendships. Those are internet tools which young people use for communication, such as Facebook, Skype<sup>12</sup>, MSN<sup>13</sup>, e-mail and other internet applications which are used for real-time communication, regardless of the nature of the internet connection through which they are used.

Online space of flows are among emerging adults in late modernity seen as particularly meaningful mostly in the context of maintenance, but also in the context of forming of friendships. Namely, almost all of the respondents (45 of 50) use at least some kind of internet technology to maintain contact with their friends, most even on a daily basis. The technology thus seems to be extremely embedded in the everyday life of emerging adults in late modernity.

The central category around which the analysis of the interviews is structured reflects the double nature of internet tools which the respondents themselves seem to often emphasize themselves. Many of them see internet tools as making certain aspects of friendship process easier, such as first and foremost the maintenance, and then the forming of friendships. On the other side, they perceive certain characteristics of online communication in a negative way, and see online maintenance of a friendship as inadequate for the replacement of its offline maintenance. This critical attitude which a lot of the respondents have towards online space of flows can, I assume, be partly attributed to the fact that they have higher education levels, which presumably makes them more reflexive. However, it is interesting to note that even those respondents who perceive communication through internet and social networks

---

<sup>12</sup> The application which allows messaging, chatting and a telephone service through the Internet

<sup>13</sup> The application for instant messaging through the Internet

extremely negatively still use at least one other internet tool, such as e-mail or Skype, in the maintenance of their friendships. This can be regarded in the context of Adorno's claim that the main mode of usage of consumer products in late capitalistic societies is "to see through and obey" or, in other words, to see the consumerist logic of the certain capitalistic product, but still use them due to the lack of other options (Adorno in Illouz 2010, 109). In the same manner, some of the respondents perceive negative implications of Facebook usage, but cannot seem to stop using it, which is evident from their responses: "And do you use Facebook?"

Unfortunately." (Respondent 40, 2012)

This is indicative of how a critique in postmodern capitalistic societies is hard to be given 'from the outside', since capitalistic system is so interwoven with every part of society that nobody can consider himself or herself as excluded from the system (Illouz 2010). Linked to that, Illouz also argues against seeing cultural practices as either progressive or regressive, seeing that certain cultural practice can easily be progressive in one social area, but regressive in the other, and instead stands for using a critical stance which is intrinsic to the cultural phenomenon being analysed (Illouz 2010, 115). This principle was followed in the analysis of the interviews. At the same time both functional and phenomenological implications of the online flows usage with regard to a friendship were assessed. Thus the central category in this part of the analysis was termed 'practical but alienating', which seems to capture the wholeness of the ambivalency of online flows of friendship experienced by the respondents.

#### 5.4.1 Practicality of the online space of flows

##### **Already existing friendships**

When it comes to already established friendships, online space of flows is used for the maintenance of friendships.

They are used for the maintenance of friendships which are physically proximate, meaning friends from the same city or region. Within this type of usage, the instrumental usage comes to the forefront. The instrumental usage here means using online space of flows to achieve some other kind of aim such as organizing a meeting, sharing information, sharing notes from classes or writing a seminar with a friend. In this context, Facebook is especially emphasized:

“...we make arrangements...like, lunch arrangements, arrangements for going-out.” (Respondent 24, 2012); “Mostly for making arrangements. And for sharing some stupid things and internal jokes, but...in general mostly for arrangements for seeing someone face-to-face...” (Respondent 31, 2012)

The fact that the online space of flows is mostly used to organize other activities within the friendship maintenance can be contributed to the easy availability of the technology for the online flows of communication. More precisely, in 2010, 62% of Croatian households had internet connections, while in Zagreb that percentage was 75% (GfK 2010). Also, 78% of Croatian internet users older than 12 use broadband connection for internet access (GemiusAudience 2011). These numbers should be looked within the context of the previously mentioned Byrnie and Kraut's argument that users adapt the technology to suit their needs (Byrnie and Kraut 2006). In other words, the internet is embedded in the everyday life of typical emerging adults in Croatia, and thus its availability renders its use also in friendship communication as logical: “ [I use internet communication tools] usually in situations where I want to talk about something urgently or find out something quickly or something bothers me so I want to solve it, and then it is...like, it is simply offered as an option which is easy available...” (Respondent 38, 2012)

Furthermore, lots of the respondents emphasize lower costs of making arrangements through online space of flows when compared to other communication media:

Some of the other internet tools, MSN, Skype?

Gtalk.

Gtalk.

But because I have it on my mobile phone, get it...I mean, I had it before on....

Because you have it on your mobile phone, because?

No, I started using it a long time ago when it was...when I used gmail, and then gtalk came afterwards...and that was like, I don't know, everybody started using that gtalk, it was simply a tool through which I can make arrangements with people without having to spend money. (Respondent 49, 2012)

This can also be attributed to the spread of the broadband internet connections, and the fact that the price of communication through them is fixed, and not tied to the amount of



communication: “I mostly use WHATSAPP. That's an application which is like, it is used with smartphones, do you have internet? If you have, it uses internet connection, the messages are free, that means your expenditure is minimal and you are corresponding without limits ...” (Respondent 15, 2012)

Young people also replace other ways of communicating with friends by the online space of flows because of the sense of efficiency, which manifests itself in all friends being available at once: “You know...it's like some kind of fast mobile phone, like...you have lot of different contacts...I use it as a phonebook.” (Respondent 19, 2012)

In the context of efficiency and online space of flows, emerging adults also emphasize the possibility of group communication: “It's easier like that. You put in all the people you want to call and make arrangements...rather than sending individual messages to each of them...like this everyone has all the necessary information...sometimes it is enough when, how....and not that I have to send messages through five different addresses through mobile phone, and then I have to reply back to everyone, it is easier this way, this way we all know everything that is happening.” (Respondent 46, 2012)

Young people thus experience that online space of flows make communication with friends easier, which they perceive as extremely positive. It can thus be inferred that online space of flows influences the ways in which young people make arrangements: “...for example, arrangements between bands, arrangements between groups of friends when we all go out together, for some kind of projects...for example, I find it superb that I always have this scene with the closest group of my friends, there is always an open group conversation from which the one whose birthday is coming is excluded, to make arrangements...like, what will be done, which presents will be purchased, and things like that.” (Respondent 47, 2012)

This can mostly be attributed to the design of online space of flows. The prices of online communication are experienced as cheaper than the prices of another communication media. They are further easily available and offer the option of attending to multiple contacts simultaneously. Due to all this, they gradually take over the mediating of friendship from phones and/or mobile phones: “I mean, the only tool which I can use if I don't have money on my mobile phone is Facebook [laughs cynically]” (Respondent 40, 2012)

Such selective usage of online space of flows can be seen as an unintended consequence which has the possibility of further influencing the tools used: “I don't maintain friendships

like that. Skype yes, without it I couldn't talk to some friends who aren't here, but Facebook no. That is only like, not to spend money on my mobile phone.“ (Respondent 33, 2012)

Young people also use online space of flows to stay in contact with friends during the day when they are, because of their diverse obligations, physically distant. In their own words, they „keep in touch“ with friends when they are unable to socialize physically: “I cannot meet everyone all the time because I work, go to college and everything...so it's like...to keep in touch with friends and that...[...]if you cannot meet someone, then...in the learning break, you talk a little bit...” (Respondent 29, 2012)

...I have friends, which are my everyday e-mail friends, that means each of four of us is at her own workplace...and that's like, a group e-mail, every day....everything is said there...and, yesterday, Antonija forwarded an old e-mail on to everyone, app. 27 days old, in which the subject was 'Will we succeed in meeting in 2012?' And I replied underneath: If we don't succeed, we're pathetic and we don't deserve it. And now Antonija asks like, question mark. And I write back 'I am not free for the next 5 days'. And she's like 'you stupid girl, you don't even deserve it'. I mean...because we have some others...and I don't know if we will succeed in meeting in 2012. (Respondent 15, 2012)

There is also the dimension of the opportunity for the experience of the shared online group activity through space of flows which is mostly mentioned in the context of Facebook. Namely, its design is experienced as providing the opportunity for a structured online activity which in a sense gives the feeling of shared time with friends: “I even think that Facebook is a medium which changed the way of functioning...not the way of functioning, but the way of the maintenance of friendships...for example, it made certain kinds of associations possible...for example, somebody puts something on Facebook, let's say a photo or something, and then comments are gathered around it...and then that...when you sit with people for coffee you can talk about it because you know they also saw what happened to you..” (Respondent 34, 2012)

The multifunctional usage of time which new media make possible, in the sense of simultaneous work, studying and having fun at home at any time of day has already been noticed by social scientists (Turkle 2011; Van Dijk 2006). The practicality of this possibility is undisputed, but what are the phenomenological implications of this way of communicating with friends? For those I find especially indicative the example of the above respondent, who cannot seem to emphasize enough the importance of online space

of flows for her friendships, but already at the beginning of the interview defines friendship through them: “...and some kind of communication... that is extremely important to me. Checking e-mails, messages...not so much telephoning or chatting...but more like, that you write something , and that someone has to write something back to you, that is what is important to me..[..].when there is no option to see each other, then we are in touch with each other..” (Respondent 15, 2012)

Through smart phones and applications for instant communication young people keep in touch with friends during the whole day; as it is obvious from this example for some of them communication never stops, not even on vacations. Some social scientists notice this phenomenon of constant connection (Bauman 2003; Dreyfus 2008; Turkle 2011). To be constantly connected in the context of broadband and smart phone technologies is different from the maintenance of friendships through telephones in the period of early modernity; it means to always carry one's friendships around. Herbert Dreyfus sees this phenomenon from a philosophical standpoint as a positive need for the ontological “re-affirmation“ or, in other words, the wish to, amidst everyday hurriedness, remind others of our existence (Dreyfus 2009).

This option of friendship-maintenance with online space of flows is found meaningful particularly in the context of increased scope of obligation by those emerging adults who work, and they are unable to see friends during the work-week. Thus, most of the respondents see this phenomenon positively: “...the whole virtual sphere is very good to stay in contact...and so is that 'like' function, it has this function of reminding you that someone exists, neural circles and all that...” (Respondent 3, 2012)

However, there are also those who perceive this phenomenon negatively, as does one of the respondents who states precisely this phenomenon as the reason for his termination of usage of one online tools for communication:

...So, that in every moment we can start messaging about everything and nothing..and simply, that would be like, certain indicator that we just don't have topics to share, and I know that we do...so because of that, I distanced myself from that and it became somehow, simply awkward, it simply drew out the value from socializing which I would otherwise get out of, like, in the face-to-face communication. Which is interesting because I don't think it is necessarily a lot different from the face-to-face communication, but I simply think that this constant availability to talk with those

persons about what I do at a certain moment somehow precisely devalued my association with them. (Respondent 47, 2012)

Thus, the phenomenological implication of always being able to get in contact with one's friend are unclear. For one, it is unclear if the possibility of constant connection really, as previous respondent claims, fosters the trivialization of the content of friendships? Furthermore, will it, in the future, present a new standard of a social life? It can be assumed that always having friends at reach gets young people accustomed to the constant availability of other people. But what happens when friends are not available? Will this foster the development of a new standard of the self, which is, as Gergen proposes (Gergen 2000), highly relational?

There is also the question of those young people who refuse to connected at all, in other words, who refuse to use online space of flows. For example, some of the respondents feel marginalized because they don't use Facebook, even though they use other space of flows such as MSN and Skype: "...through Facebook, everything happens there, everything is so...like some defective version of everything, I find it terrible. And I don't want to be a part of it. And because of that, I am socially excluded from some circles, but what the hell..." (Respondent 10, 2011)

It can also be assumed that being constantly connected requires a certain amount of willingness to always be comfortable with sharing one's inner experiences, an extroversion to some extent. Do those who won't conform to it in such a context become marginalized?

Online space of flows also offers the possibility of easier maintenance of friendships with friends who are physically remote. This is a dimension of friendship maintenance through online flows which the respondents find extremely positive, and this seems to be another way of usage which they experience as very significant. How much this is so is also shown in the fact that this possibility, offered by the online space of flows is also perceived positively and used by those respondents who otherwise show animosity towards certain internet tools such as Facebook. In the context of the maintenance of a relationship in the sense of talking mostly through Skype or MSN, while they find that Facebook offers the possibility of staying informed about the lives of others, with optional communication. This option is especially meaningful in the context of the life phase of emerging adults. Emerging adults in Croatia often move to Zagreb or other bigger cities, due to moving to go to college or finding a job. In

this context, online space of flows becomes a main channel around which a friendship is organized.

Online space of flows is also experienced as significant in the maintenance of a friendship with a friend who is temporarily away. Many emerging adults who are studying go to foreign countries for student exchanges, and, in this context, online space of flows provides the possibility of the maintenance of friendship during this limited time-period: “My friend studies abroad...we went to high school together and we have been functioning like this for four years already, and when she comes here, I still consider her a friend, regardless of the fact that we cannot be in touch on a daily basis...we talk to each other two times a month, and I still find her...I surely wouldn't be able to maintain a contact if it wasn't for that.” (Respondent 33, 2012)

Furthermore, as it was already noted, many emerging adults in Croatia moved from smaller cities and villages to Zagreb to pursue a college degree, and lot of them remain living in Zagreb. In this context, online space of flows is again especially meaningful since friendships from their place of origin are structured mostly around them, as is shown in the case of the respondent who is originally from Dubrovnik, but has stayed in Zagreb after finishing college and works there: “I don't know when else I would talk to them exactly, except down there when we, like, meet in my neighbourhood and so on...and like this we still talk to each other.” (Respondent 36, 2012)

This option is also used when one friend stays in Zagreb and the other returns to the city of origin, as is in the case of Zagreb inhabitant whose friend returned to the city of origin;

I have this friend who went to live to Varaždin...I mean, we don't see each other as often as before. So, it is a lot easier this way.

And you stay in touch through Facebook?

Yes. Often.

How often approximately?

Well, a few times a week (Respondent 42, 2012)

It can thus be inferred that online space of flows in late modernity makes the friendship-maintenance over long distances easier than for the people in earlier historical periods, in which technology did not mediate everyday experiences to such an extent yet.

Online space of flows is also important in the maintenance of friendships with foreigners which were made on the conference trips, drugin student exchange, team buildings or journeys to foreign countries.

Yes, I look like, I don't know...what is going on, where others have travelled, maybe some kids I would otherwise never see...get it, where they travelled, we comment on each other a little bit and that's it...especially if they are strangers...[...]I mostly met them when...with my company I went for two months to some...I call it like, Big Brother [laughs]

Like team building?

Like team building, yes. And we met there, it was really great...and I mostly communicate with them...not with every one of them, but with those with whom I clicked the most...I talk to them.(Respondent 21, 2012)

In this context, two dimensions of the usage of online space of flows can be distinguished; the possibility of seeing what is currently happening in the lives of friends, a structured shared group activity through online space of flows and one-on-one communication with friends. The first experience is realized solely through Facebook and its possibility of being kept up to date with the lives of others through photos or statuses, without the necessary communication: "...it makes communicating with them simplified and easier, because...you don't always have the time to sit down and write an e-mail, I don't know, what happens in your life, where you're going and things like that, but like...you look at photos, you put photos online and you know that all of them, if they are interested, will take a look [laughs]" (Respondent 44, 2012)

Thus, it can be inferred that the design of Facebook moved the possibility of staying in touch with the lives of friends who live in geographically remote areas to a new level, in which the maintenance of a friendship through online space of flows is not anymore narrowed down to the communication. It also makes the general feeling of continuity in friendships that are physically distant possible; the feeling that they are still up to date.

The second dimension of the maintenance of a friendship which the respondents experience is talking to friends through online tools, and here Facebook is mentioned together with Skype, MSN, e-mail and some other online communication tools. It is also interesting to note that the respondents experience the communication through Skype as something which is somewhat different from the other online space of flows in the sense that it is experienced as most similar to offline communication. Namely, since it offers video-connection, it comes the

closest to the experience of the embodiment of non-virtual encounters with friends: „...we talk to each other through Skype, I find it better, you turn on that camera, you see each other, drink coffee together, all good.“ (Respondent 10, 2011)

Emerging adults also mention Facebook in the context of enabling the re-building of social friendships. As was already mentioned within the dynamics of social friendships in late modernity, in this way it makes the maintenance of those ties significantly easier: “Facebook is great because, let's say, I'll tell you on my example, I succeeded in connecting to people which I haven't seen from elementary school, and then we somehow met, even unexpectedly, because you know one, and then the other, and with time you all connect, go to coffees and like that.“ (Respondent 7, 2011)

### **Forming of new friendships**

One of the significant ways of using online space of flows is to form new friendships. The internet offers the possibility of different kinds of meeting of new spatially close friends, namely people within one's city or the region of inhabitation:

...during the whole period of my high school, I really hanged out with people who I got to know in cyberspace and in one virtual community....that was a message board, back then. And that was a private forum and a closed one, it worked only through an invitation....and it spread in a way that someone meets someone else in the cyberspace and then invites him to that message board, and we built that virtual community in that way, which spread only through cyberfriendships, let's say....and then we began to meet in real time after some time, and we were really...strong community at the core... (Respondent 46, 2012)

Online space of flows is seen as offering within its design the possibility of filtering potential friend's interests or meeting around the topic of mutual interest: “...these forums could be, you meet with someone at a certain topic, you don't know that person, you know only their nickname...and then you somehow get to know each other around that topic, and then maybe later you find some other topics you could talk about...and you decide to go to party together, and so on...” (Respondent 7, 2011)

Thus, it can be said that online space of flows offers the possibility of a different organization of friendship-forming since they enable gathering the knowledge about a potential friend prior to the physical contact with her or him: “...there is one case of a colleague and a friend from the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences with whom literally like, we've seen each other

once before in our life and then we realized through Facebook communication that we like a lot of similar things in life, and after that we started like, going out more often and hang out more often...” (Respondent 47, 2012)

Thus, the friendship-forming through the online space-of-flows can facilitate friendship-forming based on mutual interests. With the spread of Facebook, the same phenomenon of forming friendships also happens on that social network: “...we participated in contest on the Facebook page of Ožujsko, then we got to know each other, and started going to Medveščak games together, and we became friends.” (Respondent 45, 2012)

One of the dimensions of forming friendships through social network Facebook is easy access to acquaintances as potential area of friendship-forming. Emerging adults see Facebook as the entry zone which makes it easier for acquaintanceship to potentially grow into friendship. They find Facebook makes initial communication with acquaintances easier; “...you are more free in the access to people, because as soon as you get in contact with him or her...for example, you 'like' something on his or her profile...let's say. You have a feeling like you've already contacted him or her...or something like that...and then next time you are more free...and if it weren't for Face, I wouldn't even contact him...because I don't know, there are so many people at college, and like, we see each other passing by, and why would I contact you” (Respondent 24, 2012)

Online space of flows also enables the friendship-forming outside the spatially-close zones of living. Some of the respondents use Internet tools to form spatially distant friendships, in the sense of meeting people who live out of the range of their own locality, even in foreign countries. Those friendships usually transfer to non-virtual settings, too:

I have very close people which I met precisely through the internet.

Through the internet, like...?

Not through Facebook. Through one message board. I mean, through the message board which is not tied to a certain topic, on which there are people...like, from all countries from former Yugoslavia, not because it is conceived in that way, but because we, simply, understand each others' languages...and I've made exceptionally close friends in Novi Sad and Sarajevo, with whom I like to hang out as much as with people I know like this...I mean, we do hang out also in real life. I mean, we talk to each other every day, of course, through internet, but from time to time we meet in cities throughout the Balkan. (Respondent 6, 2011)



In this context an on-going debate in social sciences whether internet relations can replace offline relations is worth mentioning (Nie 2001; PEW, 2000). Van Dijk argues that internet communities cannot replace offline communities because they are far too fragile to exist without their base in an offline life, and thus can only serve as a bridge between online and offline sociability (Van Dijk 2006, 167). On the other hand, one of my respondents describes a friendship which is experienced as significant although it is based on non-virtual meetings in a very small extent:

I have a friend from Peru who lives in Amsterdam and I'm in regular contact with her through Skype or Facebook.

How regular?

Let's say, once a week. [..]

Where did you meet?

We met through certain...it was something like Facebook, but...I've already forgotten its name...Badoo or something like that...I forgot, yes. Some similar service. And then we talked about everything and anything and...so, we know each other like that for five, six years...we even met once when I went to Amsterdam. (Respondent 27, 2012)

Thus, it can be concluded that online space of flows changes the perception of friendship and physical distance. In other words, the importance of physical distance is decreased. The same could, admittedly, be said about friendship maintenance based on telephones, but online space of flows make sharing of locality unnecessary already in the forming of a friendship.

#### 5.4.2 The other side of the online space of flows

Although emerging adults see practicality of online space of flows in terms of easier maintenance of friendship relationships, at the same time, some of them feel the quality of relating provided by online space of flows as lacking, in which Facebook is often given prominence: "It will never be the same for me and it seems to me like a totally bad replacement for some kind of like, personal contact...I don't know...a lot gets lost in translation or you don't want to say it because it is over the internet or like, I don't know,

simply, it's somehow...the word which comes to my mind is 'superficial' (Respondent 31, 2012)

While my respondents find that online space of flows make contact with friends easier, some of them also experience the quality of communication as reduced:

We are all comfortable, like, outside it is maybe cold and you don't have to face the person and show how much you like someone. It may have something to do with Face, it doesn't have to, but there is always something to it. Like, it is easier to write something to someone then tell it in face, like, you know..and it seems to me really, I don't know, that it really fostered some kind of superficial relations, these 'friends'...you can be a 'friend' with hundreds of people...and for example, I even think Facebook is the worst, not because like 'uuu, I hate Facebook', but because I see little real communication. (Respondent 12, 2011)

Herbert Dreyfus argues that the main deficiency of online communication is the lack of vulnerability which corporality inevitably brings with itself, and without which the experience has an unrealistic feel to it (Dreyfus 2009, 54). In other words, the communication in online space of flows does not bring with itself the same level of consequences as in non-virtual communication. Thus, the communication has an unrealistic feel to it. Randal Collins also argues that interaction rituals which happen through online communication lack bodily presence, which alone makes for a great part of the communication – it builds a shared focus of attention which allows a shared state of intersubjectivity, enables monitoring of each other's signals and bodily expressions, and also a shared rhythm of the conversations and the fusion of motions and emotions (Collins 2004, 64). All of this, however, what lacks in the interaction rituals consisting of virtual communication, and this can also explain the unrealistic feel that the online communication has. Online communication cannot build shared focus of attention and thus lacks ritual elements of communication, argues Collins (Collins 2004). It seems that the full experience of socializing is also intrinsically linked to the component of corporeity. Some of my respondents notice this:

I didn't have Facebook in adolescence...and maybe it would, then, seduce me a little...in the sense, I have friends and...I have a feeling that I had somehow...I don't want to sound like a cliché, but a little more tangible relations in that age...like, in early childhood, in adolescence, I didn't have a mobile phone or anything, but I had...I had a lot of experiences...and it is because of that island...we hanged out a lot together, but like, face-to-face...and it is not the same exactly, whether you chat with someone on Facebook, or steal Nutella from a store and eat it on the beach [laughs] (Respondent 43, 2012)

Emerging adults also notice the lack of effort needed to communicate on Facebook. One click is enough to get in contact with a friend, which is less than in offline communication which would inevitably have to have a verbal or tactile component to establish a contact, and would thus demand more effort: "...you have this Facebook, and all those social sites and you just have billions of superficial friendships which come down to 'liking' and things like that" (Respondent 23, 2012)

Some respondents mention birthday congratulations over Facebook in the context on effort. Facebook offers an integrated Birthday reminder application, which not only automatically reminds a user about his/her friends' birthdays, but also offers a direct option of congratulating the birthday through the 'Wall'<sup>14</sup>, which requires a minimal amount of effort on behalf of the user. Some of my respondents notice that this kind of birthday congratulations became customary among young people. Sherry Turkle argues that the maintenance of relations through online technologies starts in the instrumental manner in the context of a fast way of living, but soon grows into a choice; into a choice of preferring to message someone online instead of calling them (Turkle 2011). The same can be said to happen with birthdays congratulations which, because of the Facebook design facilitating it, soon becomes habitual. Some of my respondents find this problematic: "It has influenced that that relations come down to virtual, for example, today it is super-personal to get a message on your birthday...because...the standard is to congratulate on Facebook, or in other words, you need three seconds to write someone a message on their wall, and when you get SMS it is extremely personal, with which I don't agree [laughs cynically] , I think it is personal to get a call, not a message." (Respondent 13, 2011)

Thus, for the respondents, congratulating birthdays on Facebook and in non-virtual reality does not have the same subjective value, due to the effort which each type of congratulating requires. In an American PEW research about the internet use, the interviewees openly stated that online communication is easier for them in comparison to personal communication, and this is even more so if the subject is sincere or unpleasant (Nie 2001; PEW 2000). So in the context of these findings and the lack of effort which the respondents in this study find that Facebook demands for communication, it would be worth asking whether preferring to talk online if the subject is unpleasant is getting stronger with the Facebook use. This is openly stated by some of my respondents: "To be truthful, it became a lot easier to write a message on

---

<sup>14</sup> Area of Facebook profile used for posting, whether of the owner of the profile or his Facebook friends

Facebook than on a mobile phone, because...somehow Facebook is more general...mobile phone is like, more intimate or something.“ (Respondent 24, 2012)

Collins argues that precisely the lack of ritual elements in online communication is what is lowering the solidarity of the participants (Collins 2004). Based on Dreyfus's aforementioned lack of consequences which online communication entails (Dreyfus 2009), it could also be argued that the lowering of solidarity occurs also because of the lowered level of the consequences one has to endure. Is this phenomenon of effortless communication with friends through online space of flows indicative of Bauman's claim of reduced responsibility in contemporary relations (Bauman 2009)? Based on this, we can also read anew Bauman's claim that virtual closeness decreases the skills required by a non-virtual closeness (in the sense of language and physical closeness) (Bauman 2003, 64). If communicating with friends through online space of flows becomes a choice rather than a convenience in time, doesn't it get one accustomed to less effort in communication in general? As one respondent notes: “...sometimes people are away and you consider them friends and you don't feel like talking on the phone for three hours, and on Face it is easier to write a message and things like that so...” (Respondent 25, 2012)

However, it is interesting to note the variations in how the respondents perceive this effortless communication through online space of flows. While some find it negative, others find it positive since it allows them to maintain friendships with less effort. One of the respondents describes how he is particularly grateful for this option of reduced communication which online space of flows seem to offer. He argues that it helps him in handling his problematic friend:

For example, I have a friend who is super fun...he has some phases when he is really up, and some phases when he is depressed...[...]. I would say he has blue and pink phases...he is a friend who comes with instructions [laughs]. And when he is like, in pink phases, we have to see each other in person and he is really fun...when he is in blue phases then like, he is wearying, I mean, how would I say it, you go to his place and he will constantly devalue something...[...] but even when he is like that he can know...it can be an open communication on MSN...[...] if you are on MSN, he can send you a link and if you don't comment anything, ok, it isn't funny, he'll stop...and when we are together if something happens then it is expected from you to have a certain reaction [laughs] (Respondent 34, 2012)

This kind of communication is inevitably easier in the context of a fast pace of living which in late modernity often occurs. However, given all the aforementioned assumptions, it is questionable if the participants get the same subjective value from such an effortless communication as from the communication in person.

Linked to the aforementioned superficiality, some respondents also notice that communicating through online space of flows with friends sometimes leads to reduced meetings in non-virtual reality:

..on the other side, I myself stopped seeing some people that much...some of the people with who I was, like, you know someone from school, let's drink coffee together...like, there was no Facebook, so you sent a message to that person and went to drink coffee with him or her. Now we start talking about everything on Facebook and you say everything on that chat and why bother going for coffee? (Respondent 2, 2011)

Then again, there are variations in ways in which this phenomenon is perceived by my respondents. Some of them link it with the aforementioned 'staying-in-touch' dimension of friendship maintenance which online space of flows offer, and thus in this context they see it as something positive:

...maybe it put pressure off some kind of meeting in person, because you have, you are there in their lives...we have to meet because we didn't talk to each other and we talk to each other like this so, I know what's up...because somehow a day goes by, and week goes by, and related to college, to work...like...this last few years as everybody started to work more, and you have some other obligations...then you have less time maybe to meet...but you are constantly in contact, by messages and trough internet, so you don't have a feeling that you are missing something. (Respondent 46, 2012)

Other respondents, however, claim that this phenomenon leads to the illusion of the relationship maintenance since relationships which are maintained only through online space of flows do not feel the same: "...we didn't see each other for a month, but we heard from each other three times and sent each other a message ten times...look, that isn't it." (Respondent 37, 2012)

The respondents thus don't feel that the online communication as having the same quality as the offline one. Bauman argues that in liquid modernity, virtual and non-virtual closeness changed positions, and virtual reality became "real" (Bauman 2003, 63). It can be argued that this phenomenon of replacing face-to-face meetings with virtual ones among friends is one

example of virtual reality becoming the 'real' one.”I don't know, I mean, a long time ago I used to have a girlfriend who...I mean, that is sick...but there, she played Bela over Facebook with her friends, and drank. And then, everybody drinks at his/her own home...you know, you play Bela online instead of meeting face-to-face!,, (Respondent 9, 2011)

However, the next phenomenon which the respondents notice and negatively evaluate when it comes to the friendship maintenance through online space of flows shows why it is not likely that internet communication will replace face-to-face communication to a greater extent. Namely, the lack of body is often mentioned as a main deficiency of communication with friends through online space of flows. Communication without the body is not felt as equally valuable as the one in which the body participates: “All that virtual correspondence, at the end you wonder, like, it is not like you can feel it or touch it or something...” (Respondent 1, 2011)

The respondents see the lack of corporality in online communication as its deficiency, arguing that communication is only partial in this way:”There isn't that physical contact...you don't have, you don't see the facial expressions...you don't see...you don't see anything, you see only letters...and a few smilies.“ (Respondent 40, 2012)

Eva Illouz argues that subjectivity is textualized on the internet, in the sense of turning into pure psychological event (Illouz 2010, 119). This is also problematic if the fact that a large part of the experience in non-virtual communication is mediated through the body: “All that is not in person cannot be actualized on a 100 % level...because in person you feel, except verbally, nonverbally, you feel it on that certain third level...of mood and...I don't know how to call it, the energy.“ (Respondent 11, 2011)

Illouz warns, building on Goffman's claim that communication is largely made up of unconscious body signals which influence it, that those parts are missing in an online communication and thus reduce it to a textual value, without the affective and body components (Illouz 2010). This is understandable if we take into account that non-verbal communication is the foundation of the affect transmission (Krauss et al 1981). Also, what has to be taken into account is that no more than 35% of social meaning of communication is transmitted through verbal communication (Birdwhistell 1970, 158). When all this is taken into consideration, the experiences of the partiality of communication through online space of flows which the respondents have can be put into context. From the philosophical aspect, Dreyfus explains this through the lack of the immersion in a situation, which is necessary for

making of social meaning of communication and is usually made possible precisely through corporality (Dreyfus 2009). Through internet communication, a spatial context is what is lost and thus the experience is reduced from contextual to textual. It is thus reasonable to question whether the level of experience of the other person which can be felt through internet will ever live up to the offline communication. Randal Collins also argues that virtual communication will not replace non-virtual precisely because of all the aforementioned elements, which bodily presence accounts for, in successful interaction rituals (Collins 2004). It indeed seems that some of my respondents are reflexively aware of this deficiency of the online friendship maintenance, and are trying to incorporate it into their behaviour:

Does it ever happen to you that you talk for a long time on Facebook with someone?

Sometimes yes, but like, I'm not the type, I find it stupid to sit in front of the computer screen and type, like, what's up, how are you doing... (Respondent 5, 2011)

...it can be extreme if a relationship with someone comes down only to typing over the Facebook, and then like, ok, ok, now we talk in front of the screen, but we don't feel like meeting, but we are on Face and...that is already little bad...

Because?

Because the physical component is lost. You have to verbalize a certain subject with someone so that you could...well even for yourself, if you don't verbalize it, you go to hell. It is lost...you lose social contact, which is in fact psychologically bad. (Respondent 7, 2011)

To sum up, online space of flows does in late modernity influence the structuring of a friendship of Croatian emerging adults mostly through the possibility of constant contact with friends, and of easier maintenance of remote friendships. Easier entrance to new friendships is also experienced as significant, as is the easier maintenance of friendships in the face of unfavourable structural conditions. The possibility of shared online activity also fosters the maintenance of a friendship. However, there is a general sense of instrumental use of online space of flows. In other words, although the use of technology is embedded into the everyday experience of postmaterialist-oriented emerging adults, they are highly reflexive in their attitudes about it, and they do not let it define their relationships. In most cases, they also acknowledge what they see as the negative sides of the usage of technology. In general, they use technology by adapting it to fill the areas which social conditions of late modernity render problematic in the maintenance of friendships.

## 5.5 Dynamic aspect of friendships in late modernity

We have until now examined how friendship exists in terms of experiences and structures in the static form in late modernity. In this chapter results regarding causal analysis of the data will be regarded – in this sense the dynamic aspect of the behaviour of friendship relations under social conditions of late modernity will be assessed.

### 5.5.1 Dynamic aspect of social friendship in late modernity

In previous chapters, the practice of a social friendship was described in terms of its characteristics and oppositions to a real friendship – in its static form. It is the aim of this chapter to assess how social friendship behaves under the conditions of late modernity.

When it comes to a friendship in general, social conditions of late modernity mostly interfere with two categories important for it: the categories of time and effort. Time and effort are, however, found to be crucial in the forming and maintenance of a real friendship:

Respondent 21: ...it means, investing is important, that means how much you invest that much better it will be...like, you have to invest in it, the same as in I don't know what, if you want to be good at it.

Investment of what?

Respondent 7: Well, time.

Respondent 21: Yourself, time...and simply, effort. (Focus group 2, 2012)

As it was previously shown, time spent with the other person in the form of shared experiences is crucial for the development of the knowledge of the other and trust, which leads to further intimate disclosure, and further to the development of a real friendship. A personal effort is a manifestation of personal will in the forming of a friendship when put into actions which lead to the forming and maintenance of a friendship. However, social conditions of late modernity are tampering with both time and effort as individual resources scarce. How does this happen?

As was described before, social conditions of late modernity are characterized by the increased geographical mobility and, at the same time, by the diversification of life-



trajectories (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002; Gergen 2000; Honneth 2004). Linked to the diversification of life-trajectories is also an on-going disjuncture of the shared social time of different social actors (Urry 2009). This further means that experiences are also increasingly individualized (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002). It further means that being constant is not the main feature of everyday social settings in late modernity; they are prone to fast changing (Rosa and Scheuerman 2009; Urry 2009). Linked to all of this, the experience of time can be felt as increasingly scarce (Harvey 1989, Rosa 2009, Urry 2009).

As we have seen before, time is crucial in the organization of certain type of friendships. Thus, certain ways of organizing social time in the lives of individual actors are bound to reflect in the friendships they are entering and maintaining. In other words, social conditions of late modernity are more favourable for certain types of friendships.

Since time and intimacy are crucial in the organization of real friendships, it follows from this that social conditions in which time is experienced as scarce and the experiences are shared to a limited extent are not favourable for these types of relationships. In opposition to this, social friendships are friendship relations which function based on limited amounts of time for socializing and/or limited amount of concordance of daily social experiences. Thus it will be shown in this chapter how social conditions of late modernity can favour their development. Since there is no longitudinal research on friendships throughout the last century which would compare friendship in early and late modernity, one has to be cautious in linking social friendships as a phenomenon to late modernity. It can be assumed that social friendships have existed already in the period of early modernity. However, their organization around fleeting contexts or benefits makes them fit to thrive in social conditions of late modernity in which both geographical mobility and the pace of life are increased, which leads to the increased diversification of life-trajectories and pluralisation of life-worlds. Specifically, as we have seen in the previous chapter, social friendships are primarily organized around the contextual benefit one gets out of the relationship, which can vary from the need for momentary socialization, the satisfaction of one's personal need for a certain activity or having fun. They are, further, not oriented towards the intimacy as its content. They are thus, by their very nature, not definable in terms of longevity or commitment, and are thus fit for volatile and diversified time-space organization of the everyday life in late modernity.

#### *5.5.1.1 Principle of momentary instrumentality organizing friendships*

The first ones to examine in this sense are contextual friendships. Temporal organization of contextual social friendships is of the very nature of fluidity of the later part of modernity. As was already mentioned, in late modernity temporal organization of the everyday life is of different quality than in the early modern settings (Bauman 2000; Giddens 1987; 1990; Harvey 1989; Rosa and Scheuerman 2009; Urry 2009). In conjunction with the capitalistic modes of production, already in early modernity time started to be commodified, or considered in terms of value and organized into the “economy of time“ on a day-to-day basis, which replaced the more fluid mode of labour in the pre-capitalist modes of production (Giddens 1987, 151). This is, however, even more radicalized in social conditions of late modernity where the intertwined set of the aforementioned conditions lead to high-level mobility, globalized networking and fast-pace capitalism which further change the experience of time in late modernity (Harvey 1989; Giddens 1990; Urry 2009). This time-space organization is experienced in terms of increased volatility and fast-changing contexts in which the principle of instantaneity prevails over the principle of duration (Bauman 2009; Harvey 1989; Giddens 1990; Urry 2009).

Consequently, the individuals in late modernity are subjected to a multiplicity of social settings (Gergen 2000; Stivers 2004). A large amount of everyday time in the life of typical emerging adult in late modernity is spent in institutionalized settings, either in the form of institutionalized educational settings, workplaces or institutionalized leisure activities. The alteration of these contexts is further fostered by the increased geographical mobility in conjunction with the deregulated conditions of labour-markets. This means that social contexts, within which emerging adults in late modernity find themselves, are prone to fast changing. Consequently, the need for the socialization in fleeting social contexts arises:”Those are, like, people with whom you've maybe had three courses together, you've spend a lot of time together, you shared the breaks with them and then you drank coffee together for a semester...then, next year you don't see them at all...” (Respondent 25, 2012)

The respondents express the need for socializing in these kinds of settings in order to pleasantly spend time within them:

...I have some exclusive friendships which are rare, I have certain colleague-like friendships which are more often than those, and which are levelled...it depends on how I have to be with some people, in some situations I spend a lot of time, and I always try to create a certain minimum of normal relations...and like, I can call them my friends, but there is a certain kind of, in fact,

essential difference...where I never go near the point where I can be what I am. And in these exclusive ones I can be what I am. (Respondent 11, 2011)

As was already noted before, these relationships are then instrumental in their aim, since the principle underlying their formation is something other than their formation *per se*. Such contextual social friendships are seen as important parts of the social life in late modernity:

What does it look like in practice? Does it seem to you that long-term or short-term friendships prevail?

Short-termed. More like, incidental friendships. I don't see that as something bad, but simply, there is something better. But I see it as something ok. That means, at work, at college....you like someone for their attitudes, and you spend time pleasantly. You spend a part of the time together. You often spend more of time with people who are not your best friends than with those who are. (Respondent 12, 2011)

...from education times, like, elementary school, high school, college. Where you are forced to socialize with people so you get to know them in that way.

Why are you forced to socialize with them?

Well because you spend so much time in a shared space that you have to...have contact with them. (Respondent 50, 2013)

As was already noted before, temporality is crucial in getting to know others. Spending large quantities of time together in a certain limited time-period, whether educational or of other kind, gives social actors the feeling of acquiring a certain amount of familiarity with others in the same setting: "When you go to school with someone...you see him or her every day. So you see...you know him or her. I mean, he or she is not really your friend, but you know him, so you may think that he or she is...that you call him 'friend.'" (Informant 3, Trial focus group, 2012)

The feeling of familiarity then fosters the sense of momentary association, and the relationship is considered a friendship for as long as the social context lasts:"..for example, you enrol to a certain course and now you have practice sessions, I don't know, three or four times a week and after each practice session you go to drink beer together. Those are practically people which you see most of all people...[...]those are people which you see that like, that often, and you go together...'now we are hanging out a lot, let's go to the seaside together this year', or something like that." (Respondent 13, Focus group 5, 2013)

Due to the increasing knowledge of the other, and the shared experiences which are greater with more temporal duration spent together, these social settings within which individuals spend common time are further experienced as social pools from which a potential real friendships can develop:

...those can be friends who are really colleagues and but hey, you're on the same floor, not in the same department, but you are friends because you take a break together...because you are on the same floor, I don't know. But exactly, the more time you spend with, for example, friends from football...everybody is situational friend to you at first, 15 of them. And for a year you play football together, and one day maybe you'll call one of them for christening of your third child, because you befriended so much that you became friends... (Respondent 28, Focus group 2, 2012)

However, since real friendships require energy because of intimacy and getting to know the other person, the respondents note that it is impossible to establish that kind of a relationship with more than a handful of people:

I think more of me. So maybe, because of that...it becomes important in terms of numbers. But people in general, I think they connect with a certain amount of people with quality...yeah?...So I can give my time to you and you can give your time to me...it's normal..I cannot...be friends with 100 people, I don't have time, there is nowhere to put it...so...in terms of quality, I can only have a few really sincere and good friends... (Informant 2, Trial focus group, 2012)

Thus, from those pools of potential real friendships there are utmost few which are turned into real friendships. Most of them, however, stay on the level of contextual friendships and are seen as friendships accompanying a certain life-phase: "...sometimes they are really good when they're like, in certain phase of life, only in college, now it's great and later it makes no sense anymore." (Respondent 10, 2011)

These relationships are not based on the need for the continuity or duration, but are formed based on the need to socialize within a certain social context. Thus they can be said to form based on the principle of momentary instrumentality, since the underlying principle in their formation is to satisfy the need for momentary socializing.

As David Harvey points out, the second "time- compression" which happens in the later phase of modernity brings different modes of production and consumption which transfer to general life principles; in order to survive, one has to "master or intervene actively in production of volatility" (Harvey 1989, 287). Somewhat similarly, John Urry argues that the contemporary social practices are based upon accelerated time frames which he calls "instantaneous time"

(Urry 2009, 189). Social friendships could be seen as conjunctions of the mastering of the principle of volatility and the principle of instantaneity in the social life of late modernity. In other words, a social actor has to adapt his socializing needs to the ever-changing social contexts. Furthermore, he needs to learn to do it fast, in order to adapt to an ever-greater number of social settings he goes through in ever-shorter time-periods; “I think that everything moves too fast, a lot of things are expected from you, to progress in everything, and then I have the feeling that you look for someone to be ok with only because of the situation you're in, and when that finishes, so does the relationship...” (Respondent 33, 2012)

Thus, the contextual social friendships are the form of temporal organization of friendships which can be seen as a manifestation of multiplicity of social contexts in which an individual is included in late modernity. They are instrumental in the sense that they are established in order to serve a certain purpose in a certain moment; the need for socializing in a certain social context. In this sense, they can be reviewed in the light of Zygmunt Bauman's critique of Giddens's pure relationships (Bauman 2003). Bauman argues that pure relationships are both easy to form and easy to dissolve, and that they are unlikely to last longer than the convenience they bring (Bauman 2003, 90). This is indeed the case with contextual social friendships. Since they are organized around momentary instrumentality in terms of serving the purpose of socializing in a certain fleeting context, they tend to cease after the context in which the need for them has arisen, ceases: “I used to be good friends with people I've worked with, like. But then, when the work relation would cease, then after that, simply...you simply don't see people anymore. But that is probably normal. It's like... I don't know, you stop working and then you meet each other, I don't know, for coffee for a month, and after two months we don't see each other for half a year, then we don't see each other for a year.” (Respondent 49, 2012)

Thus, the contextual social friendships can be regarded as the principle of instrumentality at work in the processes of contemporary friendships which is oriented towards momentary associations. The same principle of instrumentality but without the momentary component is, however, also found within other kinds of social friendships.

The principle can also foster the formation of friendships outside the fleeting social settings, which exhibits a more durable nature. This occurs in the case of situational social friendships that were mentioned before. The principle of instrumentality, albeit not momentary, also underlies the formation of a situational social friendship. Namely, the formation of a

situational friendship does not necessarily happen within a certain fleeting social context. It is rather based on the general need for satisfaction of the individual's need for socializing or pursuing shared interest. Situational social friendships can arise from certain social settings, but the individual agency is crucial in their formation. In other words, they are developed on the initiative of an individual. One of the respondents describes the difference between his situational social friends and contextual ones at work:

Respondent 41: I think that these friend-friendships – ‘being friends’ – is very often. That it is usual.

Why?

Respondent 41: Well what, human is a social animal.

[...]

Respondent 41: I would introduce another level here...

Ok.

Respondent 41...I think it should be. Let's say you have- I have for example –four friends and I have a circle of 20 friends that are friends with all four of us. And we like, when we go, I don't know, to the seaside, when we go hang out, when we go out...that's always the same group. But from that whole group there are only four with whom I have crossed the threshold of intimacy...so that's that, it seems to me. That means...that is, again, a higher level than friends I have at work, and with whom I go out now and then, and so on... (Focus group 5, 2013)

Situational friendships are then based on the satisfaction of the general principle of instrumentality in one's life in the sense of shared socializing or activity-pursuing. However, since the benefit from the association is mutual, this principle of instrumentality is perceived positively:

...It seems to me, get it, that all those half-friends for like, walks and this and that...it seems to me like using...I know that I use them, and that they use me and I see it that way...how to put it, I know that, ok, I want to go for a walk on lake Jarun, you want to go for a walk on Jarun...let's use each other mutually. Because we don't have one person....[...] it's like if you want to go, I don't know, to Sirup and I want to go to the club Sirup, but we're in fact fond of each other and we go only because we didn't find anyone else... (Respondent 17, Focus group 3, 2012)

#### *5.5.1.2 Lack of effort or time organizing friendships*

When two previously mentioned conditions needed to form real friendships – time and effort – are lacking, the process of friendship forming goes in the direction of social friendships. How can social conditions of late modernity work to foster this?

Some of the respondents notice a phenomenon of lack of effort in a friendship, which I decided to call ‘focus-on-oneself’. It consists of the manner of socializing which puts emphasis not on the content of the relationship, but on one's own self. It is usually characterized by the lack of effort which is felt by one of the participants in the relationship:

Today, it's all so superficial.

In what sense?

At least as far as my experience goes.

How do you mean that?

I don't know, people are not interested in...to get to know someone deeper. (Respondent 21, 2012)

...you can go to the pub and have a great time, but when you need some serious things, like, you sometimes need help and stuff, then simply, he or she is not there. I think it is precisely about this giving and taking. A person can be great but maybe it is just like this shallow....like, when one needs a conversation, some advice, something important to be done for you, well, then that someone retreats.... (Respondent 1, 2011)

The other side of the phenomenon was identified within the interviews in the answers of some of the respondents who openly admit practicing this kind of socializing with lack of effort on certain occasions:

Well, I have a certain kind of security which, it might be illusory, but everything functions so well that you can handle...you can listen to friends and their troubles like, a little like, absent-minded...experience the situation little absent –minded...

Really? That means you really listen?...[I laugh]

Well it happens that I don't listen...

How come? You don't feel like it?

Well, other things are going through my mind...

Might it be that it burdens you?

Yes, some of them, some yes...but sometimes I have a certain kind of feeling sorry, like a feeling of guilt that I should be kind...like, omg, her cat died, I have to be here...but it doesn't happen a lot, like, I'm there with a half of a brain, but I still am. I know it isn't really something, but it could be worse [laughs] (Respondent 15, 2012)

Focus-on-oneself can be linked to the demand regarding the emphasis of one's own life-trajectory, which late modernity casts on the shoulders' of the individuals. It can be viewed within the context of the shift from the traditional collective identities towards the individualized ones in which the individuals feels the whole responsibility for the creation of their life-project is on themselves (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2001; Giddens 1991; Honneth 2004). Life is to be lived as a reflexive project, which is something one has to constantly organize in a reflexive manner: it has to constantly be questioned, re-created, re-thought (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2001). If life has to constantly be reviewed and organized as a project in a reflexive manner, this then leaves less time for the needs of multiple others in one's life project.

When this is linked to the aforementioned multiplicity of social circles, it has the prospective of leading to the investment of minimal efforts in most of the relationships: "...our social circles are much wider today than they used to be and we simply don't have enough capital to invest, to go deep with all those people, but we are simply forced to be superficial with some..." (Respondent 3, Focus group 2, 2012)

Thus the strategy of action in conditions which require individualized approach to one's life-trajectory and moving among multiple social settings is often the increased orientation towards oneself. This is in line with what Bauman regards as the tendency of the contemporary relationships: the lack of responsibility for others (Bauman 2008). Tanja Renner terms this orientation towards oneself "relational minimalism", characterized by the calculative egoism and energetic and time savings (Renner in Ule et al 2000, 113). In other words, the effort invested in most of the relationships is minimal. This can be seen as a manifestation of the logic of individualization. The logic of individualization demands from the individual not only to take care of oneself on his own, but also to put his own needs and his self-trajectory on the first place. Thus the responsibility towards others ceases to be a social task, as Bauman notes, since social norms which used to regulate the previous traditional communities are no longer clear, yet alone stable, and consequently, every person



gets to define the extent of his or hers responsibility for others (Bauman 2008). When this is linked to the individualization processes with the emphasis on one's own life-trajectory, the investment in the other in a relationship has the prospective of being reduced. Thus, and again in accordance with the demand for activity which individualization casts on individual's shoulders (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2001) if one does not actively pursue attention and responsibility of others, one risks not getting any. This view sometimes emerges when the respondents talk about friendships on the level of the discourse: "Maybe some kind of responsibility...care of people towards one another. It seems like everybody should take care of themselves and people are not connected in that way." (Respondent 1, 2011)

People are awfully shallow...

How do you mean that?

I don't know, I can only say that it is something you sense, basically...it can be about some most trivial stuff, where you expect someone to be there when you need him/her as friend... (Respondent 19, 2012)

Why is this phenomenon important for the formation of social friendships? Because, when the lack of effort in terms of focus on oneself is noted on the receiving side of the relationship, it often functions as the decisive intervening condition which causes a friend to shift from the category of a real to the category of a social friend:

Respondent 23: For example, I am talking to a friend and I see that he or she doesn't make an effort to give a certain feedback or something, but just lets it pass like that...

Respondent 3: That he or she listens, but does not hear you...

Respondent 23: Yes.

Mmhm, and then?

Respondent 23: And that is an irritant characteristic.

And then, what...

Respondent 23: And then it impacts the quality of the friendship...and you simply start communicating with him or her less, and you devote your time to someone who understands you more, and wants to understand you more. (Focus group 2, 2012)

The use of this strategy is further noticed by some respondents in the conditions in which taking care of a friend requires an increased effort. One of the respondents describes the experience in which one of her real friendships shifted to the social one when a friend showed the lack of concern for the other friend who had experienced the death of a close family member. This experience influenced the way in which this particular respondent further saw friendships in terms of the lack of responsibility:

I don't know, it seems to me that those are some kind of stressful situations...there is nothing merry in them, and if you don't want to bother yourself with it, you really don't have any reason to be with that friend...you go away and it is easier for you [...]

Aha, so you think people are more focused on happier aspects of friendship?

No, I don't think that only happier, but only those which suit them. They are also focused on unhappy if they are related to them personally... (Respondent 2, 2011)

Thus, the focus-on-oneself is another possible intervening condition which fosters social friendships. Namely, as it was already shown before, in opposition to real friendships, social friendships do not depend upon an effort in their formation, and tolerate less effort in their maintenance. Thus they are easier to handle within the late modern emphasis on one's own life-trajectory.

Lack of time can also work as an intervening condition in fostering social friendships. As it was already mentioned, time in late modernity is generally experienced in terms of acceleration (Harvey 1989; Rosa 2009; Rosa and Scheuerman 2009; Urry 2009). Furthermore, the acceleration of time experienced in late modernity can make individuals feel that they lack time, to feel hurried and under stress (Rosa 2009). However, not all parts of all societies experience the same pace of acceleration, some being excluded from the dominant modes of accelerated temporality (Rosa and Scheuerman 2009). This is, I would argue, even more so in societies as radically fragmented in levels of modernization as is the Croatian society. However, the assumption was that the employed emerging adults in Zagreb are a part of the sample with the possible experience of time constraints in their everyday lives.

Indeed there is a general sense of lack of time influencing relationships of employed emerging adults within the sample, together with those who are simultaneously employed and still attending college. This sometimes works as an intervening condition which makes less time available for the socializing aspects of one's life:

Like, I would like to believe that it is something deeper than, like, a superficial acquaintance or meeting pro forma, but it somehow seems to me that because of the way of life that is often a lot more distinct, that superficial, you know like...we are friends but like...friends under quotation marks. [...] Like, stress, hurriedness, and ok, the financial crisis a little, people probably fight to solve their own existence, financial and familiar, and only after that there is the socializing part, if you have free time...if you don't, you cannot even make that happen. (Respondent 7, 2011)

In conditions in which a social actor is constrained by the lack of time, most of his/her focus and energy is placed upon the establishment and carrying out one's daily trajectories:

I don't know...maybe the lack of closeness in the society...because of different...I'll say life pace although that is not the real...the real word I want to use. Because life is more oriented towards solving some kind of mechanical problems during the day and towards the structuring of the day and so on...maybe some kind of...maybe it is simply perceived like too time-consuming...I don't know...like too much energy is spent on that... (Respondent 41, 2012)

Consequently, this draws the effort away from one's relationships: “I think that people are somehow lost...like when you start working and I don't know, if you have a family and everything...like, when you look at it, on a daily basis, a lot of time goes solely on technical things and like, resting and alike...and I think that it is really hard there in the first place to find a place and time for people“ (Respondent 39, 2012)

Thus the lack of time can be regarded as the intervening condition which makes less time available for the friendship-forming and maintenance. Since social friendships, again, require less effort than real friendships, this can favour their development. This is particularly evident in the story of one of the respondents whose both interview and focus group narratives were permeated by the sense of the general lack of time, because of her workplace being in the remote city to which she commutes on daily basis. Because of this, she reports often feeling too exhausted to socialize: “I don't know, I for example, travel to Kutina for work everyday...and I get up at, like, at five o'clock in the morning, I come back at six o'clock in the evening...and like, for weekend, I don't really feel like going out, and doing I don't know what...like, first, the most important thing is to get enough sleep, for example.“ (Respondent 42, Focus group 1, 2012)

Thus, in this example, the lack of time functioned as a general intervening condition in the maintenance of all of her relationships. How did it foster the development of social friendships instead of real ones? Later in the same focus group, when the subject of the

superficial friendships is raised, she describes her experience with friendships which she did not consider to be real ones, although not being able to pinpoint the reasons for this:

Respondent 42: I don't know, I have like certain friendships which are like, relatively superficial...but...it's not like they're utilitaristic, but simply they work that way.

How do they work?

Respondent 42: Well like....mmm...for example, I cannot say that I am really friends with some girls, but like, when we find ourselves in certain situations somewhere, or when we arrange a meeting on our own...that, like, functions great. I don't know, it simply functions like that...and like, lately. (Focus group 1, 2012)

Further, the respondent expresses the will to establish real friendships, but also the lack of success in this case. She herself cannot seem to grasp the reasons behind this, and tries to understand it through the discussion with others:

Respondent 7: Maybe there is no deeper connection.

Respondent 42: There even is but simply...I don't know...I mean I believe if like, there was this big wish, that we would meet each other more often...but simply...

Respondent 24: I don't get it, why are they superficial friends to you? If there is a deeper connection?

Respondent 42: I don't know, simply...

Respondent 24: Like, you wouldn't confide in them, or?

Respondent 24: I even would, but simply...I don't know, for example, we make arrangements for one coffee for like even, three weeks...so like that.

You don't see each other that often?

Respondent 24: Yes. Like...and before we weren't that very good friends. Like, we simply started in this way, and it remained like that, and now it goes on like that...like, everything is great, we get along great, we have very similar interests and I don't know, experiences and what not...but they simply aren't...it didn't come to that that we are now great friends and we meet, I don't know, every weekend.

Respondent 30: The person suits you but you simply don't have the need to get to know her further.

Respondent 42: Well no, no, I even have the need, but simply...

Respondent 30: Is that so?

Respondent 42:...I don't know, I guess I don't have the opportunity for that in this period of life.

Mmm...Like you don't have?

Respondent 42:And that other person, yes.

...you don't have enough time, you want to say?

Respondent 42: Well yes.

Respondent 44: I wouldn't call that superficial friendship then.

Respondent 42: But look, we were never real friends...

Respondent 44: Aha.

Respondent 42:...it started like that and remained on that level. (Focus group 1, 2012)

Thus, the category of time, or even better a lack of time, proves once again to be the central organizing moment of the type of the friendship established. Not having enough time to meet with her friends, the respondent does not feel she has the ability to turn them into real friendships. Thus, the intervening condition of the lack of time has the development of the social friendship as one of its potential consequences.

Social friendships do not require so much shared time as real friendships. They can be regarded as a convenient way of befriending in the conditions of the individual's time constraints. Since they are more flexible with regard to time-organization, they are more likely to thrive in these conditions in late modernity than are real friendships.

#### *5.5.1.3 Plurality of experiences organizing friendships*

The interrelatedness of complex social conditions of late modernity can work to foster situational social friendships instead of the real ones. As it was already mentioned, life in late modernity is led between multiple social networks and social realities (Gergen 2000; Wellman 1979; 2001a). The implications of this are twofold; while at the same time having a liberating effect by giving a social actor space for maneuver, multiple social networks which an individual belongs to can also potentially trigger the questions of belonging and identity

(Wellman 1979). Different social circles which an individual belongs to have diverse claims on the individual and thus, the individual is a social product of the reconciling specific needs of his social circles (Pescosolido and Rubin 2000). Increased mobility which happens in late modernity can also be said to attribute to this phenomenon, as is disjuncture of collective social time of social actors (Urry 2009; Wellman 1979). As one of the respondents notices:

I wonder if it was like that before. Because before there wasn't much of a choice. I think that people were very similar. If you, like, belonged to a certain group, then you knew, I'll talk in a caricature manner now...you go, let's say to the club Roko, there is no chance that you also go somewhere else. And then you found the same easily...And today, today, every person is like, a combination of everything and anything, total eclecticism of everything and it's hard to find an adequate partner which is your copy. Before it was like, if you were in like, I don't know, subculture of punkers you all liked one thing, hated one thing and like...you were the same, you knew, like, ok, maybe someone is more generous, someone is not, in the sense of those traits of character, but as far as preferences and the taste went, you knew...if you're in that group, we are all more or less the same. (Respondent 17, Focus group 3, 2012)

As previously stated, this multitude of experience which the individual in late modernity experiences results in multiple relational selves, which, in terms of friendship relations, means partial friendships, which cover only one side of social actor's personality. Particular kind of such a partial friendship is a situational social friendship, which is organized around the interest both participants share. How do these friendships evolve on behalf of a real friendship?

The development process of situational social friendship was particularly easy to trace in the case of one 27-year respondent, who raised the subject herself in one of the focus groups. She regards these kinds of friendships as areas of frustration due to her inability to turn them into real friendships, because of the often contradictory interests which she and her friends have: “...if my best friend won't go to the movies then I have, like, friends who are ok, for whom I know that they love going to the movies very much and we mainly socialize, go to the movies and later go for a drink. It's more or less about that, and we talk about, I don't know, a movie, and share some things like that, later. But it's not like...the first person, do you understand?” (Respondent 17, Focus group 3, 2012)

A large amount of time during that particular focus group was spent analyzing and discussing this respondent's dissatisfaction with her partial friendships, due to her experience that each friendship only covers a part of her self:

... I don't need a lot of people. That means, I can be satisfied with two, three very close people with whom I would in a certain ideal world go do sports with, and to the movies and everything which interests me would also interest them, and we would do all things together. But that mostly never happens and then I have friends of all sorts of activities, with which I share the passion for that certain activity, and then I have the feeling that it is all atomized, that it is a loss of energy for me, you know, I chit-chat with this one, then we're a little intimate, but not all the way...then a little bit with that one, and then with the third one...and I would like to do it with two persons. But I cannot get it from them. I cannot force people: come to pilates, or I want to go to pilates so we can share the passion, be intimate later [laughs], then we go together to the theatre, we're like...and then, get it, I find myself hundred of friends, or how do you call that, drawers, the term is irrelevant, and then in the end I am not satisfied because I have the feeling that I scatter my energy around and everything is like that [unsatisfied]. (Respondent 17, Focus group 3, 2012)

The perspective of the Respondent 17 who is dissatisfied with partial social friendships is not typical for my respondents. Most of the respondents who have partial friendships see them as mutually 'compensating', in the sense of finding in one group of friends what they can't find in another:

Respondent 15: But why would that necessarily have to be like that? I had a huge problem when I broke up with my boyfriend that...I had a whole spectrum of things I am interested in and I cannot share them with my friends. I went to a ballet performance the other nights and I watched and observed where she pulls that movement of her leg from, from which muscle she pulls it...and I am having a great time, because she performed fabulously...[...] And I lean over and I clap and I tell my friends, like: 'fabulous, fabulous'. And they reply: you're so, like, stupid. They came only because they got a ticket from me! And they're like, if you didn't exist, you should be invented. And they are rolling on the floor laughing and simultaneously eating Rondo candies, I mean...

[laughter]

Respondent 17: But that irritates me...[...] when I try to get my friends from pilates to the theatre and then they don't share the passion, then I go crazy.

Respondent 15: But no, no...you know what my reaction was? 'You two are really pathetic'...and nobody got mad there, got upset, we continue further...that means...

Respondent 17: Yes, and then I, I think inside [she sighs loud and frustrated] why can't I find one person in which I would find it all...because get it, then...

Respondent 15: But what do you need one person for? Isn't that the beauty of life, like, knowing different people?

Respondent 6: Yeah, I find it positive...

Respondent 17: Ok, you can see that as something positive...but I for example, don't, because I have the feeling that I waste too much energy and I cannot join all of it into one. And then I share this with one person, and that with another person, and that with the third one...and then, get it, accidentally...then I like, try to take this one to that and then she watches me like you're crazy' [she talks in a caricature manner] and then I think you're such a cow, you don't have taste, you're so narrow'...and then I get mad...

Respondent 15: Ok, those are the collisions of worlds.

Respondent 17: Well, the collisions of worlds, yes, but like...

Respondent 15: But why would you collide them? Can't you find certain combinations? (Focus group 3, 2012)

In the case of this particular respondent who is dissatisfied with partial friendships, however, further intervening conditions operate to create this consequence. Namely, she is a highly reflexive intellectual individual, with majors in art history and pedagogy, and a side major in Chinese, while at the same time on the constant move; she is highly active outside college regarding both art, dance and going out and has unconventional interests in things normally seen as contradictory to high art such as folk music. However, it is precisely because of the particularity of this respondent's experience and the discussion centralized around it that I found it interesting in relation to my topic, since her experience directly showed how partiality in friendships is one of the potential conditions which foster the formation of social friendships instead of the real ones. Thus, the high level of pluralism of social selves operates here as an intervening condition where the consequence is the sense of not being entirely understood within a single friendship. It was particularly interesting to contrast the experience of this respondent with the experience of the Respondent 15, whose friends have the similar variety of interests as she does:



Respondent 15: Now, just to brag a little, to rub it in to [Respondent 17]'s face a little bit...I was at Faithless concert with my friend, then we went to eat chevap at the Serb's place<sup>15</sup> where they watched boxing and we were the only women, then we went to 'Pepač'<sup>16</sup> to dance a little and then we went to...Sokol<sup>17</sup> and were there 'till closure. [laughs] .

Respondent 1[laughs]: And they're like...I don't have time.

Respondent 17: Well, lucky you, get it?...I cannot find such a friend, and then I used to force all of mine for a certain period of time like : come on, come on, and then they go out and they're like, exhausted...mmm...I can see that they are openly terrified, disgusted, that they give all they can to please me...and then I am frustrated when I see that they are trying, but it doesn't work [laughs]  
(Focus group 3, 2012)

In the case of the Respondent 17, a wide variety of interests which include contradictory lifestyles, prevent her from finding one friend who can understand both at the same time. It is precisely her experience of the pluralism of selves as not being entirely understood within a single friendship that leads her to the compartmentalizing of friendships. The defining moment which leads to the compartmentalizing, is the moment of the respondent's disappointment in not being able to be wholly understood within a single relationship. This leads her to the shift of a friendship towards a situational social friendship: "I gave up the colliding already...not anymore...now it's more like, you're my friend for Jarun..."(Respondent 17, Focus group 3, 2012)

Compartmentalizing of relationships according to particular interests renders real friendship impossible, since clashing interests and tastes are not discussed. This further makes total sincerity and authenticity, required for real friendship, impossible:

Respondent 17: ...And then I said I won't force anybody to do anything anymore, I won't talk to these when I go out to Roko that...ok, now I am talking in a manner of caricature, it's not that I really go out to Roko<sup>18</sup>...

Respondent 15: C'mon, c'mon...

Respondent 17: I go out to Močvara<sup>19</sup> every night, but I am talking in a caricature manner...then when I'm with those I'm like 'yes, yes, this is the oooonly thing I have interest in' [laughs] and then

---

<sup>15</sup> 'Kod Srbina', Croatian, local Balkan chevap place in Zagreb

<sup>16</sup> 'Pepač', short for Pepermint as urban club in the centre of Zagreb

<sup>17</sup> Sokol – folk music club in Zagreb

<sup>18</sup> Roko – club in Zagreb with folk music

<sup>19</sup> Močvara– an alternative music club in Zagreb

I'm like, totally, then they start sharing some of their things with me, which also represent a collision of worlds to me.

Respondent 1: You're hiding, that much about honesty!

Respondent 17: Well I am! (Focus group 3, 2012)

Without being able to be authentic and sincere, the respondent cannot establish a real friendship. Thus a friendship is established on the level which is felt as lower in importance; as a social friendship:

That's what I want to say. With those half-friends for a certain function, I am not sincere because otherwise it would come to a collapse...and then I'm like njenjenjenje [she acts that she is pretending] and then it isn't a true friendship because I don't find them to be truthful periods and in a certain period I experience a little breakdown, and then I ask myself what the f\*\*k am I doing. [laughter] Because I have the feeling that, get it, that I squander myself every time...I fake it, I fake it a little, this and that, and then I think, I can't do this anymore, I need two persons...[...] and it comes down for me in the end like prostitution. I have the feeling that I prostitute myself. In those, get it...when it's like that...little bit with that, little bit with another, little with the third...and then I'm exhausted and I get nothing in return [laughs mildly] (Respondent 17, 27, Zagreb, Focus group 3, 2012)

It is also evident from this example how partial relationships do not secure the feeling of belonging which relationships that include the whole self of the social actor do. Namely, pure relationships, and thus also friendships, are directly linked to one's self-identity (Giddens 1991). Thus, when interests between friends are clashing, they can serve as intervening conditions for the consequence of the questioning of one's identity:

Respondent 1: No, but really, you simply cannot reconcile some people...for example, I really listen classical music a lot, I grew up on that, and that's what I've studied and all...but I also love rock, even more than that. I really like both. And it's hard to say what more or less...but also people from the Academy or wherefrom, with whom I go to Lisinski<sup>20</sup>, or Musical institute, I cannot take them with me to Bogaloo or Močvara, and vice versa, some with whom I'm in Močvara, which are hairy and with overgrown hair...I simply cannot go with them to Lisinski [laughs] ...doesn't fit.

Respondent 6: [laughs] they wouldn't let them in.

---

<sup>20</sup> Lisinski – classical and serious music venue in Zagreb

Respondent 1: [laughs] Yeah and like, exactly what you say, you don't really know where your place is...because a few times it really used to happen to me that, after Lisinski I go somewhere, either to Bogaloo<sup>21</sup> or somewhere like that, and then you know like, you sit for two hours and watch and listen to a concert and everything...and then next two hours you jump somewhere. And you really ask yourself, where is my place then... (Focus group 3, 2012)

#### *5.5.1.4 Social friendships as the area of increased disposability*

As it is evident from the discussion above, social friendships operate within social areas of less effort. Since they are not expected to be continual or to provide intimacy, they are not attended to in the way in which real friendships are. They are, in this sense, well described by the already mentioned Gergen's concept of fractional relationships, which are “vital within circumscribed domains, and moribund beyond“ them (Gergen 2000, 178). Respondents indeed often express different levels of effort when attending to different kinds of friendships:

I have some kind of categories, I have friends arranged in drawers. It's like a little drawer unit, there are categories on that drawer unit, first, second and the third.

What are the drawers?

First, second and third.

First, second and third?

Yes...you know, like, how much someone is important to you, how much of an effort will you make around someone, how much someone will f\*\*k up and then you'll give him or her another chance because he or she is in the first drawer. Rarely there are, like, transfers between drawers...(Respondent 15, 2012)

What does this mean for the level of responsibility within social friendships? It can be noticed that some respondents speak of social friendships in a very non-obligatory manner: “I think that friendship is mostly something good, I cannot say transient, but like...like, simply, in one moment you feel great, that's this part which is fun...only fun, going out...and then you move on and you don't miss it because you find another crew with which you have a great time.” (Respondent 2, 2011); “You have this gradation, but you don't precisely know how to name it...and then, here it often happens, when someone says...like, why are you now going for

---

<sup>21</sup> Bogaloo –alternative club in Zagreb

coffee with him or her, someone who I don't like or something...'but that's just my friend, doesn't matter, or female friend...like, we go for coffees, we hang out, but we don't have the relationship which is like...important, like some.” (Respondent 13, 2011)

Some respondents notice that these kinds of friendships are treated with the lack of the significance one places upon real friendships:

Respondent 6: I have noticed that there are people who savour those short-term friendships. I mean, ok we have never really discussed that...

What does it look like?

Respondent 6: Well like, you have, like... in a certain moment they have a certain person with whom they hang out intensively and all the time like, that person this or that person that...and then suddenly they don't hang out with them anymore. But not that it breaks on a certain level it just...simply...

Respondent 15: They cool down.

Respondent 6: ...they cool down. Like when you're mad in love, and then you're not anymore.

Respondent 17: Well those are like those bees that go to a lot of flowers, intensively to one, I for example, know a few examples...you know, like, I see someone outside...and there are, for example, a few people and they are intensively bonded with one person...they dress identically, and then I see them in three months having the same bond with someone else. And like that...Then I think of it in my mind as short-term friendships. Now, why it breaks or doesn't break I don't know...

[...]

Respondent 6: I think that my best friend...he like, really, we've summed it up when he had his bachelor party, that he has [laughs] very few friends....[laughter] [...] he has like, really a lot of people whom he knows and he is really sociable...I mean, he is really cool and all. But in reality he has very few friends with whom he is...good...who are his friends for a longer time-period. Like, me and maybe two-three other people. But he always has like, always some people with whom he hangs out often...I mean, he has a wife and a daughter and we were at his daughter's birthday recently and suddenly there was a guy and a girl there who I see for the first time. And the two of us are really the best and like, really, who are those people, are they from the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences? I don't know them and he finds them that good to invite them to his daughter's birthday. That means...and like, now he doesn't mention them anymore, and like that. (Focus group 3, 2012)

When the lack of significance placed upon social friendships is accompanied by the fact that they are the area of less effort than real friendships, it can be safe to assume that social friendships are the first ones to feel the strain in the face of unfavourable conditions for the maintenance of a friendship, such as the lack of time or moving of a friend. This is openly acknowledged by some of the respondents: "...I think that if someone is a friend, meaning that we have gone beyond the threshold of intimacy, and she or he has the function of the communication, support and so on...this can be maintained in conditions of long distance. So the geography is not such a big strain on friendship, as it is on friendship." (Respondent 41, 2012)

I mean, it has an impact, because look, I now spend all of the day at work, de facto...if you have a girlfriend and certain friends, you have to somehow arrange time and it's not...work absolutely makes a difference, you cannot say that it does not because...

Ok, and what does it look like then, how do you manage?

Listen, you try to give everyone the attention they deserve, with the ones with whom you're better friends you'll see more often, and with the ones with which you have, let's say, a more superficial relationship, you'll see less of them. (Respondent 36, 2012)

In the case of the splitting of life-trajectories, the strain is most often felt by contextual friendships which are organized around a certain context and cease when the context ceases to exist and the individual moves to another life-phase:

What I said earlier, what I thought were my friends and they were some kind of contextual friends, they are gone.

Mmhm. Why concretely?

Because the context is gone.

Aha, the context is gone. The context has changed?

Yes.

In what sense?

I don't smoke weed every night anymore, do you understand? Then people don't come to my place. (Respondent 35, 2012)

After this, the respondents often move to new social contexts within which they find new friends. Increased choice of social relations due to the pluralisation of life-worlds attributes to finding new friends in new contexts, and thus makes switching of friendships easier:

Respondent 23: Because for example, one my ex best friend, with whom I was best friend forever since elementary school, then the whole high school....and simply, it happened, different life paths, different interests and simply it diluted, broke...

Respondent 21: Yes.

Respondent 23: ...and like, we're no longer even acquaintances.

Respondent 21: You maybe don't want that, but it happens...

Respondent 23: Yes.

Respondent 21: This one goes this way, you go that way...you have different priorities...

Respondent 23: And you meet someone new who has same interests as you...and like, you'll become great friends a lot easier.

Respondent 1: And what's important...I mean, that is that psychological phenomenon when those friends who're...now, it's not that you had a fight, but simply life paths went different ways...(Focus group 2, 2012)

Thus, it can be proposed that social friendships are the area of friendships which contain most of the insecurities which stem from social conditions of late modernity. Bauman's critique of the purity of contemporary relationships is found to be within good reason in the area of social friendships which are not built upon the relationship itself, but around the satisfaction of momentarily needs for socialization, or the benefit one gets out of the relationship. Their organization, which does not demand effort, also means that individuals are less likely to attend to them in situations which demand increased effort for the maintenance of the relationship. When this is linked to the non-obligatory manner in which they are understood, it can be said that they are indeed built on the “until-further-notice“ principle (Bauman 2003, 90). As one of the respondents notices:

Frend is someone with whom you, I don't know, periodically meet for coffee...it means when there is a certain common context then I think of him...on the other hand it can also happen that I don't think of a friend every day, it can be a friend which I think of once a year, but a different feeling is underneath...frend does not oblige as much, I'd say...frend is like, look, now I'm in Zadar, you are

currently in Zadar, let's meet and drink coffee...we'll have a great time, I had a great time, I had a great time after a while, like...but it's a friend.(...) Simply nonobligatory. (Respondent 35, 2012)

This, however, does not necessarily mean that social friendships are always built on the utilitarianistic principles. Some of my respondents show awareness of their utilitarianistic motives in the description of their social friendships, others do not. However, social friendships of late modernity are not of “until-further-notice“ nature due to their foundation on utilitarianistic principles, but because their social organization is such that it does not function well based only on the content of the relationship itself. The social link which fosters them includes a benefit one gets out of the relationship, or the context within which the relationship is organized. Thus they are indeed prone to degradation when the benefit or context which provided their existence ceases to exist.

### **5.5.2 Dynamic aspect of real friendships in late modernity**

#### *5.5.2.1 Scarcity of time as a threat to real friendship*

As was already stated, the experience of the increased pace of life is a significant constituent of a cultural experience of modern societies (Tomlinson 2007). However, in late modernity, as we have already seen, this experience is even more radicalized (Harvey 1989; Rosa 2009; Urry 2009). This renders time as a scarce resource for the individual of late modernity. However, this is not so for every social group. Namely, different parts of society exhibit different kinds of temporal organizations of the everyday life (Rosa 2009). In the specific context of Croatia with alleged simultaneous two modernizations and within the sample of emerging adults, the divide in the experience of time as a resource is done according to the employment status of a particular emerging adult. Those emerging adults who are still unemployed or in college experience slower pace of life and do not recognize time as a scarce resource. However, those emerging adults who are employed, those who have a family or those who are both employed and at college recognize the impact of these conditions on the everyday organization of their lives:

Like, from my example, since I have started working I simply cannot manage to have...to maintain some of these relations with the same frequency I could have before. And I find it a little problematic.

What does it look like then?

Well it looks like that, I don't know, someone with whom I used to drink coffee every day or every other day, now it's once a week or once in two weeks and we're all somehow...each one of us also has a load of other people in their lives, and all that balancing is, let's say, a little...a little problematic. And then you limit yourself to what you can handle, of course. (Respondent 31, 2012)

Employed adults recognize that the experience of having less amount of time in your everyday life reduces the energy left for the maintenance of friendships: "...you don't have time, and then you do what is the most, most necessary to do what you have to, like, to survive. And then you don't have the time to get in contact, and you neglect that friendships...and then, if you neglect them, that connection maybe drops off a little..(Respondent 21, Focus group 2, 2012)

This can lead to the myriad of different consequences in the field of relating, whereas intervening conditions which lead to them are not always obvious.

In late modernity, the disjuncture of different spheres of social time occurs, argues John Urry (Urry 2009). However, he mentions only the desynchronization between different institutional spheres of the society (Urry 2009). One form this descynchronization of collective social times can have is also different timetables of friends who are employed. If the respondent has unemployed friends who adapt to his schedule, this makes the maintenance of a friendship possible. However, if the respondents' friends are also employed, the synchronization of schedules is harder, and this renders meetings more improbable:

For those of you here who work, tell me, does it somehow influence your friendships, increased quantity of obligations, does it somehow affect your friendships?

Respondent 13: To me it did, to me it did, because I have recently started to work a lot and...

Respondent 26: Only lack of time.

Respondent 13: Nothing, nothing...lack of time. People who stayed in my life are my boyfriend's friends who are younger and they are still students...so they have time to see me anytime...

[everybody laughs]

Respondent 13:...and now those are my friends. And my friends, my friends before this relationship are people whom I would never see because I work, they work and that's it. (Focus group 5, 2013)



This can pose a difficulty for the maintenance of a relationship, which can again result in multiple consequences, depending on various intervening conditions:

Respondent 7: In the sense of the lack of time for meetings.

Respondent 44: Yes, yes.

And then?

Respondent 7: With the condition that it is not a friend from college.

Ok, ok...and then? What does that lead to?

Respondent 7: To virtual communication, for example.

Oh?

Respondent 7: Yes.

Respondent 42: Or to the lack...less...

Respondent 7: Or to the lack...

Respondent 42:...less communication. (Focus group 1, 2012)

One of the significant strategies of actions which foster this process towards the continuation of the maintenance of a friendship in the conditions of the lack of time is the maintenance of a friendship through online space of flows:

They are also employed, so it's kind of more about synchronization than about the lack...we simply see it like, I work, he or she also works....it's not that they're at home so they're bored...or that they hold a grudge because you don't have time or something like that...so we synchronize....we make an effort. Or we, simply stay in touch a lot, so it's not...when there is no option to see each other, then we're in touch with each other, like...

So you talk through these technologies...

Yes, about everything...

Aha, about everything, like from smalltalk to deeper topics?

Yes, definitely...from like, look what kind of a woman is in the tram, to something that bothers you, economy, political situation, everything, everything...(Respondent 15, 2012)

Also, online maintenance as a strategy of action against the backdrop of the conditions of employment often works when the effort invested is heightened. Usually this happens by the socializing missed during weeks being compensated for during the weekends:

That means, before, I had a lot more free time, like, all days, and then I could...make a list of friends to see...and then at every moment when they called, let's go for coffee or let's go here...or like, 'We'll be in touch in a week, will you be here? Of course, we could always meet. However, now I can't anymore, especially when sometimes it's like, I work in the morning one day and then the other day in the afternoon...and then all of this kills me, it's like really bad, I can eventually go somewhere after work like I did now....during the week I don't really go anywhere. Eventually those activities that I have and that make me happy, let's say, football...and then mostly, over the weekend.

[...]

And how do you handle that?

Well then we talk to each other, like I told you, we make arrangements on Face...and then we make arrangements for coffee, for which day and then...before it used to be coffees everyday and now it's like, even monthly only one coffee. Sometimes we even meet by accident rather than by arrangement. (Respondent 48, 2012)

However, some respondents find that, in spite of the online maintenance, some of their real friendships wear off. This usually happens if the strategy of maintenance is focused only on the online maintenance without the accompanied compensated socializing:

That what I said, like, the orientation towards some other things in life simply leads to you not having the time...or anything else. Like, from my personal example, I don't know, since I've started working, I simply cannot manage to...to maintain certain relations with the same frequency I could have before. And I find it a little problematic.

How does it look like, then?

Well it looks like, I don't know, someone with whom I've drunk coffee every day or every other day, now it's once a week or once in two weeks and we've all somehow...at the same time everyone of us has a lot of other people in life, and all that balancing is, let's say...a little problematic. And then, of course, you limit yourself to what you can handle. (Respondent 31, 2012)

Since the crucial aspect of the maintenance of a friendship is also time in the form of shared experiences, the online maintenance of friendship is not experienced as sufficient:"It will

never be the same for me and it seems to me like some totally bad replacement for some kind of like, personal contact...I don't know...a lot gets lost in translation or you don't want to say it because it is over the internet or like, I don't know, simply, it's somehow...the word which comes to my mind is 'superficial' (Respondent 31, 2012)

As we have already seen, one of the significant dimensions of the respondents' feelings towards the online maintenance of friendships is the perception that the online maintenance is not able to replace the face-to-face communication, due to its superficiality and the lack of embodiment which makes interaction through the online space of flows feel unreal and incomplete. This is what makes online space of flows favourable for a temporary everyday substitution for face-to-face contact in the context of the maintenance of a friendship, but can render it inadequate in long-term periods of friend's absence.

The strategy of online maintenance of friendships lacks the shared experiences and time spent together with a friend. Since this is the dominant facet of the dimension of the knowledge of the other, which is again the dominant facet of the dimension of intimacy, the lack of it reduces in both these dimensions. This further leads to the experience of the estrangement from a friend: "...it's, we don't see each other for two weeks, and then three weeks and then what's new? Nothing, you know like, it's already stupid to talk about it...and then it degrades..." (Respondent 29, 2012) Or as other respondent notes:

That is what I also consider important for a friendship... as much as we cannot see each other for six months and be great together again, I think it's like, for real friendships it is nevertheless important that people spend time together and that's why in the end maybe people, when their lives start, when they start having families, jobs, this and that, that maybe a lot of people lose friends...you simply don't have so much time to invest in your social structure, and then people who were your good friends are suddenly friends because you don't know them that well anymore. (Respondent 3, Focus group 2, 2012)

A clue to why this is so is offered within the observation of one respondent who notices how the lack of shared experiences with her friends results in the change in their interaction. Namely, the interaction changes from the one which is organized around self-disclosure towards the one oriented towards the exchange of information: "...only that lately I somehow noticed that...in regard to that more and more important things happening, a job and the rest, that all...that it mostly came down to reports, like, about those incidents, like, we don't have

the time to retell like, exactly the feelings and similar things...like, before we spent really a lot of time [laughs] on emotional analysis and similar things..." (Respondent 39, 2012)

The interaction oriented towards the exchange of information, as we have already seen, is not the characteristic of a real, but rather of a social friendship. Thus, the different type of interaction leads further to the lowering of the feelings of familiarity:

Does it somehow affect relationships, or?

Of course it affects them, I mean.

In what way?

You simply grow apart, you don't feel that you can say certain things anymore or go burden someone with some of your problems, I don't know...simply...I mean, it is clear that if you don't meet someone often enough, and you don't work on that relationship, that is simply comes to... a separation. (Respondent 31, 2012)

Thus, the temporal desynchronization of everyday social practices of friends can lead to real friendship distancing in long terms:

Respondent 13: ...I mean, my crew is very well connected, which means that there is no person which is not connected to another person, but they're all very good friends...and then when I left those shared socializing in order to do my job, I didn't have time to come to gatherings, practice sessions, birthdays, what not, where everybody else...and it just through a certain period, it's less...nobody expected me to come anymore, nobody called me anymore, because I never can and why would they call me, who'd remember...so...

So it did have an effect in your case.

Respondent 13: Yes, very much. (Focus group 5, 2013)

The lack of time for a friendship can also result in a conscious growing apart from friends. In early modernity, time started to be thought of in terms of commodity (Bauman 2000; Harvey 1989; Urry 2009). Similarly to this, when time is commodified this can lead to the thinking of a friendship process in terms which are alike to those on the commercial markets. Namely, the lack of time demands from social actors to reflexively think about friendship processes in terms of calculation. Namely, if the demands of a friendship are in terms of time oriented versus demands of the fulfilment of one's life-project, this can lead to reflexive negotiating of

friendship processes, which resembles cost/benefit analysis conducted on commercial markets:

..because I am tired and it is really demanding to even go out tonight...because you know you'll get sleepy, you know you cannot drink, like, get drunk, you know you can't stand the atmosphere of smoke, loud music, you cannot dance, you cannot do literally anything, you don't have the strength to intellectually converse with people, you can be passive, but you don't have the strength to give anything.

Ok, and how did you handle it then?

Well really bad....I mean, I tried to evaluate the situation, how important it is now to go to that party, how long I haven't seen those people. So that people know that I am still here...that I didn't forget them. And then I would evaluate, aha, yesterday I was here, so now I don't have to anymore... (Respondent 13, 2011)

The reflexive process of calculation, however, is rather at odds with the authenticity which is typical for the social practice of real friendships.

Furthermore, temporal desynchronization can also lead to the friction in a friendship process, triggering the re-evaluation of demands of a friendship and the one's possibility to fulfil them.

Respondent 15:...I have a friend, a really good friend, with whom I have great intimacy and trust and reliability...[...] and he was outside the country at a graduate program. And then, after the graduate program, he went again to another country to do some sort of scientific research. And now, he wasn't home for, let's say, a year and a half in total. Before, he usually had a job which was exclusively in the morning and in the evening, all other of us work from 9 to 5. And it would always be in some kind of a hole, like, coffee, smoke, whatevs. And now he is back and he doesn't have a job. He has to finish that research. And like, he contacts you on Skype, I am at work, nervous, crazy...bucu, entertain me a little...and I'm like, I cannot entertain you because I am nervous, I want to stab someone with a pen 'till he dies and I cannot animate you on Skype...let's go for a coffee at five. And like, I tell him...I don't have obligations, I am so exhausted, worn out, I just want to lie in my bed, dirty, take of my skirt like, lie down in a shirt and watch a turkish soap opera which I don't watch. And he holds that against me, he says, you don't have time for me, I have already been here for two months....and he simply does not understand...maybe I am a bad friend, in the end, but he doesn't get it that he like, flew into our routine lives and that he should maybe adapt because he is at home all the time.

Respondent 1: Yes, but maybe he in fact expects that, since he came to your routine lives, that you could get out of that routine a little, so you can, like...

Respondent 17: Yes, that is always debatable...

Respondent 15: And now it's like...is it that I am a bad friend or that he doesn't have understanding?  
(Focus group 3, 2012)

In conditions which limit the time available for the maintenance of a friendship, reflexive negotiating is present in the thinking processes of my respondents.

Also, the respondents often mention two intervening conditions which they find most significant in the maintenance of a friendship in spite of the unfavourable social conditions. These are *personal efforts* on behalf of the friend who has the lack of time for the maintenance of a friendship, and *understanding* of the other friend for the first friend's lack of time.

As we have noted before, personal effort can be regarded as a direct manifestation of personal agency in the maintenance of a friendship. The discourse about it can be said to accompany individualized thinking about friendship:

Respondent 3: And like, I wouldn't agree with this that I like, literally don't have time. Because for a best friend, that's exactly what you've said, you'll always somehow find time, that's what we've said, it doesn't have to be once a week, but once in six months it is a lie that you cannot meet someone...

Respondent 21: ...that you indeed don't have...

Respondent 3: To sit for coffee, yes. That's like, you see that it fades always and you let it go...

Respondent 28: ...and you let it go...

Respondent 3:...because you have other priorities. (Focus group 2, 2012)

Namely, as it is evident from this discussion developed in one of the focus groups, most respondents have, at one time or the other, experienced a friend lacking time for the maintenance of a friendship. The phenomenon which is interesting, however, and often present among the respondents who had this experience is their persistent refusal to accept the lack of time as valid reason for friendship failures, and how they instead replace it over and over with the notion of personal effort:

Respondent 1: But you know what, I think that also that when they back out by 'I don't have time'. Ok, there is certain period when one is really in a hectic period...or you have something...

Respondent 17: Mmmhm, but then you say, I don't know...I have to eat today, and like, I don't know, I offer this to you, I am really busy, but I don't know, like, eat with me now...

Respondent 1: Well like, yes, or that. Or it can be a certain hectic period or more stressed period in life or what not. But it lasts for a few weeks...but then again, if someone insists on telling you that they don't have time, well, then something is wrong with you, I mean I'm sorry...

Respondent 6: Yes, or like...

Respondent 1: If you don't have time non-stop, what is that about? Either you lie, or you are making it up or you don't want to have time. (Focus group 3, 2012)

As I have noted before, personal effort can be considered as a manifest form of personal agency put into the dynamics in the process of the friendship forming and maintenance. Thus, it is interesting to note that much of the maintenance of a friendship is credited with personal agency, when social conditions are unfavourable for it in terms of temporality, as will be shown further in this chapter. Why is this so? For one, the emphasis on personal effort is the manifestation of the exercise of an agency in late modernity. I would argue that the reason why personal effort is a category so central to the respondents' discourse of a friendship is the general individualized approach to life within which a personal agency is often placed in the centre, even on the account of the processes which are socially triggered (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002; Giddens 1991). The discourse on personal effort is a direct manifestation of the late modern emphasis on the personal agency on behalf of the structure. In this sense, my respondents are typical late modern individuals who experience personal relationships reflexively by emphasizing one's active role in their formation, maintenance and renovation (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002, 35). However, this also means that possible social influences on the formation and maintenance of these relationships can be neglected.

In the context of the maintenance of a friendship, the respondents also sometimes link having time for a friendship with how much someone values certain friendship relationship. This can be regarded as the manifestation of the commodified time in late modernity, in the sense that time devoted to something or someone is experienced as a value placed upon something or someone: "... that is something I just told my friend yesterday...that I won't contact her anymore or wait for her to contact me because I am sick of it that I call her all the time, every day, and where I am to her, like, sixth on the to do list...and then she does thousands of things

and I try to meet her like, to maintain a friendship and I've told her, this friendship won't be like this anymore if you don't contact me“ (Respondent 13, 2012)

In other words, in the conditions of temporal scarcity in late modernity personal effort invested in a relationship is often measured precisely in terms of the time invested in it. Since time is a commodified resource which has value, finding or not finding time for a friend is interpreted as the value which a friend places or does not place upon friendship. This could explain why the respondents are in this area especially not ready to compromise: “I always find the time for friends...and what I say, if some time in life you don't have time for someone, or someone doesn't have time for you, that relationship was never worthy.” (Respondent 32, 27, Split/Zagreb); ”...yeah, but like, if someone is extremely important to me, then I'll find...I'll really find the time, I'll like, find the time. But if I don't recognize the same effort from the other side, like, I don't have time, period, there is nothing left to talk about...” (Respondent 17, Focus group 3, 2012)

The emphasis on a personal agency, however, often means that failures in the maintenance of a friendship – even those which are to a large extent attributed to the unfavourable social conditions, are interpreted as the lack of effort on behalf of a friend. This, then, might add to the heightened expectations of friendships as the part of the heightened expectations of personal relationships in late modernity. It is also in accordance with the responsibility which an individualized social actor of late modernity takes upon himself with regards to his life-trajectory; for his successes, but also for his failures (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002).

The second condition which the respondents find crucial in determining whether a friendship will be continued in spite of the increased pace of life, is the understanding which a friend has for the other friend's lack of time. They normatively agree that friends should have understanding for the increased scope of obligations in each other's lives:

Respondent 3 : But I mean, that's again that...on the one hand the word understanding we used before...

Respondent 21...it depends, it also depends on the other party...

Respondent 3: The other person has to have understanding for your situation, and his or her own...and so on. (Focus group 2, 2012)



However, in practice this ideal is sometimes hard to achieve, as previously mentioned by the respondent who commutes to work every day and finds that her friends are not as understanding as she would expect them to be:

I don't know, for example, I travel every day, to Kutina, to work...and like, I get up at five, I come back at six, let's say...and like, for a weekend, I don't feel like going out, or doing what not...like, first, the most important thing is to get some sleep, for example. And now...I don't know, I am more in the mood for some other type of socializing than what my girlfriends expect....which may now not be in such...I don't know...all the time something, like, obligations. So that...It was often that I didn't find understanding and that. For that way of living...[...] or I don't know, like, we have to buy a friend a birthday present, and now, we make arrangements who will go, who can, and who cannot...and I did not find that certain kind of understanding like, you work, like, 80 kilometres everyday in one direction and come back, so like, I don't know, hey, we'll do that, for example. And I did not find the understanding for, for example, that something...my lack of time and who has to work, and like that. (Respondent 42, Focus group 1, 2012)

However, there were a few respondents in the survey who perceived the scarcity of time in regard to real friendships positively. Those are the respondents who have the experience of the enduring real friendships in spite of the scarcity of time. Those respondents find that the lack of time for associating with friends partly influences the association positively in terms of the quality of shared time. Namely, both the multiplicity of experiences of a friendship participant who lacks time outside of friendship context and the limited amount of time for associating are experienced to heighten the quality of the time spent together:

It influences the feeling of friendship positively, and it influences some kind of association negatively.

Mhm, so it influences positively in what way, and in what way negatively?

Well positively like, I don't have time and I still have friends. And I don't have those who were just like that....and negatively, in terms of not having time for associating.

Ok, and how do you maintain those friendships if you don't have time..

Well I find time, in the past those associations were sometimes also boring...now they are a little bit more constructive. (Respondent 35, 2012)

To sum up, on the normative level most of the respondents find that the maintenance of real friendships is a manifestation of personal agency of the individual, and that the increased

scope of obligations, desynchronization of lived temporalities or lack of time should not affect real friendships. However, real social practices of a friendship are sometimes removed from this ideal and do not endure the strain which the lack of time or temporal desynchronization in social lives of friends put on real friendships.

#### *5.5.2.2 Diversification of life-trajectories as threat to real friendship*

Real friendships can be influenced by the change of life-trajectories of the participants in a friendship. This can happen in the form of one of the participants moving to a geographically remote area. It can also occur in the form of life-trajectories splitting to different social areas in the form of different lifestyles, interests or change of a phase in the life-course:

Respondent 42:...we grew in different directions. Simply, people change and...

Respondent 42: Yes.

Respondent 30: ...that is, it somehow seems to me, the most common. I have never, for example, lost someone because he betrayed me or he stabbed me in the back, but...it comes naturally.

Respondent 7: Yes, it depends on a situation. Yes, maybe your friend got married and I don't know, he moved away and you are not in that certain kind of contact, that connection simply stops, you are not that close anymore. (Focus group 1)

The change of the lifestyle, because I graduated at 23 and started working...that was some kind of a turning point, then I lived for a year in Split...then I lived between Zagreb and Split for a while, then I made lot of friendships in Split...then I met some people through work...well, I have to say it changed a lot...

And what you've told me – that it was a turning point when you started working, in what sense? Did it somehow reflect on your friendships, then, or?

In some way it did.

How?

Because...for example, with people who stayed at college...ok, not with all of them...I simply did not have common interests. And simply, it happened that they graduated when I did, or after me, and found a job and somehow life split you apart...no, I mean there weren't any arguments, like..that didn't happen. Life has simply torn us apart. (Respondent 32, 2012)

As my respondents note, this process can have different consequences due to different intervening conditions, with two most frequent being the real friendship dropping to a level of social friendship or the ceasing to exist entirely. The central category is again time – since significantly less time is spent with a friend, consequently this leads to less shared experiences and less knowledge of the other, and thus the area of intimacy shrinks:

Respondent 13:...I have maintained a very close friendship on the relationship like, Koprivnica-Lovran, which functioned for years and years...

Aha, how did you maintain it?

Respondent 13: Through phone...

Through phone?

Respondent 13: Mostly telephone conversations...In one moment, when she moves somewhere, I don't know, where there is no phone line...it's like a collapse of the system...we don't talk to each other in three months, and then it feels stupid and like...nobody is updated anymore. And like, we really maintained a really close friendship which then...with the interruptions of conversations, communication...when somebody is not in your life every day, when you cannot like, share something instantly, that function is lost. And then...we still have the distance, but a lot less eagerness to visit each other and talk to each other, because we don't have anything to tell to each other...(Respondent 13, Focus group 5, 2013)

As we can also see from this example, when it comes to the case of a friend moving to a remote geographical area, the intervening condition which is especially significant for the maintenance of remote friendships is the possibility of the maintenance of friendships through online space of flows. The continuation of real friendships with friends who moved away through online space of flows is often described by my respondents:

Respondent 17: Because, for example I have a situation with my friend in which I live on a different continent and it has been like this for two years...and really, we maintain our friendship through Skype. And I think...I mean, he recently came for a visit and it was like we saw each other yesterday....and before I'd say it is impossible if you don't share daily activities...if you are not in like, real life. But then, for example, based on this I think it's possible.

Respondent 6: Me too...

Respondent 1: It's possible if you really click with a friend and you invest lot of effort in maintaining it, then I think it's possible.

Respondent 17: Yes. Mmhm. I think that where there is will from both sides, it is really possible

Respondent 15: This friend of mine who went to London, she switched jobs a lot, she lives in London literally, lot of years already...I go to visit her to London at least twice a year, she comes here, we see each other, we talk to each other through e-mail, message, on a daily basis...and telephone, when something extremely dramatic is going on. (Focus group 3, 2012)

Since the possibility of the maintaining of relationships through online space of flows are inherently a late modern cultural experience, it can be said that this factor enables the maintenance of a friendship against the backdrop of the increasingly unfavourable conditions for its maintenance in terms of the splitting of life-trajectories.

Another intervening condition which is seen as a crucial determinant of the continuation of a friendship is again, personal effort:

Respondent 28:...maybe I am, I don't know...an idealist in that sense, but I think that this alienation and separation for no reason, that it happens only if one allows it. That means, if he/she literally emotionally does not care, and he/she simply watches it to go away and does nothing...that it happens like that. With some people...with some people you will never let that happen, wherever they are. For example, my best friend is in Spain...that means, she moved away, not to another city, but across half a continent...

Respondent 21: Mmhm...

Respondent 28: And we make an effort, of course it's not the same. It's not the same as every day...we lived in the same neighbourhood, two blocks away...we have to put in more effort, use different mechanisms and so on...but we keep trying because we both want to. If we didn't want to, we'd let it go and we'd say we simply split apart, alienated, time, circumstances...

Respondent 21: But it also depends on her.

Respondent 28: Of course, of course. (Focus group 2, 2012)

This again shows the emphasis on the active role in the formation of one's personal network which is a dominant experience of individuals in late modernity (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002). The respondents often claim that if a friendship has failed to continue when life-trajectories split, it was because of the lack of personal effort:

Respondent 6: That is a friend from high school and we were really great, and now when we meet we tell each other everything...but it somehow always turns out that we don't have time to see each other...like, you don't have time for two months, what is that?

What is it then?

Respondent 6: Well we don't care, obviously. But I don't mean it as...

Respondent 15: She's just not that into you.

[Laughter]

Respondent 17: Yes.

Respondent 6: But I don't know how I'd...I don't even see it as something...we have completely different, like, life-styles, she's a doctor... (Focus group 3, 2012)

If personal effort is a crucial intervening condition which determines whether a friendship will be continued in the circumstances of splitting of life-trajectories, and friendships which have failed to continue did so on behalf of the lack of effort, it can be inferred that friendships which are less based on effort and more on social circumstances, such as social friendships, are more prone to breaking when circumstances change. The consequence of this kind of strain is often contextual friendships. When the social context of their organization ceases, and life-trajectories split if insufficient effort is invested in the maintenance of these friendships, they turn out to be limited to the context around which they were organized: "I for example, socialized with some girls from college with whom I haven't talked in a year and a half. Now, I see those were interest-based associations, and some common things...although those associations at the time went to a wider spectrum, so we talked about everything, and then it was very intensive, going out and that, but it wasn't continued." (Respondent 4, 2011)

However, in the first focus group there was an interesting case in which one of the respondents felt that she had a close friendship with a person who lived remotely for a while, but that even both closeness and personal effort were not enough to maintain it over long distance:

Respondent 24: I wouldn't agree.

No? Tell us. Ok?

Respondent 24: Well, it always turned out for me, for example, I don't know, if I developed a certain kind of communication with someone that it will then survive in a condition of a distance too, and if I wanted to stay ok with some people, we simply did not develop that way of communicating that we can, let's say, telephone each other and talk for hours. And then I don't even call....though I would want to, and I miss it, but we simply aren't on that level that we can keep it in a condition of a distance.

Mmhm, mmhm. It means...

[...]

Ok, that means..I understood what you said now...because you said that you didn't come at that level with those people to call them on the telephone...they aren't close enough?

Respondent 24: Yes, simply...I don't have anything to...

Wait, but those are then not the closest friendships...

Respondent 24: It's not even about how close we are...because I have people with whom I am very close but...I don't have that way of communicating with them and it won't survive that way. But, because I am close enough with them, when they return we will continue where we stopped...but at a distance it won't function equally right as it did...I don't know, it's different.

Respondent 30: Maybe simply a type of a person, or?

What do you mean, you don't have that way of communicating?

Respondent 24: Well, the same...for example I think it is really my fault, and not theirs...

Aha, you had that kind of an experience, or?

Respondent 24: No, I have different friends, for example, a lot of them went back like that, one stayed in Zadar, I don't know, I have a friend now who went for a student exchange and I don't know, he is in contact with this other friend through Skype, they also said it was a bit odd from the beginning...it's all, like, let's try. I don't feel like...even trying [laughs] because I know...not that I don't care, but simply I don't have that certain kind of communicating manner with him, and then, I don't see how that would go. But it's not that we are...

And what way of communicating is that?

Respondent 24: Well the talk is different so it is, I mean I have to somehow...I don't know.

Different in what way?

Respondent 24: That's not it. You don't talk like...I don't know, when I talk to someone through Skype or something, then I have internal jokes, so if I don't have that, it feels stupid to write, hey, hi, how are you, what's up.. [laughs] (Focus group 1, 2012)

Here the intervening condition which stops the maintenance of a friendship over long distance is type of a communication which the respondent feels is not intimate enough for the online maintenance. However, at the same time, she experiences this person as a close friend. Is this then a contextual or real friendship? It is unclear, but the experience of this respondent sheds light on nuances of types of friendships in reality which are sometimes more complex than the ideal types in the sociological analysis. It is also indicative of how, against the discourse of personal agency which permeates narratives of the respondents in accordance with the individualization logic in late modernity, when life-trajectories split and even personal effort is sometimes not enough for the continuation of a real friendship.

## **5.6 Perceived difference between friendships in smaller and bigger social settings**

The phenomenon that can't go unmentioned in the context of the remodulation of a friendship in late modernity is the difference in social organization of a friendship between smaller and bigger social settings, the first ones being small towns and rural areas, and the latter being larger metropolitan areas. The research was started with the assumption that there would be a difference in experience of a friendship in smaller and bigger social settings, which those respondents who had the experience of growing up in smaller settings, and then moving to bigger ones, or living between the two, would notice. This was to be assumed already from the change of nature of ties observed by Georg Simmel already in the period of early modernity (Simmel 1950). He started his analysis with the description of the difference between a psychic life of the inhabitants of the metropolitan area as more impersonal, as opposed to the one of the inhabitants of the rural area, which he linked to the conditions of the impersonalized system of interests in money economy on which the functioning of the metropolitan area is based, as opposed to a slower pace of life in smaller social settings which allowed more feelings (Simmel 1950). This then also transferred to the area of relationships in terms of relations becoming less personal and increased differentiation of relationships in bigger urban settings, as opposed to relationships being founded on greater familiarity and, paradoxically, on the individuality of each person, and thus on emotionally warmer tones in

smaller settings, as he picturesquely described the difference (Simmel 1950). Although his description was oversimplified to a certain extent, it should be taken as the initial setting of the agenda for the general direction which to look when analyzing the differences between smaller and bigger settings, since he intuitively grasped the sense of what latter findings of the research of those differences in late modernity showed. More specifically, the phenomenon of increased differentiation and loose-nature of social life in larger urban settings, in opposition to more dense and stable character in smaller social areas, continued to be observed and researched throughout late modernity (Fischer 1982; Wellman, Carrington and Hall 1988; Wellman 2001). This difference between smaller and bigger settings reminds of the difference between traditional spatially dense communities and contemporary loosely bound ones (Wellman 2001). Or, as Fischer noted in his research of Californian urban and rural centres already in the 1980s, “the city is to small town as modern society to traditional society“ (Fischer 1982, 1).

The assumption was thus that in Croatia this difference would also be present, especially bearing in mind the vast differences in the levels of modernization between certain regions of the country, especially its capital, Zagreb, which is more similar to its European late modern urban counterparts than to less modernized settings of smaller social areas. Thus Zagreb, Rijeka, Split and Osijek were considered as bigger cities in Croatia, since four of them are regarded as significant metropolitan areas of larger regions. This analytical framework then considers differences between bigger metropolitan areas and in opposition to this, smaller cities and villages, not the classical urban/rural dichotomy.

The suitable theoretical framework for this proposition was found within Bernice Pescosolido's and Judith Levy's conceptualization of differences between the levels of integration and regulation within different kinds of social networks (Pescosolido and Levy 2002). In this framework, the concepts of integration and regulation are built on the combination of Durkheim's distinction of the level of integration and regulation to which an individual can be exposed in community, together with Simmel's nature of social ties (Pescosolido and Levy 2002). The integration is here understood as care and concern that integrate individuals into the community and manifest as a sense of belonging, while the regulation is defined as an oversight of the individual which places isolating regulations on the individual's behaviour (Pescosolido and Levy 2002, 7). Pescosolido and Levy distinguish between four levels of integration/regulation to which individuals can be exposed to within their social networks: the level of high integration and high regulation, the level of high



integration but loose regulation, the level of high regulation but loose integration, and the level of both low integration and regulation (Pescosolido and Levy 2002, 3-28 ). This framework was used to understand different experiences between friendships in smaller and bigger cities, found among those respondents who have had the experience of living in smaller communities and then coming to study and/or live in Zagreb. In smaller cities, the experiences emphasize the higher level of integration into one's social network, with an accompanying sense of higher regulation. In bigger cities, however, levels of integration and regulation are experienced as more loose, and relationships as more differentiated.

What does this look like? The respondents from smaller cities find that in their place of origin friendships are more conditioned by physical proximity. At the same time, they feel that in Zagreb the emphasis is more on personal agency:

I didn't acquire my friends through life, I was born with them...they told me immediately, this is your friend, and ok [laughs]...yes, it was literally like that...

[...]

in those smaller places it is really totally conditioned by the fact that you live nearby...it means, it is what keeps us together. You don't have anyone else to hang out with, there you are, you are practically forced to hang out together...and accept each other, even if you fight all the time...And here, friendships are more like, you really choose each other somehow, for some reason, and then you maybe enjoy it more, but it is different...there it is more like some kind of a family, and this is really...different. (Respondent 10, 2011)

In other words, friendships in smaller settings are experienced as built more on the availability of social actors in limited spatial settings than on active reflexive effort. In this way, they resemble the less modernized form of communities. However, this also has implications for the strength of the bonds:

Do you maybe see the difference between friendships in Zagreb and in the place where you grew up [Gornji Zvečaj near Duga Resa, a village]?

Well...mmm..yes, somehow like, in smaller settings friendships are maybe more solid. Like, I have friends from elementary school, they're precisely from this village setting and...with them I'm precisely in some kind of a more solid relationship, although we don't see each other or talk to each other that often...but we will always help each other..and we will always call each other if we have certain problems and talk about it...while here in Zagreb, I don't know...even if we don't talk to each other, like, every week...we don't miss it that much, let's say. (Respondent 27, 2012)

Thus, in smaller settings, due to limited spatial settings and consequently a limited pool of choice from which friendships can emerge, the respondents have the feeling of being more oriented toward one another even with the lack of similar interests or worldviews: “In those smaller settings it is totally conditioned by the fact that we live nearby...that means, it is what keeps us together. And you don't have anyone else to hang out with, you are there and you are practically forced to hang out together. And accept each other, even if you fight all the time...” (Respondent 10, 2011)

As Wellman, Carrington and Hall notice, the inhabitants of small cities are in contact with the same interconnected web of people throughout the day, while networks in bigger cities are more dispersed (Wellman, Carrington and Hall 1988): “What does it mean to meet someone in Varaždin? You will see a person three times a week for sure.” (Respondent 12, 2011); “In Zagreb you have this bigger circle of acquaintances which don't necessarily know each other, while in Sisak even if you have acquaintances, they all know each other.” (Respondent 6, 2011)

What this brings for the inhabitants of smaller settings, however, is the feeling of familiarity which then transfers itself onto the feeling of the strength of the bond: “Friendships from Sisak are somehow stronger, because you grew up together, so you know each other longer...and I suppose a friendship is stronger when you know someone longer.” (Respondent 6, 2011)

Thus friendship relations in smaller social settings are felt as bonds of higher sturdiness which cannot be broken easily: “I think that in Makarska, in smaller settings you have bigger probability that friends will be friends till the end of life...and in bigger cities it is not so. Because I see, I am, more than some other people...regardless of the fact that my girlfriends don't go to college in Zagreb, I am still very connected with them...[...]I think they're more pushed towards each other. Especially if you remain living there, then, I think it's 90% chance that those people will remain your friends.” (Respondent 33, 2012)

However, this also brings a limited agency in the choice of a friendship and friendships which are felt to emerge more from the habitual patterns of interaction and physical availability than personal agency:

Do you maybe see some kind of a difference between friendships in Cavtat and friendships in Zagreb?

Well yes...let's say that...here, when people are in bad friendships, I think that you can get out of them more easy...down there...since it's a small place, since you see people all the time...especially if you live down there all the time and spend all your time there..and work...it is harder to break them because you always take the path of the least resistance. Like, it is easier to endure that than to have some sort of a big break-up... (Respondent 25, 2012)

Friendships in smaller settings are thus, in a sense, experienced as self-sustaining:,, "...well yes, there [in Slavonski Brod] are a lot of people who grew up together and that is the only reason why they hang out together.“ (Respondent 39, 2012)

In this sense relationships in smaller social settings, due to the limited spatial area of smaller settings, are indeed felt to resemble a pre-given character of densely-knit communities of higher integration, but also of higher regulation in traditional communities (Pescosolido and Levy 2002; Wellman 2001). Some respondents describe the experience of what can be seen as higher levels of regulation: “It seems to me that in Varaždin it is very important that....that similarity of yours, that you are similar, some kind of crew, and from a crew then you somehow find each other, those two who click the best. It seems to me that this is very dangerous, because you never test a friendship in this...[...]" (Respondent 12, 2011); “What makes one of us happy, makes all of us happy. Or, when one of us is mad, the others are mad too, and so on....that means, we are a very, very connected crew, emotionally and physically...because we are all basically from Velika Gorica, we all live within the circle of a few kilometres, and then we see each other very often which surely influences our hanging out and so on...” (Respondent 22, 2012)

From all of this, one could assume that friendships in smaller communities are more prone to conformism in the sense of over-regulation. Over-regulation in this sense has the potential of hindering an individual's ability to make choices on one's own (Pescosolido and Levy 2002). This trait resembles Emile Durkheim's mechanical solidarity (Emirbayer 2003), and in this sense smaller communities are experienced, to some extent, as resembling less modernized social conditions.

The difference felt between friendships in smaller and bigger social settings was particularly evident from the narrative of one respondent from Slavonski Brod<sup>22</sup> who first went to Zagreb to study, and then, finally, he lived in Paris for a year during student exchange. During the course of his interview, he strongly and explicitly differentiated between 'old' friendships in

---

<sup>22</sup> City in Slavonia in Croatia, of app. 63 000 inhabitants

Slavonski Brod and 'new ones' in Zagreb and Paris, which are notably bigger social settings. There was a distinct sense of high levels of regulation and less choice in friendships in Slavonski Brod, and less levels of regulation and more emphasis on a choice in the ones in bigger cities:

...there are a lot of people in Slavonski Brod who listen to folk music...it is not my kind of music...but if I go out with someone from Brod, that would inevitably like, include...

Really, folk music?

Yes.

What does it look like, how do you handle that?

Well, I don't know, it was easier to handle that there because it was the dominant genre of music...now, here, where...let's say it's not like that here....at least I think it's not, then...there is much more choice. (Respondent 34, 2012)

The dimension of an agency in the choice of friendships in Zagreb was also emphasized by other respondents from smaller settings: "In Koprivnica you can choose friendships by the 'top colleagues from high school' and things like that, in Zagreb, it is maybe more like, friends of friends of friends, you have a lot more possibilities here..". (Respondent 14, 2011)

The agency in bigger cities was not only mentioned in the context of forming friendships, but also in the context of their maintenance:

What does it mean to meet someone in Varaždin? You will see a person three times a week for sure.

You don't have any other choice?

In Zagreb, you have to make an effort. (Respondent 12, 2011)

However, the higher reliance on personal agency of friendships which is felt with regard to friendships in bigger settings would also explain why they are felt as more fragile in opposition to the ones from smaller settings.

It has to be noted that this experience of higher sturdiness of friendships from smaller settings could be partly attributed to the life-stage of the respondent in which they were formed. Namely, the friendships in the places of origins were formed during childhood and adolescence, and thus the sturdiness of the bond can be partly attributed to the category of

friendship which is experienced by the respondents as especially strong – a childhood friend. The respondents do also offer more generalized perceptions of differences between friendships in smaller and bigger social settings which go beyond their personal relations. However, it cannot be dismissed that a different experience in terms of regulation and integration can be partly attributed to the different ways of forming friendships in different life-stages. More precisely, it has to be noted that even those respondents who come from bigger settings report a difference in their current perception of a friendship and the one in the previous life-phases. Generally, a friendship is in emerging adulthood a life-phase experienced more reflexively, more based on a personal choice and individualized than in previous life-phases, when it was organized without reflexivity, less based on personal agency and more organized around fun: “Today, the component of conversation is more important....some fun activities are not necessary....the conversation suffices...and before that it used to be the bigger component like, going out and similar...or some common activities.” (Respondent 44, 2012); “When I was younger I didn't have anything to base my opinion about friendship on...simply anyone with whom I had good relations was my friend...and today it's like a chosen circle of people...” (Respondent 30, 2012)

Before it was more like going out, joking around...now it's more concrete.

More concrete in what sense?

In all possible senses, like from mutual relations to ...topics of conversations. It's more serious, you could say. (Respondent 40, 2012)

Since the respondents from smaller social settings moved to bigger social setting in their late adolescence, thus the findings point in the direction of the differences in the perception of friendships in smaller and bigger settings that can at least partly be attributed to the life-phase in which the respondents are currently while living, in the bigger social setting vs. the life-phase they were in while they were living in the smaller social setting. In other words, the reflexivity and the emphasis on the choice in the formation of friendships in Zagreb can at least partly be attributed to their progress in their life-stage. However, the differences in the size of the pool of choice of potential friendships, which inevitably exist between smaller and bigger communities based already on the account of the differences in their physical size, is something which cannot be attributed to the life-phase of the respondent:

..it is simply a little different when you are in high school...like, ok, when you are in high school or elementary school...you go to school in the place where you are, where you are from...that means,

friendships can practically be neighbours or people with whom you normally go to high school....or eventually with whom you attend a certain kind of activity, like practice sessions...I mean, it comes down to that...while here...college, I mean...Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences is very loose, you have like, lots of people who study different things, so the bigger circle of people with whom you can socialize opens up. And then again, when you are somewhere else, if you work, then again...other people come into your life... (Respondent 34, 2012)

The narrative of this particular respondent was marked by the moment in which he went to live to Paris for a year. Feeling that he has a bigger pool of choice with different kinds of people, he finally felt free to choose friendships based more on shared worldviews, as opposed to the ones based on pre-given conditions of the small social setting:

Ok, and does [having similar interests in friendship] maybe include similar worldviews or attitudes, such as political and religious and so on, or not?

Mmm...well if you asked me a year ago I would say no, but now I think that it does after all...I have the feeling that now, lately, people with whom I hang out are more compatible with me regarding worldviews and attitudes and those kinds of things...than before.

What changed in that year?

Well I don't know, I have the feeling that previously I had more capacity for hanging out with people who...who have some totally...who are totally different than me...and now I simply don't feel like spending my energy on those people.

Mmhm, because?

Well I don't know, I somehow realized that...there are so many people I am more compatible with...I have a feeling that really...you can socialize in a way that has more quality with someone who has similar worldview. Not exclusively, but yes...

Ok, but tell me something that concretely happened...? You stopped socializing with some people, or...?

Let's say yes. Yes. Yes, yes.

What did it look like?

I stopped socializing with friends who are...I don't know, I'd describe myself as a little more liberal, a left-oriented person...and they are a little more right-oriented, more conservative.

Ok, and that bothered you or?

Well, when we hung out together, I could get over it. But now, I don't need to...it's stupid, like, when every subject is controversial, you practically cannot say anything...lots of topics, if you don't want to have arguments, if you want to normally have coffee with someone then...the range of topics is practically very narrowed [smiles]...because whatever happens, if you want to comment, the attitudes are opposite...[...]

And tell me, in which moment did this realization happen, was it because of some concrete incidents or?

Well, yes. Like, for the last year I didn't live in Croatia. And then, when you realize that in some other contexts you are surrounded by people, with a lot more people...here, you are surrounded by a lot less...you inherit friendships, some from high school, some from college...and then as you grow as a person, those friendships stay all like...it is hard to get away from it...and as I wasn't here, then I realized we don't really have common topics anymore...I think it was mutual...I realized we don't suit each other anymore.

That happened when you went abroad?

Yes. (Respondent 34, 2012)

To summarize, the respondents feel that in bigger cities the emphasis is on personal agency in the formation of friendships. This indeed points to the direction of more individualized kinds of networks based on personal agency which can be chosen from different social worlds (Wellman, Carrington and Hall 1988; Wellman 2001). This further, as in the above case, increases not only the size of the social pool from which one can choose friends, but also increases different kinds of friendships which can be found among different interest groups. This can, as in the above example, increase the reflexivity about a friendship as a relationship of choice, and the question of one's needs being met in a certain friendship, which is in accordance with the logic of a pure relationship (Giddens 1991). Thus, we can say that the increased choice of potential friendship pools, offered by bigger social settings, triggers the logic of a pure relationship as more important in choosing friendships for the emerging adults who come from smaller social settings:

In Rijeka, really, most important was that those friends were with me since always. That means , that they were born near me and lived there. So, we really built common interests together. And now, later, understand that really important are lots of things, like...that person is...some kind of equality in the sense of how much time is dedicated to whom...and that both are mutually acknowledged...and like, that you don't judge people and that you let them be who they are...[...]

when I came to Zagreb and changed friends which I had all my life...I finally started to choose them more by myself, and I gave that [equality in relationships] more attention. It is somehow natural. (Respondent 10, 2011)

Friendships in bigger cities are thus felt as democratized pure relationships of late modernity (Giddens 1990; 1991); since they are based on a choice, the emphasis is put on equality and satisfaction of one's own needs within them.

Thus, to conclude, friendships in smaller social settings are perceived as higher in integration and security in the maintenance of bonds. However, the sense of higher regulation is also felt , in the sense of having a less perceived choice in their formation and dissolution, together with proneness to conformity. This lends some weight to the claim that friendships in smaller settings resemble relationships in less modernized forms of communities, while those in bigger settings are formed more in accordance with the logic of individualization. In this sense, the experience of friendship in bigger social setting is indeed nearer to the experience of a pure relationship of late modernity.



## **6 FRIENDSHIP AND SUPPORT**

### **6.1 Support in friendship and other contexts**

As it was already evident from the phenomenology of friendship, the respondents experience support as one of the main substantive features of a friendship, to the extent that it is sometimes mentioned even within the definition of a friendship. Support is thus perceived as one of the main functions of a friendship. In accordance with the respondents' view, and from the evolutionary anthropological perspective, support is seen as the main function of a friendship which advances the chance of the survival of the species by securing mutual help between friends in uncertain environments (Hruschka 2010).

It is argued that in the context of late modernity this function tends to be even more emphasized. Namely, the traditional social forms in the sense of family or extended kin which provided support in pre-modern societies are in late modernity in constant flux, and thus claimed to be potentially problematic sources of support (Bauman 2009; Pahl 2000). It is argued that for this reason support provided by personal relationships, among others also friendships, gains increasing importance (Giddens 1991; Delanty 2010; Pahl 2000; Roseneil and Budgeon 2004). Friendship is placed within the debate about new social forms together with non-monogamous lovers, partners without cohabitation etc., which are claimed to offer the possibility of the formation of a family of choice, taking over the functions of support which traditionally belonged to the family (Roseneil and Budgeon 2004).

I was interested to see whether friendships of emerging adults have this potential. When it comes to support coming from personal relationships, how reliable are friendships as experienced by Croatian emerging adults? To what extent do they rely on a friendship as opposed to family ties? It is my assumption that the question of support provided by friendship in comparison with support provided by family should be particularly indicative in the life-phase of emerging adulthood, since its separation from the family of origin constitutes the definition of this age group. Thus if friendships have the potential of replacing the functions of support traditionally belonging to family, then this should be even more so in the life-phase in which young people learn to live on their own.

In this chapter, a friendship considered in the context of support is treated as a real friendship. Since categories of types of friendships emerged only at the end of the research, the respondents gave general answers of 'friends' on questions where they would turn in need of

a certain type of support, disregarding different types of friendship. However, since in answers to other questions they stated clearly that only real friendships are areas of intimacy and support within friendships in general, it can be inferred from this that the support from friends talked about in this context is the one stemming from real friendships. Also, under the term 'family', nuclear family is considered, meaning parents and siblings of the emerging adults.

- **Emotional support**

When it comes to support, a friendship is experienced as the source of regular emotional support. Regular emotional support is support in terms of advice or emotional reflexivity on a daily basis. In this area of support, a friendship is placed before the family, since most respondents (43 of 50) would turn to friends in the case of regular emotional problems, and a lot of them (39 of 50) would turn only to friends:

To friends, yes, for sure.

Why friends and not, for example, parents?

Well, I don't have such a relationship with my parents. I have more like, general, but...[based] more on the respect towards my parents and alike. With friends it's more like, because you want to share, and you need that...you need it. (Respondent 50, 2013)

Friendship is not only crucial when it comes to personal support, but is also often a tie which is found irreplaceable in this sense: "You have a feeling that someone is looking after you, regardless of that it objectively...I mean, he or she just listens to you [laughs]. But like...you're more secure. You have your man." (Respondent 33, 2012)

This is consistent with the findings of Wellman and Wortley, who also found a friendship to be the main source of emotional support in the study of East York personal social networks in Toronto (Wellman and Wortley, 1990).

Emotional support which a friendship provides ranges from regular support in terms of everyday emotional reflexivity to a more general emotional support in the affirmation of the choices of one's life-trajectory, linked to one's self-identity. The latter kind of support is, however, not unconditional, since it is tied to the trajectory of friend's own self-identity:

Respondent 28: Emotional support, yes. It is even on the level of being implicitly included, let's say, in a friendship.

Respondent 23: Yes.

Respondent 21: Yes.

...

Respondent 28: ...Support with measure would be supporting someone in making some life choices.  
(Focus group 2, 2012)

Why are friendships put before the family as the source of emotional support?

Friends are generally considered not to be burdened by the structural constraints of familial relationships. The respondents describe this as seeing parents as a more 'neutral' source of support in the sense of being free from expectations which come with familial ties: "...maybe the family would take it too personal...like, you are having a problem and you are crying on our shoulder, now you have made it our problem too. 'What are you doing with that girl anyway? She is no good.'" (Respondent 7, 2011)

However, for those respondents who are in a romantic relationship which is considered long-term, partners are also often reported as an important source of emotional support, even in spite of the existence of satisfying friendships (12 of 50). Furthermore, in the cases of long-term partnerships, they are often reported as the primary source of emotional support, before friends. This is sometimes explained by the higher frequency of contact with partners than with friends: "Probably to my boyfriend for the simple reason that he spends lot of time with me...we talk to each other and see each other daily. If he would not be able to provide, then the girls would probably get an SMS." (Respondent 8, 2011)

It can also, however, be explained by a different nature of romantic partnerships as personal relationships than friendships, with the added physical dimension which then adds to intimacy; "...it is somehow of a different nature of connection and different...therefore probably also more intensive association. And of course, different association. They [romantic partners] spend more time together..." (Respondent 1, 2011)

A family is less often mentioned by the respondents in the context of regular emotional support. It is mentioned in the cases of few respondents (5 of 50) as the source of this kind of support, alongside with friends. Other 6 of 50 respondents report nuclear family as the primary source of regular emotional support. This happens under the conditions of democratized relationship with parents (Giddens 1990). In other words, a relationship

between a parent and an emerging adult is based on equality, openness, and resembles a friendship rather than a traditional parent-child relationship:

I would talk to my mom first. Then, since I am in constant contact with my boyfriend, I would tell it to him to, and then I would meet with K. [best friend]. That is it. To no one else.

And why first to parents?

Because my mom is not a person...whenever I asked her something or told her something I never felt like...there are some moms who are like, you are the daughter, you are always right and the best...I mean, a lot of times my mom told me things I didn't like, but in the end they were like she had told me. I know it sounds stupid, but mom is right. She has that experience and...whether it is about certain boyfriend or...I was always able to talk to her about everything. She was always there for me and she has never judged me... (Respondent 2, 2011)

Also, those respondents who feel extremely close to their family of origin, regardless of the democratization of the relationship, report turning primarily to family for emotional support: "...because those most intimate stuff...you maybe hold yourself back a little with friends, when it comes to...those really hard core intimate stuff." (Respondent 37, 2012)

Further on, those respondents who have experienced the frailty of a friendship list a family as the primary source of emotional support: "I would always tell my mom first. Because...you can trust your friends more than anything else, but when it is a first experience, the first impression, in some situations it's best to keep a cool head a little and like, not tell everything at once. And mom won't go around and tell things, in that I am certain." (Respondent 2, 2011)

- **Financial support**

When it comes to more tangible forms of support, such as financial support, situation is reversed than in the case of regular emotional support. Namely, most respondents (35 of 50) would, in the need of financial aid, turn to family first. When it is further probed why the respondents would turn to family instead of friends, the differentiations in perceptions of familial and friendship ties emerge. As is often emphasized in the interviews, a family is experienced as a bond which is obligational, while a friendship is based as founded on a personal choice. Thus, in the case of the demand for financial help, a relationship which is obligational is expected to provide, while a relationship based on choice is often experienced as too ambivalent for such a request: "...of course I would ask dad first, it's his duty [laughs]."

(Respondent 6, 2011); “When it's something concrete or little harder, you do end up relying on your parents...” (Respondent 32, 2012)

Some respondents see money as putting the obligational implications in the relationship of a friendship which is against the foundation of voluntary basis which a friendship is supposed to have. A fear that this would put a strain on a friendship can be sensed in their answers: “...maybe you will bother him or her if you'll pay him back a certain debt in like, six months, you are uncomfortable, he/she is, I borrowed money to a friend once, and I think she didn't pay me back until today. And then it makes me angry, because I keep thinking about it – why doesn't she think about me now, and how could she forget, why isn't she returning the money, look she bought herself this now, and she didn't pay me back and like this and like that...” (Respondent 13, 2011); “...because I think that money will disrupt a friendship more than a family...I mean, the family would maybe be more tolerant, because you are their son, because you are their brother...than a friend would be. You know like, he is not returning it, not respecting, this and that, you know...” (Respondent 16, 2013)

This is in consistency with the findings from the study conducted by Barry Wellman and Scott Wortley, whose respondents also considered friendship not suitable for financial aid or large services and turned to kin for these instead (Wellman and Wortley 1990). Thus the findings can be regarded as a part of the wider socio-cultural inclination of Western civilization to consider family suitable for these kinds of support.

However, the caution is required in stating the conditions which attribute to this inclination in seeking financial aid primarily from family, since it can also be argued that emerging adults in Croatia have this tendency because of their belonging to the already mentioned “Southern-Europe“ or “familistic“ cultural context, in which the separation from a family of origin comes late, and parents are still expected to provide for them late into this period (Mulder 2009). This expectation indeed often permeates answers of the respondents: “I somehow have the feeling that parents are obliged to provide it [laughs], although they are not.” (Respondent 22, 2012)

Following this reasoning, a residence in a common household with parents is also mentioned by emerging adults in the context of turning to family instead of friends for financial aid: “...with family you live, right?...So that relationship is somehow deeper.” (Respondent 7, 2011) “First family, because we're together in those financial problems...because we live together. I don't live alone, and frankly, I wouldn't even want to.” (Respondent 8, 2011)

However, even most of those emerging adults who don't share common household with their parents, still claim they would turn to parents for financial support: "...there is no such thing as debt in the family [laughs]...all the property is somehow like, shared. And that goes without saying like, normal, that if a certain member of the family has more than some other, that it is distributed without, in fact, maybe ever being returned..." (Respondent 38, 2012)

Another condition which causes emerging adults to consider family as a primary source of financial aid is the life-phase in which they find themselves. Namely, it is typical for the emerging adults in Croatia not to work in the context of both prolonged period to transition and high unemployment rates. Consequently, emerging adults don't see their age-fellows as financially capable to provide aid: "Well, since they are also not comfortably off, I'd probably turn to family first." (Respondent 23, 2012)

Whether most of the friends are employed also plays a role in the decision whether to ask friends or family for financial support. It is mostly those respondents who have employed friends who even consider asking friends for a bigger financial support. Others do not even consider this option: "The day before yesterday, I needed money for my college tuition. And it's like, I won't go to friends [laughs], because I know they don't have the money." (Respondent 49, 2012)

However, friends are considered an option in providing financial support in cases of smaller amounts of money: "...at least in my circle, nobody is yet a full time employe or anything. I can't ask those people who have money the same as I...ok, for some 50 or 100 kunas ok, but the rest...so, if I would really need a bigger amount of money, hell, to parents." (Respondent 29, 2012)

There is however a group of respondents (7 of 50) who choose friends over family when it comes to potential support in financial terms. The respondents choose friends over family in turning for financial aid in the conditions when their relationship with family of origin is disrupted or when family lives under unfavourable financial conditions: "Because I have unemployed parents and a sister at home [laughs]" (Respondent 15, 2012)

There are also few respondents (3 of 50) who seem to show deviance in the pattern of the prolonged expectancy of parental financial provision. Those respondents, ranging from 23 to 27 years of age, consider themselves too old to be asking financial aid from their parents in this life-phase: "...Because we're somehow in the age when...look, you'll always go to parents

first to lend you the money. But somehow it's more and more embarrassing to do that, you know..." (Respondent 37, 2012)

- **Major negative life-event**

Beside regular emotional support, I was interested in whom the respondents would turn to in cases which require emotional support of bigger magnitude, such as is the case of serious illness. Serious illness is the example of a major negative life event, which is a concept taken over from psychology, consisting of events which can be very stressful and potentially have a negative impact on one's course of life and health condition, such as a death of a partner or family member, divorce, serious illness, loss of a job, problems at work or lacking a school certificate (Meeuwesen 2006, 63).

What is interesting is that in this kind of emotional support family was included more than friends, in opposition to the regular emotional support where the emphasis was clearly on friends. Furthermore, almost half of the respondents (23 of 50) state that they would primarily seek support from the family, with some (14 of 50) clearly emphasizing family as the main source of support. When probed further, a lot of them reported experiencing familial support as the kind of support in which they could be certain, even in spite of the satisfying friendship relations: "For support, I think to family really...that means, parents and sister...and friends, I mean I would tell them if I had like a terminal disease, but...I'd let them estimate the amount of support. I think I wouldn't even ask for it, sincerely..." (Respondent 28, 2012).

As is evident from these responses, with the respondents who would turn primarily to family in the case of serious illness, there was a definite sense of a feeling that a family is in these conditions obliged to provide emotional support, while friendships are not: "Maybe they could understand me more because I am theirs"(Respondent 1, 2011)

The belief that a family would provide more emotional support than friends in the case of serious illness is strong even among those respondents who report that they would turn equally to both friends and family:

Health problems...

For support, I mean.

Aha, probably also to parents.

Why to parents? And not to friends?

I mean, I would turn to both...but probably parents would be, like, of bigger support. (Respondent 49, 2012)

These findings can be better understood when compared with the findings in East York study in Toronto, where, upon analyzing personal networks of East Yorkers, Barry Wellman found 50% of parent-child ties had an emergence-assistance component, as compared to 26% of other intimate ties (Wellman 1979, 1219). Bigger emotional support requires more individual resources, whether in time or energy, to be spent on the individual who is in need of it. In this context, a voluntary nature of a friendship relation becomes a potential area of uncertainty that the support will be provided, while the obligational nature of familial ties gives the individual the certainty it will be. For this reason, in a lot of the respondents there can be sensed a reluctance in seeking this kind of support primarily from friends: “Because it demands...I mean, health and existential problems demand certain care, where it somehow seems to me that the person you go to for help has to sacrifice her life and obligations much more, I don't know, to help you....and I somehow have that kind of a relationship with my family that it would be easier to do ...I mean, I would feel less guilty about...about burdening someone to take care of me.” (Respondent 38, 2012)

However, a friendship is not excluded from this area of support. 12 of 50 respondents would seek this kind of support only from friends, while friends are included in this kind of demand for support in more than half of the respondents (33 of 50).

Within the sample, there is also a group of the respondents (11 of 50) who had actually experienced a major negative life-event. Most of these respondents (9 of 11) have relied on experts and parents for support, in spite of reporting satisfying friendship-relations:

In that moment, it was somehow simply too burdening for someone who is maybe not obligated to...I still look at parents, probably because they have implanted it in me since I was little...that they will, in a way, always help me...and that they have a wish, and in a way, have to help me...although that is relative. And on friends I always look at like, they don't have to help me...of course, they probably would if I asked them, but...somehow it is...those biggest problems were somehow maybe too-burdening for someone who is not literally family. (Respondent 28, 2012)

However, in the cases of two respondents who relied on friends, a negative major life-event consisted of death of parents. Consequently, friends were reported as a major source of emotional support:”...when my parents died, friends provided support...and another one...I had a car accident and I had to spend few months in bed and all that...and then friends really made



a difference because they...they like, came and visited me when I couldn't go around...'a friend in need is a friend indeed'" (Respondent 44, 2012)

In other words when parents were available, the respondents who experienced major negative life-event reported relying primarily on them, both for emotional support and care. Nonetheless, when friendships are reported to have offered this kind of support, it often gives them an added value which the respondents evoke even when they generally talk about the meaning of a friendship:

Can you tell me a few things which instantly come to your mind, which mostly influenced the way you see friendship today? First thing that comes to your mind...

...I don't like to talk about that, but yes...I had one very ugly experience in life and there...my sister died, like, she was killed...in a traffic accident...

Oh my god...

This...one tycoon...and the case of my sister became the case of the whole Croatia then...it was, like, nine years ago. It was all over the media and everything...[...] and if there wasn't for my parents and my friends I wouldn't survive for sure.

You mean friends?

Yes, yes...I mean first my parents, and then my friends...but they helped for sure...

In what way?

Well, those are strange things, I cannot point them out concretely...they understood that in some phases one has to be quiet about it, and that in some phases one has to talk about it...so that I didn't have to tell them what I expect from them. This and some like...anything dramatic that happens in life...in that way I guess everybody can see who will be there for them...

Ok, and what did you learn from that about friendship?

Well, that along with them and my parents I don't trust anyone [laughs] generally, those few people...Well yes, I felt safety...from then on I am sure that...I would never...sacrifice that kind of private life for some like, super-job and some ambition. I'd rather be mediocre if necessary, only a link in a chain, but with people around me. (Respondent 33, 2012)

Initially I was interested only in the emotional support in the case of serious illness as a major negative life-event. However, during the course of the interviews, the respondents themselves

started to include more tangible forms of support in these conditions, such as care in the form of driving to the hospital, visiting doctors with them etc. They would include this kind of support in order to emphasize that in the case of care, parents would be the primary source of support. In this context a friendship is generally experienced as a voluntary relationship which is too fragile to be burdened with the crisis of such magnitude: “Because...it's stupid to say: they're not obliged to...but why would they need to spend their time on that....and whatever I was like, family would never abandon me in such a situation.” (Respondent 32, 2012)

Because I somehow have the feeling that I would feel like..hmm...uncomfortable burdening someone with it...if I, god forbid, was dying of cancer...I would somehow feel that it is the duty of my mom....more...and I wouldn't feel uncomfortable to expect that help from her, and from friends...it would maybe be a little more difficult, I mean, it would be great if it could happen, but I don't really know if I would have the guts to ask that from someone. (Respondent 17, 2012)

It seems thus that the reasoning here follows the same logic as in the case of the request for financial support; voluntary nature of friendship, which is paradoxically in other contexts linked to the value of a friendship as a relationship, causes doubts in its ability to provide kinds of support which require higher investment of friends' resources: “I mean, I was for example always in really bad relations with my family. Truly bad relations...while I have very good relationships with friends. But in the situation in which I, god forbid, fall under a car, I would run to my family...because they will have to put up with me. That's how I'd compare that...” (Respondent 32, 2012)

How the difference between family and friends in terms of support in times of a major negative life-event is perceived is best visible precisely from the respondents who had this experience, as did one respondent who suffered from a serious health problem. In spite of her listing friends as major emotional support in that period of life, she later stated that she would turn to parents for tangible support in the case of a major negative life-event. When I probed further, asking why she told me previously that friends were of big help during that phase in her life, she stated that friends provided reflexivity and advice, but her family was the one taking care of her: “They helped me in the sense of....like, they encouraged me, and like really pushed me into starting to deal with that and solve those problems...but hmm when like, serious measures had to be taken, then the family was the one who...who took care of me on a daily basis in that sense.” (Respondent 38, 2012)

Barry Wellman reports that the perceived feeling of higher closeness to parents is what makes them a more likely source of help in an emergency (Wellman 1979). This was confirmed throughout my interviews. Generally respondents have the feeling of a family being much more invested in their well-being than friends:

I don't know, the feeling, probably the feeling of care for my own wellbeing...like, it is probably tied to the family in many cases....I don't know, like, parents are those who take you to the doctor, who care that you...who bring you medications, who take time off work to be at home with you...who go with you through some kind of like, tough moments and they are somehow emotionally involved, so based on the pure force...of habit from childhood...a habit from the early socialization...I would probably call upon it (Respondent 47, 2012)

Yes, yes, I had one awful health situation where I couldn't turn to anyone, nobody understood it, like...at the time I had an awful relationship with my mom which was based on like, we hate each other mutually...and then I turned to her and she was supportive, a friend...that means everything, everything, everything...that means that she gave me the support which really, nobody else could have given me in that moment. Because I was, normally, most important to her, she did not have anything else in life that could be more important than me. Like...with me, with the doctors, with payments, with this, with that, so I rekindled this certain basic relationship, and I realized that in fact a parent can be something which is a lot stronger than a friendship, a lot more fundamental. (Respondent13, 2011)

Also, common household arrangements are also sometimes considered important in the context of turning to family in times of a major negative life-event:

With health problems I think I would turn to family first...

Because?

Well I think that...they can understand you better, and they are the support, like, all the time through illness and if you have something...while again, friends, like I said, you spend shorter time periods together. They can also be support but that's like...

[...]

Mmm...in those moments, let's say, close family is always a support....like, you see them every day and they're...they see you, like, every day. While friends see you, let's say, even those you hang out with every day, they see you once...one to two hours a day. And they...they know you well, however, a family knows you better, in every moment, that means, they know what's good for you. When you are in a critical situation, friends can also help in different ways...and again, they can

spend an hour or two a day with you...while again..when it's some kind of a bad situation, like, within a family you are always together. And that means that they go through a lot more stuff with you than in a friendship. (Respondent 48, 2012)

This is also in congruence with Barry Wellman's findings that frequent contact of parents and children is what attributes to them being a more likely source of help in an emergency than other intimate relationships (Wellman 1979). That the frequency of contact with parents or sharing a household with them partly attributes to them being the primary source of support in a major negative life-event is in my study confirmed by the cases in which friends are named as the primary source of the support since parents live too far away, as this respondent from the far south of Croatia who lives in Zagreb states: "To parents...but somehow, I mean, what I've said...now I am here and my parents are 800 kilometres away from me...and simply, I think I'd be forced in a certain moment to seek help from someone else, too...and that would then be friends, for sure." (Respondent 31, 2012)

However, the higher investment of the family in one's wellbeing is generally perceived as the main reason of turning to parents in times of a major negative life-event. This is further evident from the answers of those respondents who would, in spite of a family living in remote areas, still turn primarily to their family in a case of such a life-event. As this respondent from Cavtat who lives in Zagreb claims: "I'd start with parents and then go towards friends..." (Respondent 25, 2012)

There were 5 respondents who reported turning to experts for support after having experienced a negative major life-event:

...I thought that a psychologist should help me [laughs], because it went too far.

Ok, and why couldn't friends help you with what a psychologist could help you with?

Sometimes you need a professional[laughs].

Because?

I don't know. Because, I guess, those people have more experience. Although a friend knows you well, a professional maybe knows how to get to the bottom of the problem. (Respondent 20, 2012)

Most respondents turned to psychological experts (4 of 5), while one reported turning to a priest. It is important to note that all of the respondents who have the experience of turning to

experts also report having satisfying friendships. However, it could be sensed from their answers that states caused by a negative major life-event were such that the emotional support available in friendships was perceived as insufficient: “...when I had family problems which I didn't know how to handle alone, which itself already posed a problem...then I...I tried to turn to friends, and so on, they did give me classical advice which a friend should give when he doesn't know what to do, but nobody knew what to do in that kind of a situation so I ...I had to...it was the only time when I sought professional help.” (Respondent 41, 2012)

As was already stated, in late modernity, life is to a large extent based on trust in the expert systems (Giddens 1990). Expert systems are “systems of technical accomplishment or professional expertise that organise large areas of the material and social environments in which we live today“ (Giddens 1990, 27). One such expert system is the system of psychological help, which in late modernity partly takes over the organization of individual psychological lives from the private sphere of the individual. The rise of the therapeutic culture in late modernity is symptomatic of this (Bellah et al 1986). However, among the respondents expert system takes over the function of support from friends and family in the cases of a experienced negative major life-event. This can be considered the empty spot of support in which support coming from personal relationships is not perceived as sufficient.

There were also respondents who showed tendency towards an individualized approach in dealings with problems (10 of 50). Those respondents report not wanting to burden their friends with problems, or express a belief that friends wouldn't be able to help them. Thus they practice handling difficulties alone: “I didn't turn to anyone...I mean, there were times when nobody could help me, it's simply...you know it's like that and that it has to pass....so there is no point in turning to anyone...it's simply something that is my business and I have to handle it alone....Because most of my...most of my problems I like to handle alone...in the sense that I am pretty sure that someone can tell me very little of what I already know...I'm not really the type who likes to complain to people.” (Respondent 30, 2012)

This can be regarded from the perspective of an individualized active approach of living a life of one's own which is emphasized in late modernity, where individuals increasingly take control of their lives (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2001). This idea can easily become radicalized and can result in the notion that individual should handle everything alone: „I don't know, there are certain things which are like, in my mind, and for which I really think that, with all their effort and help, nobody can resolve it except me...concretely me...which

does not mean that I won't share it with them to some level, but I don't expect from them that they, I don't know, make an effort around it.“ (Respondent 39, 2012)

Thus, the living a life of one's own can, as Beck and Beck-Gernsheim notice, become a compulsion (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2001). Active shaping of one's lives can easily be taken to an extreme when the need for the other is negated and an individualized approach to handling problems is taken: “There were situations when I felt lonely, in those moments when I was not ready to share problems with my friends...it means, when I didn't want to let them know that I was in some kind of a situation, problem, state, phase...and they didn't recognize that on their own...it was unreal for them to recognize...and then I thought in that moment that...that maybe no one really understands me, or that I am alone in the mass of people...” (Respondent 28, 2012)

Some respondents notice this over-individualization in the handling of problems as a general tendency: “The problem is that people don't turn to others for quite some time, I think that generally the level of emotional intelligence is very low...” (Respondent 3, 2011)

They consider this over- individualized approach to handling problems as the condition which leads individuals to extreme emotional states in the face of which they are then forced to turn to experts for support:

...maybe it's just my perception, because I don't have the information, but it seems to me that people run to more...that in that kinds of situations they want to talk to experts, more than with the members of their family. In the end, I am also like that, but I don't have time for an expert. I would also rather talk about my problems with a psychologist or a psychiatrist than with friends or family, but what can I do when, I am working...

Ok, and why is it like that, how come, why with an expert rather than with a friend?

Well I don't know, I don't know. I couldn't explain that, but I somehow have the impression that there is a lack of closeness among people within the primary groups today.

Ok, and how do you see that, by what do you see that?

Well, among other things...by the fact that people I confide in don't have the...they are not prone to opening up to anyone. And then...when they snap, then we have to refer them to professional help, to go to professionals, because they don't open up to anyone really, except eventually, what I see as an active dimension of opening up is opening up to romantic partners. (Respondent 41, 2012)

It was my initial assumption that, in the conditions of uncertainty related to personal relationships, individuals relocate intimacy to other spheres. I proposed that a friendship, as a relationship of a voluntary nature, was seen as too fragile to be burdened by non-pleasurable parts of their private lives. As was shown before, this was only partly so since intimacy is required to be located within the sphere of friendship in order to consider it a close one, and is kept out only of the sphere of social friendships, which is then used for pleasure and socializing. However, these findings suggest that it is the support, instead of intimacy, which is, under certain existentially endangering conditions, perceived as more reliable when relocated to spheres other than friendship.

The extent to which the respondents are willing to turn to their friends for support reveals the experience of a friendship as a relationship which is perceived as qualitatively different than familial relationships, and is thus considered suitable only for a certain kinds of support. Friends are indeed perceived as the main and often only source of regular emotional support. They also take over the functions of the family in some instances, when the family is either in remote areas, unavailable or when the relationship with the family is disrupted. However, when a family is available, and even if it is in remote areas, it is regularly perceived as more suitable for kinds of support which require a greater amount of tangibility, such as financial aid or care in the case of serious illness. In the case of a negative major life-event, friends are to some extent included in the emotional support, but the emphasis is on the family or the expert psychological system. Furthermore, support offered within friendships is in the cases of experienced major life-event often felt as insufficient.

It should once again be noted that the emphasis on the family for the provision of support in existentially endangering conditions can be attributed to the Southern European cultural context to which Croatia belongs, and which is less characterized by individualism and by stronger bonds between parents and children, both throughout their emerging adulthood and later in life, in opposition to Northern countries (both in Europe and in the USA) which are characterized by higher levels of individualism manifested in earlier separation from families of origin and weaker familial ties (Mulder 2009). This “familistic” cultural context is also characterized by the high reliance on parental provision, even after the household separation of young people (Mulder 2009). This attitude can often be sensed in the thoughts of the respondents, even those who have already separated from their parents and live in different households: “...of course I'd ask my dad first, it's his duty [laughs]” (Respondent 6, 2011).

The phenomenon can also partly be attributed to the prolonged transition to adulthood as a general phenomenon of late modernity. It is precisely the prolonged intergenerational support that is seen as one of its main sources (Toguci Swartz and Bengston O'Brien 2009). This is also reflected in the sense of the entitlement some of my respondents seem to have regarding parental provision after the separation: "Because they are...somehow used to that relation, to support me...their job is not over yet [laughs]" (Respondent 20, 2012)

The phenomena of general prolonged transition to adulthood and „familistic“ regime of Croatia which surely attributes to a later separation from family of origin are hard to entangle within the Croatian context. Both also surely partly attribute to the tendency to seek more tangible forms of support from family rather than from friends. However, that these findings are the result of conditions more complex than cultural patterns or prolonged life-transition to adulthood is evident from their comparison with similar results of studies of intimate ties; the one already mentioned study of intimate ties of personal networks of adults in Toronto borough of East York in Canada (Wellman 1979; Wellman and Wortley 1990) and the other being the survey-based study conducted on adults in Northern California (Fischer 1982). In these two research findings, friendships were also mostly used companionship and emotional aid, while family was the crucial source of support in a case of more tangible forms of need such as financial aid or larger services, and also a primary source of support for care in times of serious crises (Fischer 1982; Wellman and Wortley 1990; Wellman 2001). This then implicates that different kinds of ties have specialized themselves for different kinds of support (Fischer 1982; Wellman 1979; Wellman and Wortley 2001). Both Wellman's and Fischer's research studies were done with different methodologies and on wider samples than the one in this research, more specifically, on adults from 18 years onwards, and with the emphasis on quantitative survey-based methods, with an additional qualitative sub-research (Fischer 1982; Wellman 1979; Wellman and Wortley 1990). Nevertheless, such mainly quantitative findings on a wider sample only further point to the conclusion that some kinds of ties are generally perceived as more suitable than others for certain kinds of support.

Moreover, the cultural contexts of these two researches are different than the Croatian cultural context in terms of individualism. Both American and Canadian social context are considered as more individualistic, and should thus be characterized by weaker familial ties (Mulder 2009). However, that both of these contexts, in spite of their tendency towards individualism, nevertheless point to similar direction as perception of emerging adults in this study further



points to the conclusion that specialization of support ties cannot be attributed only to the cultural context.

Thus, it seems that perception of friendships being the primary source of regular emotional support and family as the primary source of more tangible forms of support in postmaterialistic emerging adults in Croatia can be attributed more to the general specialization of support between different personal ties in late modernity, than to the particular cultural context of Croatia or a life-phase they are in.

This perception of the specialization of ties among emerging adults in Croatia has some implications for the general meaning of friendships in late modernity. Furthermore, it is the starting point from which any universal claims about friendship replacing familial ties should be questioned.

Friendships are indeed perceived as the primary sources of such support in conditions where family is unavailable. However, when family is available, friendship's voluntary nature which does not structurally oblige friends to offer support to one another in many instances comes to the forefront as the main perceived obstacle of seeking support which requires higher investment within friendship-relationship. If support which requires higher level of investments, whether in terms of time or energy or in more tangible forms is experienced as more reliable when coming from relationships with a non-voluntary nature, such as nuclear familial or the one offered within the psychological expert systems, what does this say about the general perception of friendships as relationships in late modernity?

A friendship as a relationship is indeed perceived as invaluable when it comes to regular emotional support and reflexivity. However, the fact that when it comes to support which requires larger or more tangible investment of friends' resources there is a reluctance to place such requirements only or primarily on friends, or that the support available in friendships is in the face of extreme conditions of negative major life-events is perceived as insufficient, points in the direction of a limited range of functions which a friendship covers for emerging adults. Moreover, if the voluntary nature of a friendship is experienced as the main source of doubt in the extent in which one can rely on a friendship, then this lends some weight to the doubt about the possibility of a friendship to replace familial ties in general. It also further suggests that a friendship is, among emerging adults in Croatia, perceived more as a relationship suitable for emotional reflexivity and companionship than as a relationship to be relied on in a case of endangered existential conditions in terms of survival. Or, in the words

of one of my respondents, the division is often done according to the following differentiation: “to friends for advice, to family for help“ (Respondent 5, 2011).

## **6.2 Empty spots within friendship support**

The respondents in this study generally have satisfying friendship relations and report not to feel loneliness very often. Loneliness occurs under certain conditions, in what I decided to call empty spots of friendship. These are the parts of the respondents' social experience in which friends do not or are unable to participate due to conditions which are not related to friendship relations. These experiences can then potentially trigger the feelings of loneliness.

Thus, the loneliness among emerging adults who report having satisfying friendships does not, as my initial assumption was, occur because of the remodulation of friendship. Instead, among those emerging adults who report satisfying friendships, loneliness seems to result as a consequence of certain conditions which a friendship does not seem to cover in terms of support or companionship. These are empty spots which friendship support is not able to cover and which persist in spite of satisfying friendship relations. According to the difference of these empty spots, four types of loneliness emerge:

- **Structural loneliness**

One of the conditions which trigger the possible feelings of loneliness in spite of satisfying friendships is lack of integration into the social system. Among the emerging adults in Croatia this is experienced if an emerging adult finds himself or herself in social vacuum caused by the transition from one life-phase to another. For example, it can occur if a person is between college and the first employment, as some of my respondents report:

First and foremost, I am in a specific situation in which I don't work, I don't have a lot of obligations, I live with my grandmother, she cooks for me, does all the housework, that means I have a lot of time and I have really big needs for socializing...and most of other people don't since they work, like, the ones which don't work they don't have any money, they finished the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences and are not doing anything, so it's like, to say let's go to Sljeme and we'll eat a bean stew means like, you know, most often people don't have money even for drinks...My parents are financing me so I can perhaps, afford bean soup on Sljeme. Like, the ones that have time don't have the money, and like, this one does not work for three years so he is

depressed, or like, people work maniacally. And for me this means; since I don't work, I no longer have the possibility of meeting so many people so I hang out with my old friends, most of whom have changed...and I cannot go to the street and say, I am now looking for friends which suit my new worldview. So I am in a kind of a frustrating situation... (Respondent 17, 2012)

This kind of loneliness is the result of structural conditions such as temporary lack of integration into the labour system. For example, one respondent who is already a parent also mentioned feeling lonely when she was temporarily excluded from the employment system on a pregnancy leave: "...mostly when I was on a pregnancy leave...like...I really was lonely sometimes...you know, all those people working or...everybody has their own obligations..." (Respondent 21, 2012)

Friendship support is experienced as limited in its range. In this particular case, since structural loneliness is a result of unfavourable structural conditions, a friendship can only be of limited range in covering this area. As seen from the above examples, if friends are integrated and are consequently in a social temporal desynchronization with them, the emerging adult can feel lonely. However, this type of loneliness is usually only temporarily. Namely, it lasts only until structural conditions which have caused it change and the individual feels integrated again. In other words, this kind of loneliness is only temporarily related to specific structural conditions and usually disappears with the disappearance of those conditions, for example, when the emerging adult finds employment, as one of the respondents describes:

Frankly, I don't have time to feel lonely [laughs]. Before, we come back to that, when I didn't have anything to do, then it is normal that if someone has...someone has a certain other, like, this one works, that one still goes to college, this one does not have time, that one has certain errands to run, so if I am at home, you do what you have to do and then...you call this one, he cannot meet you right now, the other one is here, this and that...and then you are bored and you don't have anything to do. But now when I don't have time to think about that...if you have any spare time you sleep or lie down, and like that... (Respondent 48, 2012)

However, it should be noted that if these conditions were to continue for a longer time period, such as in the case of long-term unemployment, individuals would be more likely to become socially isolated (Fischer 1982; Machielse 2006).

- **Loneliness arising from individualizing experience**

The second type of loneliness among emerging adults is caused by the experience which is experienced individually instead of collectively. This is related to the experience which is unique in the sense that the respondents' friends do not have the possibility of going through the same kind of experience, and thus they lack the capacity for relating with the experience. Such is, for example, the case of serious illness in the family, as this respondent describes: "...when...mmm I don't know...my excessive care of my family, because I have a sick brother and that...maybe people don't have it in their circle, so they find it hard to understand...I don't hold it against them, but I sometimes feel a little alone because of that..." (Respondent 43, 2012)

The experiences which potentially result in this kind of loneliness are also bodily experiences. Bodily experiences are inherently individual due to the fundamental gulf between oneself and the others (Yalom 1980). Thus, the extent to which significant others can relate to them is limited and the experience has an individualizing effect. One example of this are bodily changes accompanying pregnancy which is described by one of the respondents as the individualizing experience:

...if a certain situation which I am going through...if that situation covers some kind of a more private area, then my friends cannot cover the range...so to say...

What do you mean by 'don't cover the range'?

Well they don't have, in the sense, in this situation in which I am currently, meaning I am pregnant....friends don't have, like, how to say...

Point of reference?

Yes, they don't have that...all the more so that I am going through...

You mean like, they are not going through?

Yes, they don't, I don't know how to put it...they are not going through it with me physically...they cannot relate to me in every situation at every point...that means in a certain situation they can relate only partially and then I feel lonely in that part in which they cannot relate... (Respondent 22, 2012)

Thus, the individualizing experiences surpass the amount of support and relating which the individual can get from friendship relations. This empty spot which friends can share with

each other only to a limited extent can consequently become the source of the feeling of loneliness.

- **Existential loneliness**

Some respondents report occasional feelings of loneliness in spite of having satisfying friendship relations:

Do you ever feel lonely in spite of friendships?

Yes.

What does it look like then?

Well I don't know, I tell myself that it's completely normal.

Because?

Well because this one part of a human brain, the one that activates before you go to bed, is always only yours and you cannot share it....as much as you would like to share it with someone...somehow you have to get even with yourself, every day (Respondent 11, 2011)

Some respondents report feeling existentially lonely even in spite of having friends. The existential perspective recognizes this type loneliness as existential loneliness, which is not based on insufficient social contacts and can persist even in spite of them (Yalom 1980). It is caused by a fundamentally unbridgeable distance between an individual and any other human being as a part of given of human existence (Yalom 1980). The description of one of the respondents illustrates this point: "...that guy Godard, he had this great thing, and I've had this feeling since always, he had one wife for his whole life and he loved her totally and everything is great with them, not like he was a f\*\*\*\*\*d up character or something, and he says, look I make a movie and everything is great and everybody loves me and I am great, and I have a wife and I adore her, I have kids, I look at them, I adore them, everything is great, I come, lay into bed and I go to sleep alone. Like, that moment, that is me." (Respondent 12, 2011)

The respondents also report a feeling that this kind of loneliness cannot be surpassed by the active involvement of friends:

Do you ever feel lonely in spite of friendships?

Sometimes, yes. I mean, unrelated to people. You have times in your life when you feel like that...

Specific situation?

Well, female hormones. You come to those periods when everything is depressing for you, so in spite of them [friends] you feel a little down...but nothing serious, that passes in two or three days (Respondent 29, 2012)

Some respondents note this kind of loneliness to be related to self-reflexive questioning of one's own life in matters which concern the facts of one's existence. This kind of reflexive process is experienced as a social process only to a limited extent. In other words, friends can provide a source of reflexivity and thus participate in this process only to a certain extent since the decision itself and its consequences for the individual are in the end an exclusively individual experience:

I think that all of us have that sort of phases...yes...but nothing to be worried about.

In some particular situations, or, which you could tell me?

Well like when you think what to do with yourself in life and these kind of things...friends are like, I mean there you are alone with yourself...simply thinking alone with yourself....friends can tell you how they see you, but... (Respondent 44, 2012)

- **Emotional loneliness**

One of the experienced sources of loneliness in spite of satisfying friendship support is the lack of romantic partner. Some respondents who are without a partner report feeling loneliness related to this: “Yes...I suffer more...not in that sense, because of friends, since I can always call someone...that, luckily, I do have. But I am lonelier because I don't have a partner. [laughs] I suffer more from that kind“ (Respondent 32, 2012)

This kind of loneliness is in theory conceptualized as emotional loneliness, a type of loneliness which is felt in spite of having satisfying friendships and is identified instead as the lack of truly intimate ties in the form of a spouse, lover, parent or a child (Weiss in Green et al 2001). Does it mean that needs that are fulfilled by romantic partnerships can in no way be fulfilled by friendships? Although the final conclusions cannot be drawn, there are some empirical indications towards this. Social network research has indeed shown that the feelings of emotional loneliness are negatively correlated with the existence of a partner in one's social network (Green et al 2001). However, romantic relationships become an increasingly important factor in loneliness only at the end of the university (Russel, Steffen and Salih in

Green et al 2001) and college friends rate friendships as more important than romantic relationships (Cutrona 1982 in Green et al 2001). This is in accordance with the fact that, among my respondents, it was older emerging adults, aged 26 and 27, who reported experiencing occasional loneliness as the results of the lack of romantic relationship in their lives:

Do you every feel lonely in spite of friendships?

...yes, but it's not because of friendships, it's because of other things.

Like?

Well maybe, because of other kind of unaccomplished relations like love relations. (Respondent 38, 2012)

This kind of loneliness usually disappears when the respondent finds a romantic partner:

Do you every feel lonely in spite of friendships?

Like, a year and a half ago I would maybe say yes, but currently I am in a romantic relationship which is extremely intensive and like, 24 hours a day I am with my boyfriend...we have great communication, great relationship, we're close, intimate so...no, definitely no. My day is based on his timetable and his on mine. So I am really never alone.

Ok. And why would you say yes a year and a half ago?

Because I was...before him I had three years of being single, I didn't have a boyfriend and...my social life was based on friends. And I had a great, really active social life, I was out all the time, constant hanging out, roommate and all that...but I again had some romantic needs unfulfilled, and so there were this moments in which I thought why am I alone and others are not...(Respondent 13, 2011)

To sum up, loneliness in spite of having satisfying friendships is usually felt when the the respondent has the experience in which a friend is unable to participate Although the respondents feel that they can share such an experience with a friend, the range of friend's resonance with the experience is felt as limited . This then constitutes the potential source of feelings of loneliness and points to the limits of the range of support functions of a friendship.

## 7 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Within this research, the contemporary friendship and its behaviour within the conditions of late modernity were assessed. This included the static picture of a friendship in late modernity in the form of social practices of friendship which was then followed by social practices of friendship put into the dynamic by the various conditions which they are subjected to in late modernity. Within the discussion, the findings will be tied together and linked to the research questions. Finally, the conclusion will be given.

The research was started with the examination of the use of the word 'friend'. As was already mentioned, the question of how the label 'friend' is used is left largely unanswered in today's research on friendships within sociology (Pahl and Spencer 2004). This research aspired to give an answer to this question. However, the social reality has proved to be more complex than the unified meaning of the word and unidimensionality of the meaning which was initially assumed. Instead, it was found that emerging adults in late modernity in Croatia respond to the complex social reality of late modernity by differentiating between different practices of friendship, often automatically. Thus, it was found that the word 'friend' is used for a variety of social practices of friendship among emerging adults. Two main social practices of friendships were discovered. The first one is what the respondents call a real friendship and this category corresponds to the meaning of the word 'friend' in common language. The second one is what I have termed social friendships that cover the linguistic missing link between a real friendship and a relationship of acquaintanceship which is perceived as socially more distant.

A real friendship has revealed itself as a complex social relationship based on a personal choice, but organized around the prolonged shared social time which enables the formation of trust, knowledge of the other and consequently, intimacy. These characteristics further enable the constitution of other normative ways of behaviour within a friendship such as investing effort in a friendship, the possibility of reliance on a friend, reciprocal and sincere behaviour. These further enable substantial characteristics which form the content of a real friendship to arise: the possibility of authenticity, reflexivity, the possibility of gaining understanding, support and having fun within friendship. Due to the conditions of its formation which require large investments of one's time and effort, a real friendship is seen as limited in terms of numbers, but is highly valued as the zone of everyday emotional reflexivity and is seen as irreplaceable in this sense.



However, the second type of the social practice of friendship, termed social friendship, also takes up a significant part of emerging adults' lives in late modernity. Since its formation does not require temporality of the extended kind it is easier to be formed within the multiplicity of social settings of late modernity. Moreover, since this kind of friendship is not based on a substantive content but is instead organized around the benefit acquired from the association, it is even further more equipped to be built in diverge social settings of limited temporal duration. Social friendships are often experienced as widespread in social settings of late modernity, due to their multiplicity and the need to socialize within them. These friendships are thus relationships made out of convenience or utility, although this is usually not interpreted as utilitaristic since the benefit is mutual.

A social friendship thus differentiates from a real friendship due to its contextual organisation and the lack of intimacy which could foster the relationship based purely on its content. Besides intimacy, social friendships lack many of the other substantive characteristics of a real friendship, such as authenticity, reflexivity or support. They are generally not experienced as binding as real friendships. This kind of a tie indeed points to the direction of Giddens's purity of the relationship, in which relationships last until they bring satisfaction to the actors (Giddens 1991; 1992). Its nature further points to the legitimacy of Bauman's critique of contemporary frail sociabilities (Bauman 2003). Social friendships can indeed be regarded from the perspective of the rhetorics of consumerism which Bauman sees as to pervade even modern forms of sociabilities (Bauman 2003). Social friendships do indeed contain the idea of the use of the relationship as long as it is convenient for the participants, and this is especially so in the case of contextual friendships which last only as long as the social context around which they are organized lasts. In other words, when a relationship can no longer be utilized, it ceases to exist. While these relationships are not consciously viewed in terms of the "value for money", as Bauman suggests (Bauman 2003, 75), they are nevertheless not based on the particularity of the persons participating in it, but on the utility one gets from a relationship. Furthermore, social friendships can, as the social area, also be linked to the Bauman's critique of the frailty of a pure relationship in which each party has the ability to terminate the relationship at any time, which does not point to its binding nature (Bauman 2003). More precisely, social friendships are reported as constructed out of convenience and, although there is not a clear disregard for the other reported, the nature of the bond suggested by the respondents and their contextuality also does not place regard for the other in its primary

focus. Thus social friendships can indeed be regarded as relationships which are susceptible to increased frailty.

The theoretical framework within which the research was initially established has accused contemporary relationships in general of becoming more fleeting, superficial and oriented towards the fulfilment of individual's needs instead of towards the other (Bauman 1993; Bauman and Vecchi 2004; Heaphy 2007). Based on this theoretical framework, the first question of the research in this study was concerned with ***how individuals of late modernity experience friendship relations in terms of durability of bonds.*** Does a modern friendship become liquefied in the sense that it is experienced as easily dissolvable and thus more subjected to fragmentation, or does it have a more subversive character in terms of resistance of fluctuations? Are friendships in late modernity experienced in the sense of increased disposability or are they still considered to be of more enduring nature?

It was found that this, however, is a too simplistic view of a more complex social reality. As with the designation of a friendship, durability and certainty coming from it are expected according to the characteristics of a certain type of social practice of friendship. Social friendships are the area of friendships has taken upon itself this fleeting and superficial character of contemporary relationships. Their formation has in this research shown to be underlined by the lack of effort, time or wholesome understanding required for the development of a real friendship. It has also shown to be underlined by the principle of instrumentality or the principle of momentary instrumentality, which are both viewed as positive by the respondents due to their mutuality. However, due to the lack of effort invested in such relationships and their organization around convenience instead of the content of the relationship, they can indeed be regarded as prone to disposability. In this sense they indeed resemble Bauman's (Bauman 2003, xii) "connections"; they are indeed relationships which are based on the subjective needs of individuals and are perceived as easily entered and easily dissolved. This, again, is particularly so for contextual friendships which cease to exist with the termination of the social context within which they are established.

At the same time, the area of a real friendship is the social area which has taken upon itself to resist the structural fluctuations in late modernity. A real friendship is based on the particularity of the other person, the regard for the other is placed highly within this kind of a friendship and is exhibited by the characteristics of trust, tactfulness and benevolence, while prolonged temporality is found to be one of its most important characteristics. This is

precisely why a real friendship is seen to exhibit more resilience towards the social conditions of late modernity than a social friendship. Social friendships exhibit less resistance towards the social conditions of late modernity and are generally seen as less enduring. In terms of the ideal practice, real friendships are expected to endure even the unfavourable social conditions of late modernity such as the scarcity of time or diversification of life-trajectories. In this context, the respondents particularly emphasize the significance of the personal effort and understanding as two dimensions relevant for the maintenance of a friendship in unfavourable temporal or spatial conditions. As already stated, this can be regarded as a symptom of the individualization in late modernity, in which not only selves and individual biographies are individualized, but factors influencing relationships are also viewed as under individual's personal control. However, a friendship is especially prone to this kind of discourse since it is a relationship based on voluntariness, and thus personal agency is regarded as crucial also in its dissolution. Thus, when a real friendship faces structural constraints threatening it, it is expected that the level of personal effort and understanding will be increased on both sides. This is particularly so when one of the participants in a friendship lacks the time for its maintenance. In these conditions and in the face of moving to remote geographical areas, emerging adults find the maintenance of friendship through online space of flows especially significant. Indeed, emerging adults do not lose the faith in the durability of real friendships even in structurally most unfavourable conditions. However, and especially in the condition of geographical mobility, some friendships do not survive these conditions of the lack of association since this consequently leads to the lack of shared experiences, and thus the knowledge of a friend and intimacy with him or her. This is the area of the inevitable possible uncertainty within a real friendship as a social relationship based on personal choice.

Thus, it can be concluded that a friendship is among Croatian emerging adults in late modernity experienced both as long-term and short-term relation, according to its type and the function it is perceived to fulfil.

The second research question of the dissertation was *if friendship relations become increasingly partial in their nature. The aim was to explore if a contemporary individual enters friendly relationships in a partial manner, investing different parts of one's self into different relations. Does this way of relating cause individuals to feel that they are not being entirely understood within a single relationship?*

It is suggested by the results that partiality as a way of relating is indeed practiced in late modernity. Most of the respondents have indeed experienced partiality of friendships, in the sense of most of their friendship relations covering only a part of their interests or needs. The respondents don't indeed find themselves understood within a single-relationship. However, they perceive this way of relating as self-understood and satisfying. Moreover, they resort to compensating the lack of wholesome understanding within a single relationship by seeking different kinds of partial understanding with different partial relations, according to interests, lifestyles or shared social settings. There are however also those respondents who experience their real friendships as wholesome and demand complete understanding within it, while superficial friendships are experienced as partial ones. Thus, the initial propositions of the dissertation correctly predicted the experience of the orientation shifted towards partiality in contemporary relationships. The complex social reality of late modernity in which localities are rarely shared continuously, and life-trajectories often diverge, can be linked to individualized existences, which are further related to partiality as a way of relating. To deal with this, individuals use the strategy of compartmentalizing of understanding, meaning that they divide the requirement for certain kinds of understandings among different kinds of friendship ties. In this sense, it can be said that contemporary friendships are experienced as specialized ties. It can be proposed that this differentiation of a friendship serves as a strategy of satisfying one's socializing needs in the highly differentiated social reality of late modernity. However, since the initial research question disregarded the possibility of the existence of multiple types of friendships, it also disregarded the possibility of the wholesomeness of a single relationship within late modernity. A real friendship has proven to be such a relationship. While partial understanding is indeed experienced within partial friendships, the demand of the wholesome understanding is put upon real friendships. In this sense, both the compartmentalized understanding and the wholesome ones were found within friendships of late modernity.

*The question of the relation of technology and contemporary friendships* was subsequently added to the research agenda, following the proposition of the member committee. The technology is experienced as influencing the ways in which friendships in late modernity are formed and, more significantly, maintained. While friendships are among post materialistically oriented emerging adults rarely seen through the light of technology, technology is on the other hand extensively used to overcome the obstacles which social conditions of late modernity, such as geographical mobility or diversification of life-

trajectories, pose on friendships. In other words, while online space of flows is seen as having significant impact on the structuring of friendships, friendships are rarely defined through them. It has to be noted, however, that these results regarding the technology and friendships have to be viewed in the context of the purposiveness of the sample, particularly a life-phase of emerging adulthood of the respondents and their tertiary level of education. Specifically, today's emerging adults grew up without present internet tools such as Facebook or technologies such as smartphones. On the contrary, both Facebook and smartphones became widely used only a few years ago. Since it is precisely Facebook that changed the way of presenting one's self to a wider audience and thus also friends, and smartphones which allowed the constant connection with friends, it can be suggested that these respondents were not immersed in these technologies while growing up, such as younger generations of today can be assumed to have been. It can thus be suggested that they are, because of this, more capable of reflexive critical stance towards it, and that they exhibit more agency in deciding how much of their relationships will be defined through them than, for example, today's adolescents would. However, this is only a suggestion which would be interesting to verify in future empirical research.

*The question of the difference between friendships in smaller and bigger social settings* was also subsequently added to research questions. This relation added the dimension of the physical size of the setting to the ways in which emerging adults associate in late modernity. More precisely, friendships in smaller settings are perceived as more oriented towards one another due to physical proximity and the lack of other choice, while in bigger settings which is in this context Zagreb, they are perceived as based more on personal agency and similar interests. Although in this study there were only a handful of respondents with the experience of social life in smaller social setting, and thus this finding should be regarded only as an orientation point, their experience proves to be along the lines of other quantitative researches who reported a similar relation between traits of social life in smaller and bigger social settings (Fischer 1982; Wellman 2001). From all of this it can be suggested that a friendship is in its late modern, individualized, to use Giddens's terms, pure "free-floating" (Giddens 1991, 89) form best experienced in bigger urban setting, since the ways of association in smaller ones, due to their physical size, do share some traits with pre-modern forms of communities bound to one locality.

The next research question posed at the beginning of the research was concerned with *relocation of true intimacy to other spheres such as familial or therapeutic spheres*. It was

proposed that due to the insecurity of the bonds, intimacy was re-allocated to familial or therapeutic spheres instead of intimate ones. It was also proposed that one of the compensations for this was the formation of networks of more sociable kind, and the question if *the increasing shift towards social character of friendship poses another reason for transference of intimacy to relationship spheres other than friendship?*

However, the results of the research again proved to be more complex than the initial question. Namely, the relocation of true intimacy to other non-friendship spheres was not found, due to the fact that the relationship of a real friendship is largely based precisely on the content of intimacy. However, at the same time, intimacy is kept outside the friendship zones which are considered to be of a more fleeting character – zones of social friendships. However, it was also found that the area of uncertainty regarding the voluntary nature of friendship ties manifests itself in terms of a different kind of relocation. Instead of intimacy, the requirement for support is in some instances relocated outside the friendship zones. While support in everyday emotional terms is considered as one of the crucial characteristics of friendships, the demand for support is in times which require larger kinds of individual investment in terms of support often placed outside the friendship and relocated to familial and sometimes also therapeutic spheres. This is so due to friendship's voluntary nature, which is often perceived as too frail to carry the burden of larger material or energetic investments of another individual towards a friend. This implies that a friendship is seen as a particular kind of specialized tie with a specialized function of regular emotional support extending to larger types of emotional support, but it is perceived as a tie uncertain to rely on in conditions which are seen as existentially endangering. This perception of a friendship, when put into context of other similar findings from different socio-cultural milieus, lends some weight to the doubt that a friendship as a relationship is capable of ever entirely replacing familial relationships, since the functions of these two kinds of ties are experienced as different to begin with. Within this study it was indeed found that friendships have in some cases taken over the functions which are usually perceived as the functions of the family, for example in cases in which both parents of the respondent died. However, the respondents are generally not too eager to put this kind of burden on a friendship, since they are aware of its voluntary nature. It is thus debatable whether a friendship as a voluntary tie has the strength of surviving the larger amounts of investments flowing in only one direction. Furthermore, this kind of requirement is not in accordance with the norm of reciprocity which is implicitly included in the structure of a friendship.

The findings of this research indeed point to the direction of a friendship being the relationship best suitable for the satisfaction of everyday emotional needs. In this context, it is considered irreplaceable. On the other hand, its potential for ensuring support in conditions which are experienced as survival-endangering is experienced as limited. It seems that, paradoxically, precisely what is perceived as a giving friendship the most of its value – its voluntary nature and having the least possible amount of structural constraints – is what on the other side proves as its main weakness when it comes to relying on it.

The last research question of the dissertation asked whether *pervasive feelings of loneliness were in late modernity connected to the proposed remodulation of friendship*? The evidence of this was not found among emerging adults in Croatia. The feelings of loneliness were found within the sample and in respondents who reported having satisfying friendships. However, this was not found to be linked to the remodulation of a friendship due to the strategy of the compartmentalization of understanding which the respondents employ. Instead, it was found that the feelings of loneliness are linked to the limited range of support which friendship has the potential to cover. Certain areas which function as empty spots outside of range of friendship support were found; these concerned structural lack of integration of the individual, lack of a romantic partner, existential reflexive questioning and individualized experiences not linked to social conditions of late modernity, but rather to the individualizing nature of experiences themselves in terms of bodily or psychological sensations in which others are unable to participate.

*To summarize, contemporary friendship relation was in this research found to be adjusted to the complex social reality of late modernity. Due to the lack of the longitudinal research of friendship throughout early and late modernity, to speak of remodulation of friendship would be careless. However, it was found that contemporary friendship has adjusted to the multiple time-space organizations of life in late modernity in the sense of its existence in at least two different forms, each of them organized to satisfy different needs of different time-space organization.*

*However, to address the main research question, the feelings of loneliness were not found to be related to the proposed multiplication of friendship. Rather they can be linked to the limit in functions of a friendship and the specialized manner in which a friendship is perceived.*

Indeed, when the findings are reviewed in a summarized form, the contemporary friendship starts to evoke the image of a very specialized relationship. It is perceived as specialized and

divided into different subcategories according to its time-spatial organization, the functions it provides and the support it provides. Its functions in terms of support and the ability to cover a vast range of experiences are also perceived as limited.

This kind of complex specialized methodology of a friendship which contemporary emerging adults exhibit points to the extreme reflexivity in the management of voluntary ties in late modernity. It can be suggested that emerging adults show high levels of awareness as to what kind of resources which kind of a relationship provides and that they seem to regulate their behaviour accordingly. This can, again, be regarded as a part of the wider phenomenon of individualization in late modernity and its demand to take one's life actively into one's own hands (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002). These findings seem to imply that emerging adults of late modernity have not only taken their lives actively into their own hands, but that they have done the same with their friendships.

Further implications of these findings are proposed by the examination of the complex nature of the real friendship as a relationship, which was already evident from its phenomenology. A real friendship presents itself as a complex relationship which often requires delicate balancing between potentially contradictory demands. For example, the norm of reciprocity and the simultaneous demand for support in times of need of one of its participants already in themselves pose a challenge for the negotiating of contradictory demands in terms of limited and yet required burdening of a relationship. Further nuances in terms of contradictions such as the request for brutal sincerity and simultaneous request for tactfulness which often demand delicate balancing only further illustrate the point of the relationship which is accompanied by high expectations. Furthermore, in spite of all of these contradictory demands, it is required from a friendship that it exists as a self-sustaining relationship, in order to have its full value. And finally, it is requested that a real friendship survives constraints placed on its foundations by potentially unfavourable structural conditions of late modernity. Moreover, it is required that it survives without any structural governing, but based only on a personal effort of the participants involved. All these demands placed upon a relationship which rests only on voluntariness of the participants can be interpreted as high expectations. It is within these expectations that a real friendship as a relationship itself might be experienced as uncertain.

However, the initially proposed concept of uncertainty in friendships was in this research not found in that form. Instead, it can be concluded that emerging adults show significant levels



of personal agency in the management of this kind of uncertainty. This manifests itself in the strategy of action in which friendships which are experienced as unreliable are shifted to the level of lower expectations – to the level of social friendships –and one's behaviour and expectations in them are both managed accordingly. In this way, uncertainty is kept at bay of friendship relations in late modernity.

Thus, emerging adults of late modernity reveal themselves as highly reflexive social agents who successfully manage both the ambivalency of the nature of a friendship as social tie and the multiple demands which complex social reality of late modernity places upon it.

## 8 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Rebecca. 1998. The demise of the territorial determinism in *Placing friendship in context*, ed. Adams, Rebecca G. and Graham A. Allan, 153-183. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Allan, Graham. 1989. *Friendship: developing a sociological perspective*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Allan, Graham. 1993. Social structure and relationships in *Social context and relationships*, ed. Steve Duck, 1-25. Newbury Park, London, New Delhi: Sage.

Allan, Graham. 1998. Friendship and the private sphere in *Placing friendship in context*, ed. Adams, Rebecca G. and Graham A. Allan, 71-92. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Allan, Graham. 2005. Friendship, sociology and social structure in *Understanding research in personal relationships*, ed. William Dragon and Steve Duck, 254-263. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Alveson, Mats and Kay Sköldberg. 2000. *Reflexive methodology: new vistas for qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Anderson, Digby. 2001. *Loosing friends*. London: Social affairs unit.

Aristotel. 1992. *Nikomahova etika*. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naknada.

Arnett, Jeffrey Jensen. 2004. *Emerging adulthood: the winding road from the late teens through the twenties*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Aron, Arthur P., Debra J. Mashek and Elaine N. Aron. 2004. Closeness as including other in the self in *Handbook of closeness and intimacy*, ed. Mashek J. Debra and Aron Arthur. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Badhwar, Neera. 2008. Friendship and commercial societies. *Politics, philosophy and economics* 7(3): 301-326.

Barbour, Rosaline. 2007. *Doing focus groups*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

- Bauman, Zygmunt. 1993. *Postmodern ethics*. Oxford, Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. 2000. Ethics of individuals. *The Canadian journal of sociology* 25 (1): 83-96.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. 2003. *Liquid love: on the frailty of human bonds*. Cambridge: Polity press.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. 2006. *Liquid fear*. Cambridge: Polity press.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. 2008. *Does ethics have a chance in a world of consumers?* Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. 2009. *Liquid modernity*. Cambridge, Malden: Polity press.
- Bauman, Zygmunt and Benedetto Vecchi. 2004. *Identity: conversations with Benedetto Vecchi*. Cambridge, Malden: Polity press.
- Baumeister, Roy F. 1986. *Identity: cultural change and the struggle for self*. Oxford: Oxford university press.
- Beck, Ulrich. 1992. *Risk society: towards a new modernity*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Beck, Ulrich, Anthony Giddens and Scott Lash. 1994. *Reflexive modernization: politics, tradition and aesthetics in the modern social order*. Stanford: Stanford university press.
- Beck, Ulrich and Elisabeth Beck-Gernsheim. 2002. *Individualization: institutionalized individualism and its social and political consequences*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Beck, Ulrich and Elisabeth Beck-Gernsheim. 2006. *Popolnoma normalni kaos ljubezni*. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za družbene vede.
- Bellah, Robert N., Richard Madsen, William M. Sullivan, Ann Swindler and Steven M. Tipton. 1986. *Habits of the heart: individualism and commitment in American life*. Los Angeles: University of California press.
- Berger Peter and Thomas Luckmann. 1996. *The social construction of reality: a treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. New York: Anchor books.

Billington, Rosamund and Jenny Hockey. 1998. *Exploring self and society*. Basingstoke: Macmillan

Birdwhistell, Ray L. 1970. *Kinesics and context: essays on body motion communication*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania press.

Bloor, Michel, Jane Frankland, Michelle Thomas and Kate Robson. 2001. *Focus groups in social research*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Blumstein, Philip and Peter Kollock. 1988. Personal Relationships. *Annual Review of Sociology* 14: 467-490.

Boyd, Danah. 2007. Why youth (heart) social network sites: the role of networked publics in teenage social life in *MacArthur Foundation Series on Digital Learning – Youth, Identity and Digital Media Volume*, ed. David Buckingham. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Biernacki Patrick and Dan Waldorf. 1981. Snowball sampling: problems and techniques of chain referral sampling. *Sociological methods and research*. 10(2): 141-163.

Boyd, Danah. 2008. Friendship in *Hanging out, messing around, geeking out: kids living and learning with new media*, ed. Mizuko, Ito. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Brajdčić Vuković, Marija, Gunn Elisabeth Birkenlund and Aleksandar Štulhofer. 2007. Between tradition and modernization: Attitudes to women's employment and gender roles in Croatia. *International Journal of Sociology*. 37(3): 32-53.

Brodie, Marc and Barbara Caine. 2009. Class, sex and friendship: the long 19th century in *Friendship: a history*, ed. Barbara Caine. 223-279.

Brown, Stuard and Christopher Vaughan. 2009. *Play: how it shapes the brain, opens the imagination and invigorates the soul*. New York: The Penguin Group.

Brunnbauer, Ulf. 2000. From equality without democracy to democracy without equality? Women and transition in South-East Europe. *South-East Europe Review* 3:151-168.

*Bruto domaći proizvod za Republiku Hrvatsku te prostorne jedinice za statistiku 2. i 3. razine za razdoblje 2000.-2010. 2013. Available at: [http://www.dzs.hr/Hrv\\_Eng/publication/2013/12-01-02\\_01\\_2013.htm](http://www.dzs.hr/Hrv_Eng/publication/2013/12-01-02_01_2013.htm) (May 1, 2012.)*

- Byrant, G. A. and David Jary. 1997. *Anthony Giddens: critical assessments*. New York: Routledge.
- Budgeon Shelly. 2006. Friendships and formations of sociality in late modernity. *Sociological research online*, 11 (3). Available at <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/11/3/budgeon.html> ( April 1, 2013.)
- Caldwell, Mayta A. and Letitia Anne-Peplau. 1982. Sex differences in same-sex friendships. *Sex roles* 8(7): 721- 732.
- Canary, Daniel J., Tara M. Emmers- Sommer and Sandra Faulkner. 1997. *Sex and gender differences in personal relationships*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Castells, Manuel. 2000. *Uspon umreženog društva*. Zagreb: Golden marketing.
- Castells, Manuel. 2001. Virtualne zajednice ili umreženo društvo? in *Internet galaksija: Razmišljanja o Internetu, poslovanju i društvu*. Zagreb: Naklada Jesenski i Turk.
- Castells, Manuel, Mitiea Fernandez-Ardevol, Jack Linchuan and Araba Sey. 2007. *Mobile communication and society: a global perspective*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Cicero. 2005. *De Amicitia*. Project Gutenberg, available at <http://gutenberg.net> (September, 10 2012.)
- Chambers, Deborah. 2006. *New social ties: contemporary connections in a fragmented society*. Hampshire, New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Cocking, Dean and Jeanette Kennett. 1998. Friendship and the self. *Ethics* 108 (3): 502 – 527.
- Collins, Randall. 2004. *Interaction Ritual Chains*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Cote, James. 2000. *Arrested adulthood: the changing nature of maturity and identity*. New York, London: New York University Press.
- Cote, James and Anton Allahar. 1996. *Generation on hold: coming of age in the late twentieth century*. New York, London: New York University press.
- Creswell John W. 2007. *Qualitative inquiry and research design: choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications
- Day, Graham. 2006. *Community and everyday life*. London, New York: Routledge

- Delanty, Gerard. 2010. *Community*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Denscombe, Martyn. 2010. *The good research guide: for small-scale social research projects*. Berkshire: Open University Press.
- Denzin, Norman K. and Yvonna Lincoln. 2005. *The SAGE Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Doyle, Michelle Erina and Mark K. Smith. 2002. *Friendship: theory and experience: the encyclopaedia of informal education*. Available at <http://www.infed.org/biblio/friendship.htm> (March, 20 2010).
- Dreyfus Hubert L. 2009. *On the Internet*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Duck, Steve. 1994. *Meaningful relationships: talking, sense and relating*. Newbury Park, London, New Delhi: Sage
- Duck, Steve. 2007. *Human relationships*. Los Angeles, London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Durkheim, Emile. 1984. *The division of labour in society*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire and London: MacMillan.
- Durrant, Jonathan. 2005. Friendship in Catholic reformation Eichstätt in *Love, friendship and faith in Europe, 1300- 1800*, ed. Gowing Laura, Michael Hunter and Miri Rubin. New York, Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan. 66-88.
- Dumm, Thomas. 2009. *Loneliness as a way of life*. Cambridge: Harvard University press.
- Elliott, Anthony. 1992. *Social theory and psychoanalysis in transition: Self and society from Freud to Kristeva*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Ellison Nicole B., Charles Steinfield and Cliff Lampe. 2011. Connection-strategies: Social capital implications of Facebook-enabled communication practices. *New Media Society*. 13(6): 873-892.
- Elliott, Anthony and Charles Lemert. 2006. *The new individualism: the emotional costs of globalization*. London and New York: Routledge.

- Elkins, Leigh E. and Christopher Peterson. 1993. Gender differences in best friendships. *Sex roles*. 29(7/8): 497-508.
- Emirbayer, Mustafa, ed. 2003. *Emile Durkheim: Sociologist of modernity*. Oxford: Blackwell publishing.
- Epstein, Joseph. 2006. *Friendship: An expose*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Eurostat. 2013. *Harmonised unemployment rate by sex*. Available at: <http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/tgm/table.do?tab=table&language=en&pcode=teilm020&tableSelection=1&plugin=1> (May 1, 2013.)
- Feld, Scott and William C. Carter. Foci of activity as changing contexts for friendship in *Placing friendship in context*, ed. Adams, Rebecca G. and Graham A. Allan, 136-153. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Fehr, Beverly. 1996. *Friendship processes*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Fischer, Claude. 1982. *To dwell among friends*. Chicago, London: Chicago University Press.
- Flick, Uwe, Ernst von Kardoff and Ines Steinke (ed). 2004. *A companion to qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Focus group 1. 2012. Group discussion with the authors. Zagreb, November 4.
- Focus group 2, 2012. Group discussion with the authors. Zagreb, November 9.
- Focus group 3, 2012. Group discussion with the authors. Zagreb, December 15.
- Focus group 4, 2013. Group discussion with the authors. Zagreb, January 23.
- Foddy, William. 1993. *Constructing questions for interviews and questionnaires: theory and practice in social research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Förnas, Johan. 1995. *Youth culture in late modernity*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Gambetta, Diego. 1998. Can we trust trust? In *Trust; making and breaking cooperative relations*, ed. Diego Gambetta. Cambridge: Basil Blackwell Inc. 213-219.

Garrioch, David. 2009. From Christian friendship to secular sentimentality: enlightenment re-evaluations in *Friendship: a history*, ed. Barbara Caine. 165-215.

Gergen, Kenneth J. 2000. *The saturated self: dilemmas of identity in contemporary life*. New York: Basic books.

Giddens, Anthony. 1987. *Social theory and modern sociology*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Giddens, Anthony. 1990. *The consequences of modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University press.

Giddens, Anthony. 1991. *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age*. Cambridge: Polity press.

Giddens, Anthony. 1992. *The transformation of intimacy: sexuality, love and eroticism in modern societies*. Cambridge: Polity press.

Gobo, Giampietro. 2008. Re-conceptualizing generalization: old issues in a new frame in *Social research methods (SAGE Handbook)*, ed. Pertti Alasuutari, Leonard Bickman and Julia Brannen. Thousand Oaks, News Delhi, London: SAGE Publications.

Golafshani, Nahid. 2003. Understanding reliability and validity in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report*. 8(4): 597-607.

Goffman, Erving. 1990. *The presentation of self in everyday life*. London, New York: Penguin books.

Goodwin, Robin. 2009. *Changing relations: achieving intimacy in a time of social transition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

Goodwin, Jeff and Ruth Horowitz. 2002. Introduction: The methodological strengths and dilemmas of qualitative sociology. *Qualitative sociology*. 25 (1): 33- 47.

Gowing, Laura. 2005. The politics of women's friendship in early modern England in *Love, friendship and faith in Europe, 1300- 1800*, ed. Gowing Laura, Michael Hunter and Miri Rubin. New York, Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan. 131-150.



Granovetter, Mark S. 1973. The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology* 78(6): 1360-1380.

Green, Laura R., Richardson Deborah S., Lago Tania and Elizabeth C. Schatten-Jones. 2001. Network correlates of social and emotional loneliness in young and older adults. *Personality and social psychology bulletin*. 27 (3): 281-288.

Habermas, Jürgen. 2001. *The postnational constellation: political essays*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Harvey, David. 1989. *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Cambridge, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Haythornthwaite Caroline and Barry Wellman. 2002. *The internet in everyday life*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Healey-Etten Victoria and Shane Sharp. 2010. Teaching beginning undergraduates how to do an in-depth interview: a teaching note with 12 handy tips. *Teaching sociology*. 38(2): 157-165.

Heaphy, Brian. 2007. *Late modernity and social change: reconstructing social and personal life*. New York: Routledge.

Hesse-Biber, Sharlene Nagy and Patricia Leavy. 2004. *Approaches to qualitative research: a reader on theory and practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hilton, Turner J. 1947. Epicurus and friendship. *The classical journal* 42 (6): 251-355.

Hortulanus Roelof, Anja Machielse and Ludwien Meeuwesen. 2006. *Social isolation in modern society*. New York: Routledge.

Hruschka, Daniel J. 2010. *Friendship: development, ecology and evolution of a relationship*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.

Holloway, Immy and Stephanie Wheeler. 2010. *Qualitative research in nursing and healthcare*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Honneth, Alex. 2004. Organized self-realization: some paradoxes of individualization. *European journal of social theory*. 7(4): 463-478.

Howard, Cosmo (ed). 2007. *Contested individualization: debates about contemporary personhood*. New York and Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hsiu-Fang Hsieh and Sarah E. Shannon. 2006. Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative health research*. 15(9):1277-1288.

Illouz, Eva. 2010. *Hladne intimnosti: oblikovanje čustvenega kapitalizma*. Ljubljana: Založba Krtina.

Illouz, Eva. 2011. *Warum Liebe Weh tut? Eine soziologische Erklärung*. Berlin: Suhrkamp Verlag Berlin.

Inglehart, Ronald. 1997. *Modernization and postmodernization: cultural, economic, and political change in 43 societies*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Inglehart, Ronald and Pippa Norris. 2003. *Rising tide: gender equality and cultural change around the world*. Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, Sao Paolo: Cambridge University Press.

Inglehart, Ronald and Christian Welzel. 2005. *Modernization, cultural change and democracy*. Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, Sao Paolo: Cambridge University Press.

James, Carolyn and Bill Kent. 2009. Renaissance friendships: traditional truths, new and dissenting voices in *Friendship: a history*, ed. Barbara Caine. 111-165.

Jamieson, Lynn. 1998. *Intimacy: personal relationships in modern societies*. Oxford: Polity press.

Jamieson, Lynn. 1999. Intimacy transformed? A critical look at the „pure relationship“. *Sociology* 33 (3): 477-494.

Kaplan, Danny. 2006. *The man we loved: male friendship and nationalism in Israeli culture*. Oxford, New York: Berghahn books.

King, Preston and Heather Devere (ed.). 2000. *The challenge to friendship in modernity*. Illford: Frank Cass& Co. Ltd.

Kling, Rob, Howard Rosenbaum and Steve Sawyer. 2005. *Understanding and communicating social informatics: a framework for studying and teaching the human contexts of information and communication technologies*. New Jersey: Information today.

Konstan, David. 1997. *Friendship in the classical world*. Cambridge: University Press.

Krauss, Robert M., Wendy Apply, Nancy Morency, Charlotte Wenzel and Ward Winton. 1981. Verbal, vocal and visible factors in judgments of another's affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 40(2): 312-320.

Kohn, Marek. 2008. *Trust; self-interest and common good*. New York; Oxford University Press.

Kohut, Heinz. 1990. *Analiza sebstva*. Zagreb: ITRO Naprijed.

Lasch, Christopher. 1986. *Narcistička kultura*. Zagreb: ITRO Naprijed.

Leburić, Anči and Inga Tomić-Koludrović. 1996. Mladi danas: drukčiji, ali isti. *Društvena istraživanja*. 5(5-6):963-975.

Lee, David and Howard Newby. 1983. A loss of community? In *The problem of sociology: an introduction to the discipline*, ed. David Lee and Howard Newby. London, New York: Routledge. 38-54.

Lewis, Jane and Anne West. 2009. „Friending“: London-based undergraduates' experience of Facebook. *New Media Society* 11(7): 1209-1229.

Lincoln, Yvonna S. and Egon G. Guba. 1985. *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Lindemann, Kristina. 2007. The impact of objective characteristics on subjective social position. *TRAMES: Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences* 11(1): 54-68.

Luhmann, Niklas. 1986. *Love as passion: codification of intimacy*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University press.

- Lynch, Sandra. 2005. *Philosophy and friendship*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- MacDougall Colin and Elizabeth Fudge. 2001. Planning and recruiting the sample for focus groups and in-depth interviews. *Qualitative health research* (11)1: 117-126.
- Machielse, Anja. 2006. Theories on social contacts and social isolation in *Social isolation in modern society*, ed. Hortulanus Roelof, Anja Machielse and Ludwien Meeuwesen. New York: Routledge, 13-37.
- Mashek, Debra, Arthur Aron and Maria Boncimino. 2003. Confusions of self with close others. *Personality and social psychology bulletin*. (29)3: 382-392.
- Mathison, Sandra. 1998. Why triangulate? *Educational Researcher*. (17)2: 13-17.
- McPherson Miller, Matthew E. Brashears and Lynn Smith- Lovin. 2006. Social isolation in America: Changes in core discussion networks over two decades. *American Sociological Review* 71 (3): 353-375.
- Mead, George Herbert. 1972. *Mind, self and society: from the standpoint of a social behaviorist*. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Meeuwesen, Ludwig. 2006. Life events and social isolation in *Social isolation in modern society*, ed. Hortulanus Roelof, Anja Machielse and Ludwien Meeuwesen. New York: Routledge, 63-81.
- Mason, Jennifer. 2002. *Qualitative researching*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Maykut, Pamela and Richard Morehouse. 1994. *Beginning qualitative research: a philosophic and practical guide*. London, Washington D.C.: The Falmer Press group.
- Meštrović, Stjepan G. 1997. *Postemotional society*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.
- Meštrović, Stjepan G. 1998. *Anthony Giddens: the last modernist*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Miheljak, Vlado. 2002. Rezultati raziskave Mladina 2000 in *Mladina 2000*, ed. Vlado Miheljak, str. 239-270. Ljubljana: Ministrstvo za šolstvo in šport, Urad RS za mladino and Založba Aristej.

- Milardo and Wellman. 2005. The personal is social in *Understanding research in personal relationships: a text with readings*, Duck, Steve and William Dragon, ed. 244-247. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Miles, Matthew B. and A. Michael Huberman. 1994. *Qualitative data analysis; second edition*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage publications.
- Misa, Thomas J., Philip Brey, Andrew Feenberg. 2003. *Modernity and technology*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London: The MIT Press.
- Montaigne. 2006. Chapter XXVII - Of friendship in *Essays of Michel de Montaigne*. Project Gutenberg, available at <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/3600/3600-h/3600-h.htm> (September, 10 2012.)
- Montgomery M. Barbara and Steve Duck. 1991. *Studying interpersonal interaction*. New York: The Guilford Press
- Morgan, David L. and Alice U.Scannel. 1998. *Planning focus groups*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Mulder, Clara H. 2009. Leaving the parental home in young adulthood in *Handbook of youth and young adulthood: New perspectives and agendas*, ed. Andy Furlong, 203-211. London, New York: Routledge.
- Nairn, Karen, Jenny Munro and Anne B. Smith. 2005. A counter-narrative of a „failed“ interview. *Qualitative research*. 5(2): 221-244.
- Nie, Norman H. 2001. Sociability, interpersonal relations, and the Internet: reconciling conflicting findings. *American behavioral scientist*. 45(3): 420-435.
- Nie, Norman and Erbring Lutz. 2000. *Internet and society: a preliminary report*. Stanford institute for the quantitative study of society.
- O'Connor, Pat. 1998. Women's friendships in post-modern world in *Placing friendship in context*, ed. Adams, Rebeca G. and Graham A. Allan, 117- 136. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Oliker, Stacey J. 1998. The modernisation of friendship: individualism, intimacy and the gender in the 19th century in *Placing friendship in context*, ed. Adams, Rebecca G. and Graham A. Allan, 18-43. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Oschema, Klaus. 2005. Sacred or profane? Reflections on love and friendship in the middle ages in *Love, friendship and faith in Europe, 1300- 1800*, ed. Gowing Laura, Michael Hunter and Miri Rubin. New York, Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan, 43-66.

Pahl, Raymond Edward. 2000. *On friendship*. Cambridge, Malden: Polity press.

Pahl, Raymond Edward and Liz Spencer. 2004. Personal communities: not simply families of fate or „choice“. *Current sociology* 52(2): 199-221.

Paine, Robert. 1969. In search of friendship: an exploratory analysis in „middle-class“ culture. *Man, New series* 4 (4): 505- 524.

Pakaluk, Michael, ed. 1991. *Other selves: philosophers on friendship*. Indianapolis: Hacket publishing company.

Peel, Mark. 2009. New worlds of friendship: the early twentieth century in *Friendship: a history*, ed. Barbara Caine. 223-279.

Pescosolido Bernice A. And Beth A. Rubin. 2000. The web of group affiliations revisited: social life, postmodernism and sociology. *American Sociological Review* 65(1): 52-76.

Pescosolido Bernice A. and Judith A. Levy. 2002. The role of social networks in health, illness, disease and healing: the accepting present, the forgotten past, and the dangerous potential for a complacent future in *Social networks and health*, ed. Judith A. Levy and Bernice A. Pescosolido. Oxford: Elsevier Science Ltd, 3-29.

Pierce, Gregory R., Brian Lakey, Irwing G. Sarason and Barbara R. Sarason, ed. 1997. *Sourcebook of social support and personality*. New York: Plenum press.

Putnam, Robert D. 2000. *Bowling alone; the collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Renner, Tanja. 2000. Ranjivost, mladi in zasebno okolje in *Socialna ranjivost mladih*, Ule, Mirjana, Tanja Renner, Metka Mencip Čepelak and Blanka Tivadar, 93- 119. Ljubljana: Ministrstvo za šolstvo in šport, Urad RS za mladino and Založba Aristej.

Renner, Tanja. 2001. Dekonstrukcija mladine, ponikanje scen in provincializem v devedesetih. *Annales, Seria historia et sociologia* 26(2): 477-484.

Renner, Tanja. 2002. Novi trendi v zasebnih razmerjih in *Mladina 2000 : slovenska mladina na prehodu v tretje tisočletje*, ed. Vlado Mihelj, 79- 103. Ljubljana, Maribor: Ministrstvo za šolstvo in šport, Urad RS and Založba Aristej.

Renner, Tanja, Mateja Sedmak, Alenka Švab and Mojca Urek. 2006. *Družine in družinsko življenje v Sloveniji*. Koper : Univerza na Primorskem, Znanstveno-raziskovalno središče, Založba Annales : Zgodovinsko društvo za južno Primorsko.

Respondent 1. 2011. Interview with the author. Zagreb, June 24.

Respondent 2. 2011. Interview with the author. Zagreb, June 27.

Respondent 3. 2011. Interview with the author. Zagreb, July 11.

Respondent 4, 2011. Interview with the author. Zagreb, September 20.

Respondent 5, 2011. Interview with the author. Zagreb, September 23.

Respondent 6, 2011. Interview with the author. Zagreb, September 25.

Respondent 7, 2011. Interview with the author. Zagreb, October 7.

Respondent 8, 2011. Interview with the author. Zagreb, October 14.

Respondent 9, 2011. Interview with the author. Zagreb, October 15.

Respondent 10, 2011. Interview with the author. Zagreb, October 17.

Respondent 11, 2011. Interview with the author. Zagreb, October 20.

Respondent 12, 2011. Interview with the author. Zagreb, October 27.

Respondent 13, 2011. Interview with the author. Zagreb, January 19.

Respondent 14, 2011. Interview with the author. Zagreb, January 19.

Respondent 15, 2012. Interview with the author. Zagreb, January 25.

Respondent 16, 2013. Interview with the author. Zagreb, February 18.

Respondent 17, 2012. Interview with the author. Zagreb, February 3.

Respondent 18, 2013. Interview with the author. Zagreb, February 21.

Respondent 19, 2012. Interview with the author. Zagreb, February 9.

Respondent 20, 2012. Interview with the author. Zagreb, February 15.

Respondent 21, 2012. Interview with the author. Zagreb, March 3.

Respondent 22, 2012. Interview with the author. Zagreb, March 13.

Respondent 23, 2012. Interview with the author. Zagreb, March 14.

Respondent 24, 2012. Interview with the author. Zagreb, March 19.

Respondent 25, 2012. Interview with the author. Zagreb, March 20.

Respondent 26, 2012. Interview with the author. Zagreb, March 23.

Respondent 27, 2012. Interview with the author. Zagreb, March 26.

Respondent 28, 2012. Interview with the author. Zagreb, March 28.

Respondent 29, 2012. Interview with the author. Zagreb, March 30.



Respondent 30, 2012. Interview with the author. Zagreb, April 3.

Respondent 31, 2012. Interview with the author. Zagreb, April 11.

Respondent 32, 2012. Interview with the author. Zagreb, April 12.

Respondent 33, 2012. Interview with the author. Zagreb, April 25.

Respondent 34, 2012. Interview with the author. Zagreb, April 23.

Respondent 35, 2013. Interview with the author. Zagreb, February 21.

Respondent 36, 2012. Interview with the author. Zagreb, May 10.

Respondent 37, 2012. Interview with the author. Zagreb, May 21.

Respondent 38, 2012. Interview with the author. Zagreb, May 25.

Respondent 39, 2012. Interview with the author. Zagreb, July 2.

Respondent 40, 2012. Interview with the author. Zagreb, July 5.

Respondent 41, 2012. Interview with the author. Zagreb, September 3.

Respondent 42, 2012. Interview with the author. Zagreb, August 31.

Respondent 43, 2012. Interview with the author. Zagreb, September 5.

Respondent 44, 2012. Interview with the author. Zagreb, September 7.

Respondent 45, 2012. Interview with the author. Zagreb, September 9.

Respondent 46, 2012. Interview with the author. Zagreb, September 18.

Respondent 47, 2012. Interview with the author. Zagreb, September 20.

Respondent 48, 2012. Interview with the author. Zagreb, September 24.

Respondent 49, 2012. Interview with the author. Zagreb, September 25.

Respondent 50, 2013. Interview with the author. Zagreb, February 12.

Riesman, David, Nathan Glazer and Reuel Denny. 1965. *Usamljena gomila: studija o promeni američkog karaktera*. Beograd: Nolit.

Ritchie, Jane, Liz Spencer and William O'Connor. 2003. Carrying out qualitative analysis in *Qualitative research practice – a guide for social science students and researchers*, ed. Ritchie Jane and Jane Lewis, 219- 262. London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Ramet, Sabrina P. and Davorka Matic, ed. 2007. *Democratic transition in Croatia: value transformation, education and media*. Texas A&M University press.

Rizman, Rudolf Martin. 2006. *Uncertain path: democratic transition and consolidation in Slovenia*. Texas A& M University press.

Rokach, Ami, Tricia Orzeck, Janice Cripps, Katica Lackovic-Grgin and Zvezdan Penezic. 2001. The effects of culture on the meaning of loneliness. *Social indicators research*. 53(1):17-31.

Rosa, Hartmut. 2009. Social acceleration: ethical and political consequences of desynchronized, high-speed society in *High-speed society: Social Acceleration, Power and Modernity*, ed. Rosa Hartmut and William E. Scheuerman. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 77-113.

Rosa, Hartmut and William E. Scheuerman. 2009. Introduction in *High-speed society: Social Acceleration, Power and Modernity*, ed. Rosa Hartmut and William E. Scheuerman. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1-33.

- Rosedale, Mary. 2007. Loneliness: an exploration of meaning. *Journal of the American Psychiatric Nurses Association* 13 (4): 201- 209.
- Roseneil Sasha and Shelley Budgeon. 2004. Cultures of intimacy and care beyond the family: Personal life and social change int the early 21st century. *Current sociology* 52 (2): 135-159.
- Santore, Daniel. 2008. Romantic relationships, individualism and the possibility of togetherness: seeing Durkheim in theories of contemporary intimacy. *Sociology* 42 (6): 1200-1217.
- Sennet, Richard. 2002. *The fall of public man*. London, New York: Penguin books.
- Sewell, Willam H. 1992. A theory of structure: duality, agency, and transformation. *The American journal of sociology*. 98(1): 1-29.
- Shenton, Andrew K. 2004. Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for information*. 22: 63-75.
- Shephard, Alexandra. 2005. „Swil-bols and Tos-pots“: drink culture and male bonding in England, c. 1560-1640 in *Love, friendship and faith in Europe, 1300- 1800*, ed. Gowing Laura, Michael Hunter and Miri Rubin. New York, Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan, 110-131.
- Silverman, David and Amir Masvati. 2008. *Doing qualitative research*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Simmel, Georg. 1950. *The sociology of Georg Simmel*, ed. Kurt H. Wolff. Glencoe: The free press.
- Simmel, Georg. 2001. *Kontrapunkti kulture*. Zagreb: Jesenski i Turk.
- Silver, Allan. 1990. Friendship in commercial society: eighteenth-century social theory and modern sociology. *American journal of sociology* 95 (6): 1274-1504.
- Sinding, Christina and Jane Aronson. 2003. Exposing failures, unsettling accomodations: tensions in interview practice. *Qualitative research*. 3(1): 95-117.

Spajić-Vrkaš, Vedrana and Vlasta Ilišin. 2005. *Youth in Croatia*. Zagreb: Research and Training Centre for Human Rights and Fakultety of Humanities and Social Sciences University of Zagreb.

Spencer, Liz and Ray Pahl. 2006. *Rethinking friendship: hidden solidarities today*. Princeton: Princeton University press.

Sokolowski, Robert. 2002. Phenomenology of friendship. *The review of metaphysics* 55 (3): 451-470.

Stake, Robert E. 2010. *Qualitative research: studying how things work*. New York, London: The Guilford Press.

Statistika Hrvatski zavod za zapošljavanje. 2013. Available at: <http://statistika.hzz.hr/> (May 1, 2013.)

Stivers, Richard. 2004. *Shades of loneliness: pathologies of technological society*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Stets, Jan E. and Peter E. Burke. 2003. A sociological approach to self and identity in *Self and identity*, ed. Mark R. Leary and June Price Tangney. New York: The Guilford Press, 128-153.

Stolle, Dietlind. 2002. Trusting strangers – the concept of generalized trust in perspective. *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft*. 4(2/4): 397-412.

Stolorow, Robert D. 2007. *Trauma and human existence: autobiographical, psychoanalytic and philosophical reflections*. New York, London: The Analytic Press.

Stolorow, Robert D. and George Atwood. 2002. *The intersubjective foundations of psychological life*. New York, London: The Analytic Press.

Strauss, Anselm C. and Juliet Corbin. 1998. *Basics of qualitative research: techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Štulhofer, Aleksandar. 1998. Krivudava staza hrvatske privatizacije. *Privatizacija i modernizacija*, ed. Ivo Rogić and Zdenko Zeman. Institut društvenih znanosti Ivo Pilar. 163-178.

Štulhofer, Aleksandar and Kiril Miladinov. 2005. Kraj intimnosti? Suvremenost, globalizacija i ljubavne veze. *Sociologija* XLVI (1): 1-18.

Swidler, Ann. 2001. *Talk of love: how culture matters*. Chicago: The University of Chicago press.

Swidler, Ann. 2005. What anchors cultural practices in *The practice turn in contemporary theory*, ed. Theodor R. Schatzki, Karin Knorr-Cetina and Eike von Savigny, 83-101. London, New York: Routledge

Tadmor, Naomi. 2005. Friends and neighbours in early modern England: biblical translations and social norms in *Love, friendship and faith in Europe, 1300- 1800*, ed. Gowing Laura, Michael Hunter and Miri Rubin. New York, Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan, 150-177.

Thoits, Peggy. 1989. The sociology of emotions. *Annual review of sociology* 15: 317-342

Tönnies, Ferdinand. 1955. *Community and association: (Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft)*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Toguchi Swartz Teresa and Kirsten Bengston O'Brien. 2009. Intergenerational support during the transition to adulthood in *Handbook of youth and young adulthood: New perspectives and agendas*, ed. Andy Furlong, 217-226. London, New York: Routledge.

Tomić Koludrović, Inga and Anči Leburić. 2001. *Skeptična generacija – životni stilovi mladih u Hrvatskoj*. Zagreb: AGM.

Tomić Koludrović, Inga and Mirko Petrić. 2007a. Hrvatsko društvo- prije i tijekom tranzicije. *Društvena istraživanja* 16(4/5): 867-889. Available at: <http://hrcak.srce.hr/file/29945> (November 25, 2010.)

Tomić Koludrović, Inga and Mirko Petrić. 2007b. From transitional to mixed society: Croatia between two modernizations in *La questione e l'allargamento dell'Unione europea*, ed. Botta, F., Garia I. And P. Guarganella. 127-161. Milano: Franco Angeli. (english translation) Available at: [http://www.unizd.hr/Portals/13/pdf/ITK--Two\\_modernizations.pdf](http://www.unizd.hr/Portals/13/pdf/ITK--Two_modernizations.pdf) (November 24, 2010.)

Tomić Koludrović, Mirko Petrić and Željka Zdravković. 2012. Youth identity changes from late socialism to the present day in *Changing Identities in South Eastern Europe*, ed. Hanna Scheck. Beč: Centre for Social Inovation, 68-90.

Tomlinson, John. 2007. *The culture of speed*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Tonkiss, Fran. 2012. Focus groups in *Researching society and culture*, ed. Clive Seale. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Traub, Valerie. 2005. Friendship's loss: Alan Bray's making of history in *Love, friendship and faith in Europe, 1300- 1800*, ed. Gowing Laura, Michael Hunter and Miri Rubin. New York, Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan, 15-43.

Trial focus group. 2012. Group discussion with the informants. Zagreb, October 20.

Turkle, Sherry. 2011. *Alone together: why we expect more from technology and less from each other*. New York: Basic books.

Turner, Jonathan H. 2009. The sociology of emotions: basic theoretical arguments. *Emotion review*. 1(4):340-354.

Ule, Mirjana. 1996. Sociološki oris mladosti/mladine in *Mladina v devedesetih: analiza stanja v Sloveniji*, ed. Mirjana Ule, 9-24. Ljubljana: Znanstveno in publicistično središče: Ministrstvo za šolstvo in šport Republike Slovenije, Urad RS za mladino.

Ule, Mirjana. 1988. *Mladina in ideologija*. Ljubljana: Delavska enotnost.

Ule Mirjana. 2000. *Sodobne identitete v vrtincu diskurzov*. Ljubljana: Znanstveno in publicistično središče.

Ule, Mirjana. 2004. Nove vrednote za novo tisočletje: spremembe življenjskih in vrednotnih orijentacij mladih v Sloveniji. *Teorija in praksa* 42 (1-2): 352-360.

Ule, Mirjana, Tanja Rener, Metka Mencip Čeplak and Blanka Tivadar. 2000. *Socialna ranjivost mladih*. Ljubljana: Ministarstvo za šolstvo in šport, Urad RS za mladino and Založba Aristej.

Ule, Mirjana and Tanja Rener. 2000. Growing up Slovenia in the nineties. *Družboslovne razprave* 16 (32/33): 261-275.

Ule, Mirjana and Tanja Rener. 2001. The deconstruction of youth in *Transitions of youth citizenship in Europe : culture, subculture and identity*, ed. Andy Furlong and Irena Guidikova, 271-288. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

- Urry, John. 2009. Speeding Up and Slowing Down in *High-speed society: Social Acceleration, Power and Modernity*, ed. Rosa Hartmut and William E. Scheuerman. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 179-201.
- Van Dijk, Jan. 2006. *The network society: social aspects of new media*. London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage publications.
- Van Manen, Max. 2010. The pedagogy of Momus technologies: Facebook, privacy and online intimacy. *health research* 20(8): 1023-1032.
- Van Wel, Frits. 1994. „I count my parents among my best friends“: Youths' bonds with parents and friends in the Netherlands. *Journal of marriage and family* 56(4): 835- 843.
- Veniegas, Rosemary C. and Letitia A. Peplau. 1997. Power and the quality of same-sex friendships. *Psychology of women quarterly* 21: 279-293.
- Weeks, Jeffrey, Catherine Donovan and Brian Heaphy. 2001. *Same sex intimacies: Families of choice and other life experiments*. London: Routledge.
- Wellman, Barry. 1979. The community question: the intimate networks of East Yorkers. *American Journal of Sociology* 84(5): 1201-31.
- Wellman, Barry. 1998. From little boxes to loosely-bounded networks: the privatization and domestication of community in *Sociology for the twenty-first century: continuities and cutting-edges*, ed. Janet Abu-Lughod, 94-114. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wellman, Barry. 2001. Physical place and cyberspace: the rise of personalized networking. *International journal of urban and regional research* 25(2):227-252.
- Wellman, Barry. 2002. Little boxes, glocalization and the networked individualism in *Digital cities*, ed. M Tanabe, P. Van den Besselar and T. Ishida, 10-25. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.
- Wellman, Barry. 2004. The three ages of internet studies: ten, five and zero years ago. *SAGE Publications*. 6(1): 123-129.
- Wellman, Barry, Peter Carrington and Alan Hall. 1988. Networks as Personal Communities in *Social Structures: A Network Approach*, ed. Barry Wellman and Stephen David Berkowitz, 130-184. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wellman, Barry and Scott Wortley. 1990. Different strokes from different folks: community ties and social support. *American Journal of Sociology* 96(3): 558- 588.

Yalom, Irvin. 1980. *Existential psychotherapy*. New York: Basic Books.

Ziehe, Thomas. 1991. *Zeitvergleiche: Jugend in kulturellen Modernisierungen*. Weinheim, München: Juventa Verlag.



# INDEX

## A

abstract systems, 27, 29, 31, 36, 37, 38  
acceleration of time, 30, 234  
acceptance, 24, 85, 115, 120, 137, 138, 142, 164, 165, 333, 334  
acquaintanceship, 9, 10, 23, 146, 168, 170, 176, 179, 181, 216, 295  
active engagement, 39  
Adams, 15, 44, 45, 69, 305, 310, 316, 317  
Adorno, 206  
affection, 19, 22, 46, 122  
affectivity, 149, 164  
agency, 8, 9, 21, 25, 28, 38, 42, 91, 93, 104, 108, 113, 114, 115, 116, 163, 165, 187, 191, 205, 229, 253, 254, 255, 257, 262, 264, 266, 267, 268, 270, 298, 300, 304, 322, 337  
Allan, 43, 44, 45, 51, 60, 69, 93, 97, 114, 156, 158, 305, 310, 316, 317, 322  
alliances, 18, 22  
altruism, 37, 155, 329  
ambivalence, 42, 49, 51  
another self, 130  
Aristotle, 18, 19, 21, 22  
Arnett, 56, 75, 305  
Aron, 130, 305, 315  
ascribed nature, 38  
associating, 44, 127, 256  
association, 9, 109, 176, 178, 211, 230, 256, 274, 296, 298, 300, 324  
attending to multiple contacts, 209  
Atwood, 143, 323  
authenticity, 36, 113, 115, 116, 135, 136, 137, 139, 142, 143, 149, 151, 164, 165, 170, 171, 241, 252, 295, 296, 335  
autonomy, 23, 25, 39, 56, 57, 75, 114, 119  
availability of social actors in limited spatial settings, 264

## B

Baldwin, 143  
basis for friendship, 107, 111  
Bauman, 8, 14, 28, 29, 30, 32, 34, 35, 36, 40, 41, 43, 45, 47, 48, 49, 52, 53, 54, 69, 190, 191, 193, 211, 219, 221, 225, 229, 232, 245, 252, 272, 296, 297, 306  
Beck-Gernsheim, 8, 14, 28, 31, 33, 35, 36, 38, 45, 49, 52, 56, 69, 73, 79, 86, 148, 187, 188, 191, 224, 231, 232, 254, 255, 260, 284, 285, 303, 306  
behaviour, 9, 22, 32, 40, 55, 74, 92, 113, 119, 120, 122, 123, 124, 125, 128, 129, 131, 136, 139, 144, 146, 157, 158, 165, 222, 223, 263, 295, 303, 304

benevolence, 113, 120, 128, 130, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 164, 165, 171, 297  
biographical solutions of systemic contradictions, 34  
biography risks, 35  
Birdwhistell, 222, 307  
Bloor, 61, 62, 307  
Brashers, 51  
breakdown biography, 34  
bridge between online and offline sociability, 216  
Brodie, 25, 307  
brotherhoods, 20, 25, 27  
Brown, 151, 307  
Budgeon, 14, 16, 38, 44, 47, 272, 308, 322  
Burke, 143, 144, 147, 149, 323

## C

Caine, 25, 307, 311, 313, 317  
calculation, 37, 155, 252  
Caldwell, 65, 66, 308  
Canary, 65, 308  
Carrington, 38, 48, 94, 96, 110, 263, 265, 270, 326  
Carter, 43, 89, 93, 94, 96, 98, 310  
Castells, 39, 43, 44, 73, 89, 205, 308  
change in values, 34, 37  
choice, 9, 16, 18, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, 37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 47, 48, 49, 62, 93, 100, 101, 108, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 145, 147, 149, 162, 163, 164, 219, 220, 237, 245, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 275, 295, 298, 300, 317, 326, 337  
Cicero, 19, 21, 24, 308  
civic friendships, 21  
click, 98, 108, 111, 112, 116, 218, 259, 266  
closeness, 90, 91, 109, 122, 124, 125, 127, 130, 134, 164, 172, 179, 197, 200, 204, 220, 221, 234, 260, 282, 285, 305, 338, 339  
coding, 64  
cognitive resonance, 111, 112, 163  
collective sociabilities, 31  
Collins, 111, 135, 151, 153, 218, 219, 222, 308  
Commitment, 40, 117, 344  
communication, 16, 22, 27, 29, 43, 44, 73, 108, 111, 121, 122, 124, 125, 141, 172, 197, 205, 206, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 244, 248, 250, 258, 261, 262, 294, 307, 308, 309, 314, 340  
communities, 23, 29, 31, 40, 47, 48, 49, 94, 198, 216, 232, 263, 264, 266, 269, 271, 300, 317  
companionship, 287, 288, 289  
Compartmentalization, 197  
compartmentalized understanding, 299  
complex social relationship, 9, 295

comradeship, 21, 25  
 congruency, 136  
 connections, 43, 96, 208, 297, 308  
 consumerist logic, 190, 206  
 contemporary relationships, 41, 42, 43, 199, 232, 245, 297, 299  
 content, 8, 9, 45, 46, 69, 70, 113, 122, 127, 136, 141, 151, 154, 155, 162, 163, 164, 169, 170, 172, 174, 179, 180, 206, 211, 225, 230, 246, 295, 296, 297, 301, 313  
 context of modernization, 57  
 contextual friendship, 181  
 continuity, 147, 169, 193, 214, 228, 335  
 Corbin, 64, 323  
 corporeity, 218  
 Cote, 56, 75, 308  
 cross-cultural perspective, 124  
 cultural practice, 89, 203, 207

## D

decline in values, 37  
 Delanty, 47, 48, 272, 309  
 demands placed upon a relationship, 303  
 democratization of relationships, 8, 52  
 Denzin, 61, 309  
 desynchronization of lived temporalities, 257  
 different ways of forming friendships in different life-stages, 268  
 differentiated friendships, 46, 91  
 differentiated ties, 49  
 differentiation, 23, 46, 47, 48, 89, 91, 92, 109, 135, 163, 193, 198, 262, 289, 299  
 disbalance in giving and receiving, 162  
 discourse, 16, 20, 23, 26, 41, 58, 59, 60, 66, 75, 88, 112, 204, 232, 253, 254, 262, 298, 332, 338, 340  
 disembedding, 29, 30, 32, 33, 146  
 disjuncture of the shared social time, 224  
 disposability, 12, 53, 187, 188, 190, 191, 193, 242, 297  
 dissolution, 19, 32, 33, 52, 70, 73, 112, 114, 116, 163, 187, 271, 298  
 diversification of life-trajectories, 224, 225, 298, 300  
 Dreyfus, 211, 218, 219, 222, 309  
 durability, 8, 9, 52, 54, 58, 183, 186, 189, 192, 297, 298  
 Durkheim, 33, 70, 263, 266, 309, 310, 322  
 Durrant, 20, 309  
 duty to oneself, 36  
 dyad, 45  
 dynamic aspects of friendship, 51

## E

easier maintenance of friendships, 212, 223  
 effort, 9, 12, 40, 104, 106, 113, 117, 132, 156, 159, 160, 165, 174, 183, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 218, 219, 220, 224, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 242, 243, 244,

246, 249, 253, 254, 255, 259, 260, 262, 264, 267, 284, 295, 297, 298, 303, 339, 340, 341, 342  
 egoism, 37, 115, 232  
 Elkins, 65, 310  
 Elliott, 36, 309  
 e-mail, 206, 210, 214, 259  
 embeddedment, 114, 116  
 embedding, 9, 32, 38, 92, 94, 138, 146, 147, 166  
 emerging adults, 9, 10, 11, 16, 53, 57, 66, 67, 68, 71, 73, 75, 84, 85, 86, 87, 89, 95, 166, 175, 183, 192, 193, 199, 200, 205, 206, 208, 209, 211, 212, 213, 217, 223, 226, 234, 246, 271, 272, 273, 276, 277, 287, 288, 289, 291, 294, 295, 296, 298, 299, 300, 302, 303, 304  
 Emmers-Sommer, 65  
 emotional aid, 287  
 emotional buildup, 153  
 emotional loneliness, 293  
 emotional support, 3, 150, 165, 273, 274, 275, 278, 281, 286, 301  
 empty spots, 10, 58, 289, 302  
 energetic minimalism, 191  
 energetic terms, 111, 151  
 entrainment, 111  
 entry zone, 216  
 equality-representation, 97  
 essence of friendship, 112  
 ethos of the individual, 24  
 existential loneliness, 292  
 expectations, 10, 27, 42, 51, 59, 83, 84, 86, 90, 122, 127, 145, 149, 155, 171, 183, 190, 191, 255, 274, 303, 304, 332  
 expert psychological system, 286  
 expert systems, 29, 30, 284, 288  
 external regulations, 116, 124, 139  
 extroversion, 68, 125, 212

## F

Facebook, 16, 91, 106, 108, 166, 178, 182, 184, 185, 187, 200, 201, 205, 206, 207, 209, 210, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 300, 309, 314, 326, 328, 338, 340, 342  
 families of choice, 47  
 family, 3, 14, 16, 18, 25, 26, 32, 42, 48, 49, 59, 76, 77, 113, 115, 118, 126, 145, 148, 185, 233, 235, 247, 264, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 291, 301, 322, 326, 330, 336, 337  
 Faulkner, 65, 308  
 feedback, 3, 141, 143, 144, 145, 146, 233  
 feelings of loneliness, 8, 52, 54, 55, 289, 292, 294, 302  
 Feld, 43, 89, 93, 94, 96, 98, 310  
 filtering potential friend's interests, 215  
 financial support, 275, 277  
 Fischer, 14, 69, 93, 97, 98, 263, 287, 290, 300, 310

fleeting kind of contexts, 169  
 fleeting social context, 229  
 fluidity, 51, 52, 54, 193, 198, 225  
 foci of activity, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 111, 163  
 focus groups, 8, 55, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 92, 94, 132, 137, 142, 151, 161, 167, 238, 254, 305, 315, 316  
 focus-on-oneself, 230, 234  
 forming of friendship, 106, 163, 183  
 frailty, 40, 41, 47, 53, 54, 59, 275, 296, 306  
 friend, 123, 166, 167, 168, 170, 171, 180, 181, 200, 203, 204, 229, 243, 246, 335  
 friend from childhood, 185  
 friend lacking time for the maintenance of a friendship, 254  
 Friendship, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 18, 20, 24, 25, 44, 45, 46, 48, 51, 53, 91, 93, 96, 97, 99, 143, 164, 183, 272, 273, 290, 305, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 317, 322, 325  
 friendship and technology, 12, 205  
 friendship maintenance, 165, 207, 212, 217, 221, 222  
 friendship practices, 17, 89, 91, 92, 93, 131  
 friendship put into the dynamic, 295  
 friendship repertoires, 49  
 friendship replacing familial ties, 288  
 fun, 49, 103, 113, 151, 152, 153, 165, 167, 169, 170, 171, 172, 178, 179, 186, 187, 194, 197, 210, 220, 225, 243, 268, 295, 333, 335

## G

Gambetta, 119, 120, 310  
 Garrioch, 24, 25, 311  
 gender differences, 65, 66, 308  
 Gergen, 8, 29, 35, 37, 38, 43, 46, 53, 89, 110, 199, 212, 224, 226, 237, 242, 311  
 Giddens, 8, 14, 23, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 52, 54, 69, 73, 89, 100, 106, 108, 110, 116, 117, 119, 120, 123, 124, 126, 127, 148, 149, 153, 159, 161, 190, 191, 225, 229, 231, 242, 254, 270, 271, 272, 274, 284, 296, 300, 306, 308, 311, 315  
 globalization, 14, 29, 30, 32, 70, 71, 74, 309  
 Gobo, 67, 68, 311  
 Goffman, 128, 136, 137, 139, 171, 204, 222, 311  
 Golafshani, 61, 311  
 Gowing, 21, 309, 311, 317, 322, 324, 325  
 Granovetter, 45, 48, 69, 312  
 Gtalk, 208  
 Guba, 67, 68, 314

## H

Hall, 38, 48, 94, 96, 110, 263, 265, 270, 326  
 hallmark of modernity, 114  
 Harvey, 29, 30, 224, 225, 228, 234, 246, 252, 312

high level of integration, 23  
 homogeneity, 97  
 honesty, 142, 164, 241  
 Honneth, 33, 35, 36, 199, 224, 231, 312  
 Howard, 33, 35, 36, 313, 314  
 Hruschka, 93, 114, 124, 150, 158, 272, 312

## I

identification, 130, 131  
 Illouz, 14, 114, 148, 206, 207, 222, 313  
 illusion of the relationship maintenance, 221  
 immersion in a situation, 222  
 implicit level, 155  
 incidental friendships, 178, 226  
 individualization, 10, 14, 15, 33, 34, 36, 45, 48, 52, 73, 74, 86, 87, 188, 194, 195, 232, 262, 271, 285, 298, 303, 312, 313  
 individualization of biographies, 34  
 individualization of morality, 36  
 individualized approach to life, 254  
 individualized biographies, 33  
 individualizing experience, 290, 291  
 industrial revolution, 24  
 Inglehart, 24, 28, 34, 56, 66, 73, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 82, 84, 313  
 inherited friendships, 114  
 instantaneity, 30, 226, 228  
 institutionalized biographies, 31  
 institutionalized settings, 163, 226  
 instrumental rationality, 35  
 instrumental usage, 207  
 intention, 44, 49, 50, 53, 63, 86, 120, 125, 128, 130, 132, 140, 141, 142, 157, 164, 333  
 interaction, 46, 61, 63, 73, 85, 111, 127, 135, 151, 152, 153, 172, 204, 206, 218, 222, 250, 251, 266, 316, 335  
 internet communication, 59, 205, 208, 221, 222  
 internet tool, 205, 206  
 internet tools, 205, 206, 208, 212, 300, 328, 338  
 intersubjective systems, 143, 146  
 intervening condition, 9, 117, 187, 233, 234, 235, 237, 240, 258, 259, 260, 262, 338, 340  
 interviews, 8, 55, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 68, 88, 90, 92, 94, 98, 115, 127, 166, 198, 205, 206, 207, 231, 275, 280, 282, 310, 315  
 intimacy, 8, 9, 10, 14, 23, 27, 39, 40, 42, 43, 46, 47, 52, 53, 54, 65, 69, 89, 90, 91, 108, 113, 117, 118, 119, 120, 122, 123, 124, 125, 127, 131, 132, 133, 134, 137, 145, 163, 164, 168, 170, 171, 172, 176, 179, 180, 186, 198, 225, 228, 230, 242, 244, 250, 252, 258, 273, 274, 286, 295, 296, 298, 300, 301, 305, 311, 314, 317, 322, 326, 333, 335  
 introversion, 68, 124, 125

## J

Jamieson, 14, 23, 40, 42, 44, 45, 49, 58, 70, 124, 313

## K

Kaplan, 51, 313  
Kent, 20, 21, 22, 23, 313  
knowledge of the other, 9, 123, 124, 125, 139, 171, 176,  
185, 224, 227, 250, 258, 295, 334, 335  
Kohn, 119, 120, 314  
Konstan, 18, 19, 314  
Krauss, 222, 314

## L

lack of integration, 289, 290, 302  
lack of time, 160, 192, 234, 235, 237, 244, 248, 252, 253,  
254, 255, 256, 257, 329  
Lasch, 37, 43, 314  
late modernity, 1, 2, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 28,  
29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43,  
44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57,  
61, 63, 64, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 73, 75, 76, 77, 79, 86,  
87, 89, 91, 96, 98, 108, 110, 111, 116, 118, 119, 127,  
147, 148, 159, 163, 164, 165, 175, 177, 182, 183, 187,  
188, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 198, 200, 205, 206, 213,  
214, 220, 223, 224, 225, 226, 228, 229, 230, 231, 234,  
237, 238, 245, 246, 247, 254, 255, 260, 262, 271, 272,  
284, 287, 288, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 302, 303,  
304, 308, 310, 337, 340  
level of familiarity, 176, 179  
Levy, 45, 69, 70, 263, 266, 317  
life on one's own, 33  
life project, 232  
life-trajectories splitting to different social areas, 257  
limited amount of concordance of daily social  
experiences, 225  
limited amounts of time for socializing, 225  
Lincoln, 61, 67, 68, 309, 314  
Lindemann, 114, 314  
linguistic missing link, 295  
linguistic practice, 201, 204, 205  
liquid modernity, 28, 221  
locality-bound neighbourhoods, 21  
logic of a pure relationship, 271  
loneliness, 10, 27, 52, 54, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294,  
302, 312, 321, 323  
long-term principle, 165  
long-termed, 112, 172, 179, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 192,  
274  
loss of community, 48, 314  
love relationship, 58, 76, 160, 328  
Lovin, 51, 315  
lower costs of making arrangements, 208

loyalty, 18, 19, 20, 119  
Luhmann, 26, 42, 47, 89, 194, 314  
Lynch, 19, 20, 23, 130, 315

## M

maintenance of friendship, 10, 11, 112, 113, 116, 117,  
163, 176, 191, 192, 212, 217, 250, 298, 338  
maintenance of remote friendships, 223, 258  
major negative life-event, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283  
management of voluntary ties, 303  
Mathison, 61, 64, 315  
McPherson, 51, 315  
Mead, 143, 315  
meaning of friendship, 44, 51, 70, 95  
mediation of experience, 29, 30, 37, 53, 198  
meeting around the topic of mutual interest, 215  
meeting of new spatially close friends, 215  
methodology of a friendship, 303  
Miladinov, 43, 52, 54, 127, 324  
Misa, 24, 28, 316  
mobile phone, 208, 209, 218, 219, 338  
mobility, 8, 17, 29, 44, 48, 110, 175, 187, 198, 224, 225,  
226, 237, 298, 299  
modernization, 34, 57, 71, 72, 74, 76, 78, 79, 80, 234,  
263, 306, 307  
momentary association, 227  
momentary socializing, 228  
monitoring, 32, 39, 218  
Montaigne, 22, 23, 316  
morality, 23, 36, 41, 47  
MSN, 206, 208, 212, 214, 220, 328  
Mulder, 56, 57, 75, 276, 286, 287, 316  
multiple networks, 194  
multiple selves, 38  
multiplication of friendship, 302  
multiplicity of social settings, 8, 226, 296

## N

new forms of relationships, 52  
non-institutionalized institution, 93  
non-verbal affect transmission, 111  
normative characteristics, 112, 165, 170  
normative characteristics of friendships, 170  
normative regulation, 41  
Norris, 66, 80, 313  
Norton, 25

## O

objective social position, 114, 116, 145, 147  
O'Connor, 14, 44, 47, 93, 97, 147, 148, 316, 321  
offline communication, 214, 222  
Oliker, 23, 24, 25, 27, 47, 317

online maintenance, 10, 206, 249, 250, 262  
 online space of flows, 12, 177, 178, 206, 207, 208, 209,  
 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221,  
 222, 223, 248, 250, 258, 259, 298, 300  
 ontological security, 31, 38, 42  
 organization of a real friendship, 183  
 Oschema, 20, 317

## P

Pahl, 14, 21, 38, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 69, 70, 191, 272, 295,  
 317, 323  
 partial friendships, 194, 199, 200, 238, 240, 299  
 partial understanding, 200, 299  
 partiality, 10, 12, 51, 53, 55, 58, 194, 199, 222, 240, 299,  
 332  
 partiality as a way of relating, 10, 299  
 partiality of friendships, 299  
 patronages, 22  
 Peel, 27, 317  
 Peplau, 65, 66, 308, 326  
 personal decision, 116, 126, 132  
 personal experience, 8, 59, 60, 61, 86, 332, 338, 340  
 personal networks, 49, 69, 98, 195, 279, 287  
 personal relationships, 9, 14, 15, 25, 38, 39, 42, 44, 45,  
 47, 49, 51, 53, 69, 70, 73, 100, 117, 124, 188, 191,  
 195, 254, 255, 272, 274, 284, 286, 305, 308, 313, 316  
 personal trait, 131, 132, 334  
 Pescosolido, 23, 44, 45, 48, 69, 70, 237, 263, 266, 317  
 Peterson, 65, 310  
 Petrić, 57, 71, 72, 75, 76, 84, 324  
 PEW, 216, 219  
 phenomenology, 8, 51, 58, 63, 66, 92, 272, 303  
 phenomenon of constant connection, 211  
 physical proximity, 43, 264, 300, 332, 337  
 physical size of the setting, 300  
 Pierce, 143, 317  
 pluralisation of lifestyles, 32  
 pluralisation of life-worlds, 38, 89, 187, 192, 225, 245  
 plurality of existences, 159  
 political friendships, 20  
 pools of potential real friendships, 228  
 Postman, 205  
 postmaterialistic orientation, 58, 59, 76, 82, 83  
 post-traditional order, 32  
 practices of friendships, 42, 92, 204, 295  
 pre-given relationships, 185  
 principle of momentary instrumentality, 228  
 principles based on instrumentality, 28  
 private, 14, 18, 19, 34, 66, 68, 72, 73, 74, 77, 85, 90, 118,  
 215, 280, 284, 286, 291, 305  
 protective practice, 10, 128, 165, 204  
 public, 14, 18, 20, 21, 25, 32, 66, 72, 73, 74, 75, 90, 322  
 pure relationship, 8, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 58, 100, 117, 123,  
 153, 190, 270, 271, 296, 313

Putnam, 48, 70, 317

## Q

qualitative methods, 55

## R

real friendship, 9, 11, 12, 19, 23, 63, 92, 93, 94, 96, 104,  
 106, 108, 112, 113, 117, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127,  
 139, 140, 151, 153, 154, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168,  
 169, 170, 171, 174, 183, 184, 185, 187, 192, 202, 224,  
 238, 241, 246, 251, 257, 258, 262, 272, 295, 296, 297,  
 299, 301, 303, 335  
 reciprocal reaction, 157  
 reciprocity, 46, 113, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158,  
 159, 161, 162, 165, 195, 301, 303, 333, 334  
 reduced communication, 220  
 reflected-appraisal process, 147  
 Reflexive evaluation, 143  
 reflexive negotiating of friendship processes, 252  
 reflexive project, 36, 39, 231  
 reflexive questioning, 293, 302  
 reflexive social agents, 304  
*reflexivity*, 8, 32, 34, 39, 40, 41, 48, 79, 80, 81, 100, 113,  
 141, 143, 144, 146, 147, 149, 159, 164, 170, 191, 268,  
 269, 270, 273, 281, 288, 293, 295, 296, 334, 335, 336,  
 337  
 reflexivization, 31  
 Relating, 11, 28, 38  
 reliability, 38, 41, 113, 131, 132, 133, 134, 175, 252, 311,  
 335  
 remodulation of a friendship, 58, 262, 302  
 Rener, 2, 3, 52, 54, 55, 73, 191, 232, 317, 318, 325  
 Research questions, 89  
 responsibility to oneself, 36, 41  
 responsibility towards others, 37, 41, 232  
 revision of social practices, 32  
 rhetoric of consumerism, 41  
 Riesman, 37, 321  
 rites of passages, 36  
 Rizman, 71, 321  
 Rosa, 29, 30, 32, 224, 225, 234, 246, 321, 326  
 Rosedale, 54, 322  
 Roseneil, 16, 38, 47, 272, 322  
 routines of individual actors, 88  
 Rubin, 23, 44, 45, 48, 69, 237, 309, 311, 317, 322, 324,  
 325

## S

sampling method, 3, 55  
 scarcity of time, 165, 256, 298  
 Scheuerman, 29, 30, 224, 225, 234, 321, 326  
 second modernity, 28, 32

self, 20, 23, 25, 26, 28, 29, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 46, 48, 52, 53, 54, 56, 65, 68, 73, 74, 76, 77, 78, 82, 83, 84, 85, 100, 101, 104, 114, 116, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 136, 137, 138, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 153, 155, 164, 165, 171, 189, 194, 212, 230, 232, 238, 242, 251, 266, 273, 293, 298, 299, 300, 303, 305, 306, 307, 308, 311, 312, 314, 315, 323, 328, 329, 335

self-actualization, 36, 56, 76, 82, 83, 84

self-concept, 147, 149, 164

self-determination, 25, 35, 39, 48, 101, 116, 164, 165

self-disclosure, 23, 26, 40, 43, 53, 54, 65, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 137, 164, 251, 328, 335

self-esteem, 147

self-identity, 35, 242, 273

self-worth, 149, 164

shared experiences, 46, 63, 96, 103, 106, 108, 109, 125, 163, 164, 176, 181, 184, 224, 227, 250, 251, 258, 298, 332, 333

shared histories, 40

Shared interests, 102, 103, 163, 332, 334

shared journey, 94, 184

shared social links, 109, 163

shared worldview, 99, 100, 101

Shephard, 21, 322

shift in value orientation, 56

short-termed, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 192, 337

Silver, 23, 25, 27, 322

Simmel, 33, 42, 45, 46, 48, 70, 91, 99, 109, 174, 193, 195, 198, 262, 263, 322

simultaneity, 30

sincerity, 20, 109, 113, 115, 116, 126, 135, 136, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 171, 241, 303, 335

situational friendship, 229

Skype, 107, 178, 205, 206, 208, 209, 212, 214, 216, 252, 258, 261, 262, 328, 338, 339

Smith, 25, 51, 309, 315, 316

SMS, 219, 274

social acceleration, 30

social actor, 30, 38, 116, 117, 120, 128, 136, 137, 147, 151, 152, 175, 178, 198, 204, 228, 234, 237, 238, 242, 255

social forms, 8, 14, 18, 32, 33, 47, 49, 53, 70, 272

social friendship, 9, 10, 11, 169, 171, 174, 175, 178, 179, 180, 223, 224, 229, 237, 238, 241, 251, 258, 296, 298, 341

social friendships, 9, 11, 12, 90, 91, 92, 167, 169, 170, 171, 172, 174, 175, 178, 179, 181, 183, 185, 186, 192, 193, 197, 201, 203, 214, 225, 226, 228, 229, 230, 233, 234, 235, 237, 238, 240, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 260, 286, 295, 296, 301, 304, 335, 342

social link, 9, 98, 99, 102, 108, 111, 163, 196, 200, 246

social networks, 33, 48, 201, 206, 237, 263, 273, 317

social performance, 129, 136, 137, 139, 165, 171, 204

social pools, 113, 163, 227

social recognition, 146, 147

social regulation, 23, 93

social setting, 196, 268, 269, 271, 300

social settings of limited temporal duration, 296

social tie, 304

social value, 137, 153, 163

socio-historical context, 14, 44, 45, 71, 75, 85

solidarity, 47, 131, 219, 266

specialized friends, 194, 195, 196

Stake. *See*

Stets, 143, 144, 147, 149, 323

Stivers, 38, 43, 46, 52, 55, 193, 199, 226, 323

Stolorow, 135, 143, 323

strategies of action, 67, 69, 92, 182

Strauss, 60, 64, 323

strength of the bond, 265

structural constraints, 10, 27, 42, 114, 274, 298, 302

structural social changes, 29

structurally defined roles, 138

structured online activity, 210

subjective social position, 114, 145, 164, 314

substantial characteristics, 113, 295

subversive relation, 22

superficial, 43, 90, 91, 102, 104, 112, 123, 139, 140, 164, 170, 173, 174, 197, 202, 217, 218, 230, 232, 234, 235, 236, 244, 250, 297, 299, 341

support, 3, 10, 12, 16, 25, 31, 47, 49, 58, 79, 101, 113, 115, 131, 132, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 165, 170, 171, 172, 194, 206, 244, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 293, 294, 295, 296, 301, 302, 303, 317, 324, 327, 330, 332, 335, 336, 337, 341, 343

survival strategies, 35

Swidler, 60, 88, 91, 324

## Š

Štulhofer, 3, 43, 52, 54, 72, 127, 307, 323, 324

## T

Tactfulness, 128, 334

Tadmor, 21, 324

taken-for-granted routines, 88

talking to friends through online tools, 214

tangible forms of need, 287

technologization of everyday life, 29

temporal desynchronization, 251, 252, 257, 290

temporality, 104, 120, 227, 234, 254, 296, 297

termination of usage, 211

terror of intimacy, 43

therapeutic culture, 54, 284

tie of durable nature, 183

time-organization of a relationship, 177

time-space compression, 30

time-space distanciation, 29  
time-space shift, 30  
tit-for-tat, 154, 158, 165  
Tomić Koludrović, 71, 72, 74, 75, 76, 85, 87, 324  
Tönnies, 23, 25, 70, 324  
traditional guiding norms, 31  
transition to adulthood, 56, 57, 71, 287  
true friendship, 19, 22, 241  
Trust, 23, 38, 40, 117, 118, 119, 120, 122, 164, 310, 314, 343  
Turtle, 29, 210, 211, 219, 325  
Turner, 25, 312, 325  
two-person sociability, 99, 103, 109, 111, 163  
type of loneliness, 290, 293  
types of friendships, 17, 22, 64, 67, 69, 89, 90, 91, 166, 182, 225, 262, 272, 299

## U

Ule, 52, 56, 73, 77, 78, 79, 83, 232, 317, 325  
uncertainty, 8, 10, 16, 37, 39, 41, 52, 53, 54, 279, 286, 298, 301, 303  
uncertainty in friendships, 303  
understanding, 9, 46, 61, 63, 68, 69, 70, 113, 134, 135, 144, 155, 165, 170, 191, 195, 199, 200, 253, 255, 256, 295, 297, 298, 299, 302, 330, 341  
unfavourable social conditions of late modernity, 298  
unidimensional phenomenon, 89  
uniqueness of a friend, 174  
unreliability, 133  
until further notice, 40

usage of technology, 223

## V

Van den Berg, 43, 193  
Van Dijk, 210, 216, 326  
Vaughan, 151, 307  
Veniegas, 65, 326  
vibe, 111, 125  
virtual reality, 219, 220, 221  
voluntariness, 93, 162, 298, 303  
voluntaristic relation, 58

## W

Weber, 28, 33  
Wellman, 14, 38, 43, 44, 45, 48, 49, 69, 89, 94, 96, 110, 194, 195, 198, 237, 263, 265, 266, 270, 273, 276, 279, 282, 283, 287, 300, 312, 316, 326, 327  
Wortley, 43, 49, 273, 276, 287, 327

## Y

Yalom, 291, 292, 327

## Z

zombie categories, 33  
zone of everyday emotional reflexivity, 295

## APPENDIX A: The questionnaire

(Questions marked with red were during the research rendered as not significant/not yielding relevant information/results for the subject of the research and were thus rendered unnecessary and excluded from the analysis)

1. Can you tell me about your life in short? In few sentences...

2. Let's address friendship now. What are, in your opinion, main characteristics of friendship?

How much do you see each of these characteristics around you?

3. What do you think, how do people today experience friendship? What do they see when they say that someone is their friend?

4. In general, do you think that friendships are long-term or short-term relations?

5. Should friendships be equal, in terms of friends equally giving and receiving?

6. What about self-disclosure in friendship? How important is it that friends open up to each other?

7. Do you maybe talk/associate with different people in regard to different things? (If the respondent doesn't understand the question -> For example, with one you talk about sports, with the other about intellectual stuff, with the third about movies...)

8. Do you think that one opens up more in friendship or love relationship?

9. In which relationship do you open more, in love or friendship relation?

10. Let us now talk a little bit about these new technologies that people use in communicating with others. That means, internet tools...concretely Facebook, Skype, MSN and so on...Did it, in your opinion, somehow influence friendship relations and if yes, how?

Do you use Facebook?

When it comes to communicating with friends, what do you use Facebook for?

Do you use something else besides Facebook? How/for what?



Do you have any friends who don't live near you and with whom you communicate through the internet often or more often than with friends who live nearby?

Have you ever formed a friendship through internet? Through what/describe?

11. If you'd have to name few things that mostly influenced the way you see a friendship today, what would those be?

12. Can you explain how each of these influenced your opinion on friendship?

13. Do you see a difference between how you used to experience friendship when you were younger and today? For what did you use friendships then and for what do you use them now?

[if respondent is from smaller social settings] Do you see any differences between friendships in Zagreb and friendships in [respondent's place of origin]?

14. (this question is formulated on the account of the previous responses) How much do you consider friendships important in life? / That means, you consider friendships important in life? Why/Can you explain?

15. Which principles do you use in relating towards friends?

Do you think that friendship somehow influences our sense of worth/self-respect?

16. Looking at your own interest vs. altruism, how should that look in friendship, how much should there be of the one and how much of the other?

How important is that to you? Do you often question this in friendships?

17. Has your list of friends changed in the last 5 years? Has it changed significantly? If YES, why/how?

18. People today often complain about the lack of time, the speeding up of life, a number of obligations...How much do you see that influencing friendships? How much does it influence friendships in your life?

For the employed ones; Has your experience of friendship somehow changed since you are employed?

19. Do you see familial relations or friendships as more secure?

20. Do you have a partner? Does a relationship somehow influence your relations with friends?

21. To whom do you think that people turn today when they have serious problems? To family, friends or someone else?

Who would you turn to in these situations?

-emotional problems (in the sense of needing of advice about something)

-financial aid

-in the case of serious illness (for the emotional support)

22. Did you ever experience of friends not being able to help you and you having to turn to someone else?/ where you thought you should turn to someone other than friends? Can you describe the experience more thoroughly?

How come you turned to someone else, and not friends?

23. Do you ever feel like your friends don't understand you?

Do you ever feel lonely in spite of friendships?

If YES, when? Describe.

24. What do you think is the most important thing you've learned about friendships through years?

### **ADD-ON**

1. In your opinion, what is most important in life?

2. Do you think that, generally speaking, people can expect help from other people or that they should rely on themselves?

3. Do you consider women as capable as men?

4. What is most important to you when it comes to your (future) job/profession?

5. Do you personally consider religion important in life?

6. Do you find money or personal fulfillment more important in life? (If not understanding the question/being ambivalent in the answer -> If you could choose between having a lot of money but doing a job you don't like and between having little money and doing the job you love, what would you choose?

7. How are people in general? Can one trust them or should one be careful in dealing with them?

8. In what kind of society would you like your children to live in?

**APPENDIX B: Practices of friendship; partiality of late modern friendships; perceived difference between friendships in smaller and bigger social settings; friendship and support MAXQDA code system**

**Legend:**

MAIN CATEGORY	[number of...]
<b>SUBCATEGORY</b>	
<b>Dimensions of subcategory</b>	
<b>CODE</b>	
<b>SUB-CODES</b>	
<b>OWN = in personal experience of the respondent</b>	
<b>DISC = respondent talking at the level of the discourse</b>	

Code System [1429]

**PRACTICES OF FRIENDSHIP IN LATE MODERNITY [0]**

**CLOSE/REAL FRIENDSHIP [0]**

**FORMATION [0]**

**PHYSICAL FOCI OF ACTIVITY [0]**

**SHARED EDUCATIONAL/PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND [6]**

Shared educational settings [9]

**SHARED SOCIAL NETWORKS [3]**

**SHARED SOCIAL LINK - NON-PHYSC FOCI OF ACT [3]**

**SHARED WORLDVIEW [18]**

...but also possible with different political and religious vie [4]

...also different possible if not forced on a friend [2]

**SHARED INTERESTS [9]**

Shared lifestyles [1]

Shared problems [2]

Shared interests [1]

**SHARED EXPERIENCES [19]**

**TEMPORALITY [9]**

**TIME [10]**

...trust established with time and shared experiences [2]

ability to predict someone's reactions [1]

..differentiating between real and other fr [2]

...intensively spent time [2]

physical proximity [1]

or intensively spent shorter periods [3]

a friend with whom I grew up [8]

different expectations [2]

...special kind of trust [1]

**CLICK [11]**

..as precondition for formation [2]

**TYPE [0]**

**OLD FRIENDS [1]**

Knowledge of the other [1]

**MAINTENANCE [0]**

**PERSONAL AGENCY [0]**

**PERSONAL CHOICE [11]**

**EFFORT [11]**

Self-sacrifice [1]

- Characteristics of tolerance [3]
  - patience [1]
  - readiness to forgive [1]
  - ..greater with real friends [1]
- Attention [1]
- Continuity [1]
- TRUST [23]
  - LOYALTY [9]
    - definition [2]
      - emotional connotation [2]
    - ...as precondition of intimacy [9]
      - implicit [1]
    - ...as security mechanism [8]
    - ...time needed to establish it [2]
  - ...built through situations in which you see how other function [1]
    - Stable identity [1]
- Connection [1]
- Aristotelian values [3]
- INTIMACY [30]
  - CLOSENESS [6]
    - shared experiences [1]
    - you go together parallel [2]
    - ..in the sense of putting one's intimacy at other's disposal [1]
      - ...distinguishes between friendship and other kinds [1]
    - definition [4]
      - ...no judgement [1]
      - ...at least the possibility of opening of that intimacy [2]
    - differentia specifica between real and other friendships [9]
    - ...friendship as psychotherapy [3]
    - Depth of the relationship [3]
      - Deeper conversations [3]
    - Knowledge of the other [13]
    - Different importance among genders [1]
    - Self-disclosure [13]
      - ...not important [2]
        - INT COND when the person is introvert [2]
    - ..differentiates friends from other kinds of relationships [1]
  - LIMITS [1]
    - ...with real/closest friends closest to what one keeps to oneself [1]
      - TACTFULNESS/SITUATIONAL [5]
        - more needed in strangers context [1]
      - ACCEPTANCE [2]
        - ...not necessarily 100% [12]
          - ..as long as the intention is benevolent [2]
      - Allocation of intimacy [2]
        - ...then in need of professional help [1]
      - Smaller part of intimacy kept for oneself [1]
- Communication [3]
  - ...easy flow of conversation [1]
- FUN [8]
  - friendship fosters fun [1]
    - emotional contagious buildup [1]
  - as subjectively defined [1]
  - linked with reciprocity [2]
  - ..not being drained [2]
  - contagious build up of energy as fun which friendship creates [3]
    - as similar interests [1]
    - precondition for friendship [4]
- TACTFULNESS [2]
  - linked to acceptance also [2]

Shared interests [1]  
**FEELING PLEASANTLY WITH THEM [3]**  
     ...that they don't drain you [1]  
**FEELING OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR A FRIEND [3]**  
**RELIABILITY [6]**  
     ...as personal trait [1]  
     lack of reliability in everyday fr pract tolerated to some ext [3]  
     ...more practical than emotional [2]  
 more important in other relations which lack trust and intimac [1]  
     ...in the general sense of being there when needed [14]  
**AFFECTIVITY [3]**  
**RESPECT [5]**  
**AUTHENTICITY [20]**  
     **ACCEPTANCE [7]**  
         No judgement [2]  
         ..linked to the knowledge of the other [1]  
         spontaneity [1]  
         ...you have to be true to yourself first [1]  
         ...one can be more oneself in friendship than in other social s [1]  
         important because you loose more energy if not authentic [1]  
         ...linked with acceptance [2]  
         definition [4]  
         ...as not chaing of oneself because of friendship [1]  
**REFLEXIVITY [5]**  
     Feedback reflexivity [21]  
     Affirmational reflexivity [18]  
         Affirmation [1]  
         Identity [1]  
**SINCERITY [32]**  
     Limited by tactfulness [6]  
         Tactfulness even more crucial with strangers [1]  
     Limited by Acceptance [4]  
**BRUTAL [16]**  
     **INTENTION Benevolence [3]**  
**BENEVOLENCE [10]**  
     not unconditional [1]  
     why it is important [1]  
     caring for the other [3]  
**SUPPORT [15]**  
     in the sense of affirmation of one's choices and decisions [2]  
     linked with acceptance [1]  
     not unconditional [1]  
     implicit [2]  
     tangible [4]  
     emotional [7]  
         implicit [2]  
     ...general [7]  
     ...in crisis [11]  
**UNDERSTANDING [11]**  
**CONTINUITY [1]**  
**RECIPROCITY [11]**  
     No reciprocity= using [4]  
     In different areas [2]  
     Ideally yes, but in practice hard to achieve [11]  
         **DIST COND Effort [1]**  
     Important but implicit [10]  
         Comes to surface when disturbed [11]  
     In the long run [7]  
     In the sense of equal giving and taking needed for friendship [10]  
         ...if not existing the friendship ceases [2]

- Reflexive about it [9]
- Situational [7]
  - Not necessarily in the same areas [2]
  - Based on need [1]
- Very hard to keep strict score [4]
- Very important [3]
- SOCIAL FRIENDSHIP [0]**
  - DESIGNATION/DEFINITION [0]**
    - doesn't consider social friendships friends [2]
    - difference between a friend and an acquaintance [1]
    - not high on levels of friendship [1]
    - better acquaintance [2]
    - "friend" [9]
  - CHARACTERISTICS [0]**
    - CONTENT [0]**
      - NO REAL FRIENDSHIP CHARACTER NECESSARY [0]**
        - reflexivity does not matter as much [1]
        - less obligation [1]
        - no reliability [1]
        - no trust [1]
        - competition possible (not benevolent per se) [3]
          - competition [1]
        - No intimacy in the sense of self-disclosure [12]
        - Don't expect support from them [3]
        - no authenticity necessarily expected [4]
        - not necessarily similar worldview [1]
        - no sincerity necessarily expected [2]
        - no knowledge of the other [1]
      - ORIENTED TOWARDS SOCIALIZING [22]**
        - Type of interaction [0]
          - Flow of information [5]
          - Superficial conversations [3]
        - fun as key feature [1]
        - Pleasantly spent time [5]
      - potential source of real friendship [3]
      - Competition [1]
    - CONTEXTUALITY VS. SUBSTANTIALITY [20]**
      - benefit oriented [1]
      - Organized around activity/benefit [6]
    - TEMPORAL ORGANIZATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP [0]**
      - not with you in important life events [2]
      - Occasional encounters [9]
        - ...no necessary continuity [1]
      - Random encounters [2]
  - TYPES [0]**
    - FRIENDS FROM SMALL TOWN [1]**
      - Familiarity [1]
    - SITUATIONAL FRIENDSHIPS [5]**
      - possibility of long-term [2]
    - CONTEXTUAL FRIENDSHIPS [4]**
      - short-term [5]
        - INT COND If they grow to real for long term [1]
        - but in that phase spending more time with them than others [2]
    - SEASONAL [5]**
      - short-term [1]
    - COLLEGE FRIENDS [5]**
    - WORK-FRIENDSHIPS [6]**
    - Differentiating between real/close and social friends [37]
  - SUPPORT [0]**
    - Emotional [0]

**Regular emotional support** [0]  
 Also partner and only partner [12]  
 Not in everyday contact with friends [1]  
 Friends [39]  
 Noone [1]  
 Family [5]  
 Sibiling [1]  
 Both friends and family [5]

**Financial** [0]  
**DOESN'T KNOW** [1]  
**BOTH FRIENDS AND FAMILY** [3]  
**WOULD HANDLE ALONE** [1]  
**FAMILY** [35]  
**AND PARTNER** [3]  
 because they live together and she earns money [1]  
 because of social stigma [1]  
 because parents earn money [3]  
 because it's their job to support me [7]  
 against the spirit of friendship [5]  
 due to common household residence [2]  
 For smaller amounts friends [8]  
 because friends don't earn money [6]

**FRIENDS** [7]  
 because relations disrupted [0]  
 Because person autonomous, employed, has disrupted rel with f [1]  
 Because family is scattered around, close family not present [1]  
 used to turn to family when friends didn't have [1]  
 I know that friend has money so it's not a problem [1]  
 Friends work while family financial problems [1]  
 Because those are already years when embarrassed to ask parents [3]

**Negative life-event** [0]  
**BIGGER EMOTIONAL SUPPORT** [0]  
 Primary family [0]  
 Family [14]  
 Primary family then friends [9]  
 Both family and friends equally [10]  
 Friends [12]  
 Partner [1]  
 Partner and family [1]  
 Partner and friends [2]  
 Alone [2]

**EXPERIENCE** [0]  
**OWN** [0]  
 For emotional support [0]  
 Friends [2]  
 Both in case of parents' death [0]  
 Parents [4]  
 To experts [4]  
 Priest [1]  
 Friend had negative life event [0]  
 Provided emotional support [1]  
 Provided care [1]  
 For reflexivity [0]  
 Friends [1]  
 For care [0]  
 Friends [1]  
 Extended family [1]  
 Parents [3]  
 Care in the case of serious health crisis [0]  
 Friends [1]



- Parents live far away [2]
  - EXP [0]
    - Friends offered emotional support, family care [1]
  - Partner [0]
  - Family [13]
    - or friends when family unavailable [2]
- Tangible [0]
  - Friends [3]
    - Parents live far away [1]
    - Relationship with family dysfunctional [1]
- EMPTY SPOTS WITHIN FRIENDSHIP SUPPORT [0]
- HANDLING IT ALONE [10]
- DISC [1]
- LONELINESS [0]
  - LACK OF ROMANTIC PARTNER [4]
  - INDIVIDUALIZING/ED EXPERIENCE [5]
    - Having a family [3]
    - Illness in family [1]
  - EXISTENTIAL LONELINESS [7]
  - LACK OF INTEGRATION [0]
    - Different city [1]
    - Not working [3]
  - Other people doing something [1]
  - When friendship does not function [1]
  - When roommate leaves town [1]
  - Lack of agency in demanding support [1]
  - Way of life in late modernity [1]
- PARTIALITY [0]
  - Generally no [5]
  - Most partial few real friends wholesome [22]
    - Friends from childhood and high school; special category [4]
  - Generally yes [23]
- SMALLER SETTINGS/BIGGER SETTINGS [0]
  - No perceived difference [1]
  - SMALLER SETTINGS [0]
    - Familiarity [2]
    - Networks more dense [2]
    - Higher regulation [3]
    - In different life phase and then based on socializing [0]
    - Difference in education [1]
    - MORE ORIENTED TOWARD ONE ANOTHER [2]
      - Maintained out of habit [6]
      - Pre-given in certain sense [3]
      - Not necessarily similar in interests, worldviews [2]
      - Cond more by physical proximity [8]
    - Higher sturdiness [3]
  - BIGGER SETTINGS [0]
    - Networks more satellite-like [1]
    - Harder to integrate if not raised here [1]
    - More short-termed, fragmented [1]
    - Personal agency in choosing friends [1]
      - Effort in maintenance [1]
      - Bigger choice [3]
      - Emphasis on reflexivity [1]

Sets [0]

## APPENDIX C: Mediating friendships: friendships and technology

### MAXQDA code system

#### Legend:

MAIN CATEGORY	[number of...]
<b>SUBCATEGORY</b>	
<b>Dimensions of subcategory</b>	
<b>CODE</b>	
<b>SUB-CODES</b>	
<b>EXP OWN= in personal experience of the respondent</b>	
<b>EXP OTH= respondent talking about the experience of other people</b>	
<b>DISC = level of the discourse</b>	
<b>INT COND = intervening condition</b>	

#### Code System [334]

##### MAINTENANCE OF ALREADY EXISTING FRIENDSHIPS

##### EXPERIENCED AS POSITIVE [0]

##### MADE EASIER [2]

##### FACEBOOK [0]

##### SHARED ONLINE ACTIVITY [11]

Achieve closeness writing through Facebook [1]

##### STAYING IN TOUCH WITH REMOTE FRIENDS [8]

Seeing what happens in their lives (FB) [17]

I wouldn't have time for each separately [2]

Sharing what happens in mine [6]

Communication with friends (Face, Skype and mail) [20]

##### INSTRUMENTAL USE [0]

##### MAKING ARRANGEMENTS [17]

Availability of all [8]

Makes arrangements easier [5]

##### RELATED TO COLLEGE [4]

##### FREE MESSAGES [6]

When I don't have credit on mobile phone [3]

I don't have credit on mobile phone [1]

Not to spend money on mobile phone [5]

When not having mobile phone [1]

##### GROUP COMMUNICATION [17]

To not forget birthdays [1]

##### KEEPING IN TOUCH [0]

EXP own [18]

##### CONSTANTLY CONNECTED [2]

Substitutes f-2-f meetings [0]

COND Working [0]

INT COND Online maintenance of friendship [0]

Keeping updated through Facebook [3]

Communication through internet tools [5]

Longer talks with friends over sof [9]

DISC [1]

##### ...CONTACT WITH REMOTE FRIENDS [18]

Easier maintenance [3]

- ...FORMING AND MAINTENANCE OF WEAK TIES [0]
  - EXP own [17]
  - EXP Oth [1]
  - DISC [2]
- ...COMMUNICATION MORE EFFORTLESS AND THUS EASIER [2]
  - Less time needs to be spend on maintenance [1]
    - Less effort [1]
      - Easier handling of problematic friend [1]
- ...FORMING OF NEW FRIENDSHIPS [3]
  - informations more easily available [0]
  - 'checking' people [2]
- FORMING OF FRIENDSHIPS THROUGH SOF [0]
  - EXP own [13]
    - Does not differentiate between online and offline friendships [2]
  - DISC [0]
    - Opened the possibility for friendships outside of spatial zone [1]
  - Skype closest to non-virtual comm [2]
  - Finding of friends from childhood [3]
  - People more connected because they hear from each other [1]
- NEGATIVE [0]
  - INTERNET REPLACES FACE TO FACE COMM [0]
    - EXP own [5]
    - EXP oth [2]
    - DISC [7]
  - SUPERFICIALITY [1]
    - DISC [7]
      - ...if you don't know when to stop [1]
    - EXP oth [1]
    - EXP own [6]
      - Comm made banal [1]
  - THE ILLUSION OF THE RELATION MAINTENANCE [2]
    - People have harder time defining friends [2]
    - Less effort for maintenance [0]
      - Birthday congratulating effortless [2]
    - False closeness [2]
      - "Collecting" friends [1]
      - Easier to write something than in person [1]
  - LACK OF CORPORALITY [9]
    - People not present [1]
      - Come for coffee and then talk about online [1]
      - Check in [1]
    - Self-presentation [1]
      - Hypocrisy [1]
      - DISC [3]
    - Consciousness-changing [1]
      - Creates addiction [2]
    - Conflict with friend over FB [1]
  - FB reality spills over to RL [1]
  - UNSATISFIED WITH FB BUT STILL USES IT [5]
  - MARGINALIZED FOR NOT HAVING FACEBOOK [2]
  - DOUBLE PHENOMENON [5]
    - Practical but alienating [5]
- Sets [0]

# **APPENDIX D: Dynamic aspect of friendships in late modernity, linguistic ‘emptying’ of the word ‘friend’ MAXQDA code system**

**Legend:**

MAIN CATEGORY	[number of...]
<b>SUBCATEGORY</b>	
<b>Dimensions of subcategory</b>	
<b>CODE</b>	
<b>SUB-CODES</b>	
<b>INT COND = intervening condition</b>	
<b>CONSQ = consequence</b>	
<b>EXP OWN= in personal experience of the respondent</b>	
<b>EXP OTH= respondent talking about the experience of other people</b>	
<b>DISC = level of the discourse</b>	

**Code System [435]**

difference between using and momentary instrumentality [2]  
 everything is superficial and so are friendships [2]  
 going out related to friendships nowadays,before it wasn't [1]  
 Easily slips into habit [2]  
 Fake friends using each other [1]  
 TOO GREAT EXPECTATIONS OF FRIENDSHIPS [1]  
     ...minor things get angry [1]  
 NOT TO BE ALONE [1]  
 ALLOCATION OF INTIMACY [1]  
 NOT BEING ABLE TO DISTINGUISH REAL FROM SOCIAL FRIENDSHIPS [5]  
     ...word friend a whore [2]  
     Facebook enforces terminology of "friends" on everyone [6]  
     Linguistic difference more than real [18]  
         Protective practice [5]  
     EXP own [2]  
     DISC [8]  
 DYNAMIC ANALYSIS [0]  
     REAL FRIENDSHIPS [0]  
         LIFE SPLIT US APART [1]  
             Social friendships [2]  
                 INT COND Type of friendship [2]  
             LSUA Real friendships [17]  
                 Split of life-trajectories [8]  
                     change of life phase [2]  
                 CONSQ Real friendship grows towards social [2]  
                 In spite of online communication [5]  
                     It's not the same anymore [2]  
                 INT COND Type of communication [1]  
                 INT COND Personal effort [8]  
                     Online maintenance [2]  
                     ...you meet new people who are maybe more suitable [5]  
         BAD EXPERIENCES WITH FRIENDSHIPS [0]  
         BREAK OF TRUST [3]

CONSQ Shifting real friends to social friends [3]  
 IND COND UFN EXPERIENCE [1]  
 UFN Experience [9]  
     Lack of support [2]  
         Focused on themselves [2]  
 CONSQ Distress [1]  
 EXP Oth [1]  
     CONSQ More careful [2]  
 INT COND Other friends being there [1]  
     CONSQ Did not experience shaking of trust [1]  
 CONSQ Expectations of friendship rose [4]  
 CONSQ Short-term lost of trust [5]  
 INT COND Lack of personal effort [7]  
     CONSQ Better evaluation [3]  
     CONSQ Being less trusting onwards [2]  
     CONSQ Moving from real to social [1]  
 INT COND Utilizing him/her [4]  
     CONSQ Evaluating better [3]  
     CONSQ Less trust closing up [2]  
 FRIEND GOING WITH YOU THROUGH LIFE [1]  
 LACK OF TIME [9]  
     INT COND Everyday life taking too much energy [5]  
         Less energy for socializing [4]  
         CONSQ Re-evaluation of costs/benefits of friendship

[1]

On Balkan we don't have that problem :) [1]  
 INT COND PERSONAL EFFORT [17]  
 CONSQ Less time for people [14]  
     INT COND Satellite friends [1]  
     INT COND They often socialize [1]  
     CONSQ You grow apart [5]  
     INT COND Real friends more often, superficial ones less [2]  
 CONSQ Time spent with friends more interesting [4]  
     INT COND Because you have new things to talk about [2]  
 CONSQ Being able to spend less time with friends [5]  
     INT COND Make up for it on weekends [5]  
         CONSQ No significant impact [2]  
     INT COND Online maintenance [7]  
         CONSQ No significant impact [3]  
     INT COND Mutual understanding [5]  
         CONSQ No significant impact [2]  
 "LEAVING" A FRIEND FOR A PARTNER [0]  
     EXP own [6]  
     DISC [2]  
 SOCIAL FRIENDSHIPS [0]  
     Int Cond MOMENTARY INSTRUMENTALITY [19]  
         Experienced positively [2]  
         INT COND Context ceases.... [8]  
             CONSQ So does the friendship [8]  
             CONSQ Realizing it was just social friendship [3]  
             often spend more time with people who are not your friends [2]  
             potential SOURCE of REAL FRIENDSHIPS [3]  
             INT COND Need for socialization in certain context [3]  
                 CONSQ...you get to know them in that way [1]  
     INT COND INSTRUMENTALITY [5]  
         SITUATIONAL FRIENDSHIPS [7]  
             benefiting from them in terms of shared activity [3]  
     Int Cond FAST PACE OF LIFE [6]  
         ...preventing real friendships [3]  
     Int Cond PLURALITY OF EXPERIENCES PREVENTING REAL

## **FRIENDSHIPS [3]**

- Compartmentalizing [1]
  - linked to identity questioning [2]
  - some find it positive [2]
- Int Cond Area of less effort [0]
  - DISSOLUTION Social friendships [7]
    - you meet new people [1]
  - INT COND Usually break [2]
- Int Cond **FOCUS ON ONESELF [10]**
  - Relational minimalism [1]
  - CONSQ You start spending time with someone more effort [1]
  - EXP own [2]
- Development [3]
  - DISCOURSE Lack of time [1]
  - Facebook allows/fosters social friendships [3]
- Competition [3]
  - Competition preventing friendships [2]
- IND COND UTILITARISM [9]**
  - IND COND Individualistic/capitalistic ethos [6]
- Benefiting [1]
- INT COND Don't have enough energy [2]**
  - CONSQ Most friendships social, little real ones [2]

## **Sets [0]**

## APPENDIX E: Postmaterial orientation add-on code system

### Code System [474]

#### OTHER PEOPLE TRUST OR BE CAREFUL WITH THEM [0]

Doesn't know [1]

Trust [16]

Be careful [29]

Both trust and be careful [4]

#### MONEY OR PERSONAL FULFILLMENT [0]

Personal fulfillment but money is not unimportant [1]

Personal fulfillment but money for survival [7]

Money [1]

I need a job [1]

Both [2]

Personal fulfillment [38]

#### RELIGION IMPORTANT IN LIFE [0]

Doesn't know, Catholic by tradition but doesn't like Church [1]

YES [8]

practical [3]

dependent on the need [1]

but no longer practical [1]

Level of the principle and not church [0]

more principle like than religious practice [1]

I don't go to church [1]

not in good relations with church [1]

I believe but less of practical believer [1]

but don't support everything the Church says [1]

NO [41]

Spirituality [5]

Agnostic [4]

believe in science instead [1]

Universal principles [1]

#### MOST IMPORTANT IN (FUTURE) EMPLOYMENT [1]

To be my own boss [1]

Dynamic component [0]

To meet new people [1]

To be dynamic [5]

To present a challenge [1]

Not to be prosaic [1]

Not to be droningly [2]

Not to be boring [1]

Interesting [3]

Creativity [2]

Not 9-5 [1]

The possibility of progress [3]

Thrill [1]

Altruistic component [9]

Self-actualization prospects [0]

Growth through the job [4]

Learning [1]

Fulfillment [8]

Satisfaction with a job [2]

Not to smother me [5]

To contain many of my interests [1]

To love what I do [6]

Not to be from purely financial reasons [1]

To make me happy [1]

Social prospects [0]

Success [2]

- To be respected [2]
- Survival aspects [0]
  - Financial aspects [1]
  - To be in profession [1]
  - First to have one [1]
  - To be able to survive with it [9]
  - That it is paid correctly [5]
  - To have enough money for what I want [1]
  - Adequately paid [2]
- Work environment [14]
- WOMEN EQUALLY CAPABLE AS MEN [0]
  - Yes, except in physical terms [6]
  - Yes [42]
  - They can be [2]
- EXPECT HELP FROM OTHERS/RELY ON ONESELF [0]
  - Both equally [1]
  - Can expect [25]
    - But not depend on them [3]
  - Primarily on oneself [4]
    - ...and on friends [4]
  - Rely on oneself [19]
- THE MOST IMPORTANT IN LIFE [0]
  - RELATIONSHIPS [10]
    - Partner [1]
    - Commitment [1]
    - Friends [13]
    - Family [10]
    - Love [9]
    - To have someone to rely on [1]
  - SELF-ACTUALIZATION [12]
    - Happiness [8]
      - Feeling of satisfaction [1]
      - Inner peace [2]
      - To arrange your life according to what suits you [1]
      - Self-fulfillment [2]
    - Doing what you love [5]
  - General principles [0]
    - Sincerity [1]
    - Moral [1]
    - Not treating others in the way you wouldn't want to be treated [2]
  - Career [1]
    - Success [1]
  - MATERIAL [0]
    - Money [2]
    - Career [1]
      - ...here that would mean to survive, not to be hungry and separate from parents [1]
    - Money in the survival sense [3]
  - HEALTH [7]
  - Youth [1]
  - Stability [1]
- Sets [0]



## **Nove oblike razmerij in njihove posledice: prijateljstvo med mladimi v pozni moderni (daljši povzetek v slovenskem jeziku)**

Prijateljstvo je šele nedavno pritegnilo zanimanje sociologije. Sociologija, ki se je ukvarjala z makro strukturami družbe, je prijateljstvo skupaj z drugimi osebnimi odnosi ponavadi zapostavljala in ga prepuščala zanimanju socialnih psihologov in filozofov, kar se je izražalo z omejenim sociološkim gradivom o tej temi (Adams in Allan 1998; Blumstein in Kollock 1988; Budgeon 2006; Pahl 2000). Bistven poudarek pristopa, s katerim družbena teorija obravnava prijateljstvo, je v družbeni ugnezenosti osebnih odnosov. To pomeni, da preučuje njihovo umeščenost v določene družbeno-kulturne strukture, s katerimi naj bi bili do neke mere določeni. Ta pristop k prijateljstvu se od psihološkega razlikuje po tem, da se posveča dvojni naravi sklepanja, ohranjanja in prekinjanja prijateljstva, ne da bi se ukvarjal z njegovim družbeno-zgodovinskim kontekstom. Sociološke obravnave osebnih odnosov so se dosedaj v največji meri osredotočale na romantična partnerstva in so bile ponavadi zgolj teoretske, brez empiričnega preverjanja. Poleg tega se maloštevilni viri v nastajajočem raziskovalnem polju družbenih omrežij najpogosteje osredotočajo na oblike prijateljstva in njegovo ugnezenost v družbeni strukturi (Fischer 1982; Wellman 1979; 1998), le redko se posvečajo njegovi vsebini. Namen te disertacije je ugotoviti tako obliko kot vsebino sodobnega prijateljstva ter hkrati oceniti njegov dinamični vidik v družbenem kontekstu pozne moderne. Obenem je v socioloških študijah pomen pojma 'prijatelj' v veliki meri zapostavljen. S pričujočo raziskavo nameravam prispevati k razumevanju tega pojma.

Izhodišče te raziskave je bilo, da je mogoče bolj poglobljeno razumeti osebne odnose, če so ti umeščeni v družbeni kontekst določenega časovnega obdobja, v katerem se odvijajo. Zato so v tej nalogi spremembe v makro strukturi pozno moderne družbe povezane z mikrostrukturami, kot so se odražale v osebnih izkušnjah mladih.

Čeprav ga razumemo kot moderni pojav, je prijateljstvo kot afektivno razmerje obstajalo skozi zgodovino v mnogih oblikah, vendar se je njegova družbena oblika razlikovala od moderne. Prijateljstvo kot zasebno civilno razmerje, podobno modernemu, je skupaj z bolj javno obliko razmerja obstajalo že v svetu antične Grčije. Od modernega prijateljstva se je razlikovalo po tem, da se je osredotočalo na vrlino in ne na prijateljeve posebne lastnosti ter da razkrivanje intimnosti ni bil predpogoj za razmerje (Konstan 1997). Prijateljstvo je v antični Grčiji in Rimu obstajalo tako v zasebnem kot javnem pomenu; v prvem je bilo zasebno razmerje, ki je temeljilo na naklonjenosti in zvestobi, v drugem je bilo bolj instrumentalno razmerje v političnem pomenu besede (Konstan 1997). Vse od antike do renesanse lahko opazamo manjko razprav o prijateljstvu kot civilnem razmerju (Oshema 2005). Dokazano je, da so v srednjem veku obstajala nesorodstvena osebna razmerja, vendar se je o teh govorilo v okvirih sosesk, prepletenih z lokalnim okoljem (Durrant 2005; Oschema 2005;

Tadmor 2005). Od modernega prijateljstva so se potemtakem razlikovala po stopnji osebnega angažmaja pri njihovem spletnju, saj so bila na nek način predoločena in niso bila samostojno izbrana. A to ne pomeni, da se niso občasno spletle vezi, ki bi jih lahko razumeli kot prijateljstva v modernem pomenu besede (Durrant 2005), čeprav niso bila prepoznana kot taka in v javnem govoru niso obstajala. Da bi koncept prijateljstva začel pridobivati svoj sodobni pomen, so bila potrebna še nadaljnja tri stoletja. Proces je pospešilo prevajanje besedil antičnih avtorjev ter širjenje pismenosti in ljudskega slovstva (James in Kent 2009). To je potem pripomoglo k razširjanju individualističnih načinov mišljenja, kar je bil tudi predpogoj za fenomen prijateljstva. Vse bolj razvita industrializacija in urbanizacija je v 18. stoletju vodila k nastanku močnih mestnih središč, v katerih so nove oblike povezovanj, kot so različna združenja, delavski sindikati, diskusijske skupine ali kavarne, spodbudile različna politična in družbena prepričanja in s tem tudi različne odnose do družabnosti (Brodie in Caine 2009). Da bi se razmerja, ki temeljijo na osebni izbiri in so osvobojena tradicionalnih strukturnih omejitev, šele lahko pojavila, je morala družba najprej postati dovolj diferencirana (Luhmann 1998). Prijateljstvo v moderni obliki na podlagi osebne izbire in brez razrednih strukturnih omejitev se je torej pojavilo šele na začetku 20. stoletja.

Če želimo razumeti odnose v pozni moderni, moramo najprej razumeti družbene mehanizme pozne moderne. Teoretski okvir, v katerega ta študija umešča posameznikova razmerja v sodobni družbi, temelji na delih avtorjev Anthonyja Giddensa, Zygmunta Baumana in Ulricha Becka. Tem avtorjem je skupna trditev, da družba še ni dosegla faze onstran moderne, temveč je še vedno v moderni fazi, toda fazi drugačne vrste (Giddens 1990; Beck in Beck-Gernsheim 2002; Bauman 2000). Giddens to fazo imenuje »pozna moderna« (Giddens 1990), Beck ji pravi »druga moderna« (Beck in Beck-Gernsheim 2002), Bauman pa jo označi kot »tekočo moderno« (Bauman 2000). Za namen te študije bomo uporabili Giddensov termin »pozna moderna«, čeprav smo se za izdelavo teoretskega okvira, s katerim pristopamo k osebnim odnosom v pozni moderni, naslonili na dela vseh treh omenjenih teoretikov.

Kaj pravzaprav pomeni koncept »pozne moderne«? Nanaša se na sodobno družbeno-zgodovinsko obdobje v razvoju družbe, v katerem so posledice zgodnje moderne »zaostrene« (Beck 1994, 3; Giddens 1990, 3; 1994, 57). Posledice te radikalizacije so razvidne tudi v drugih fenomenih, ki prežemajo sodobno družbo: v nadaljevanju družbenega delovanja na osnovi instrumentalne racionalnosti, ki se je začelo že v zgodnji moderni, a je zanj značilna večja refleksivnost, s katero družba v pozni moderni preizprašuje svoje prakse (Bauman 2000; Beck 1992; Giddens 1991); intenzivnejša tehnologizacija družbe, ki se je z razvojem tehnologije in znanstvenega mišljenja začela že v zgodnji moderni in je v pozni moderni prevzela vlogo vsakodnevnega posredovanja izkušenj (Gergen 2000); drugačno izkustvo časa in prostora, ki je spodbujeno z »izgnezdenjem« družbenih sistemov iz lokalnega konteksta (Giddens 1991; Bauman 2000) in s spremenjeno naravo tveganj zaradi njihove hkratne individualizacije in globalizacije (Beck 1992). Posamezniki se v pozni moderni usmerjajo vse bolj v zasebno življenje, ki ga v večji meri strukturirajo institucije kot tradicije (Beck

1992; Giddens 1990). Zaradi izpostavljenosti povečani refleksivnosti so družbene oblike v pozni moderni »tekoče«; zgodnjemoderni preostanki njihovih oblik so še dodatno dezintegrirani in brez novih, konkretnih in trdnih oblik (Bauman 2000; Beck-Gernsheim 2002). Zato mora posameznik v konstrukciji svojega življenja prevzeti aktivno vlogo (Beck-Gernsheim 2002), s čimer je med drugim povezana tudi opažena sprememba vrednot pozno moderne družbe: obrat od materialističnih k postmaterialističnim vrednotam, tj. od vrednot, ki se osredotočajo na preživetje in materialno varnost, k vrednotam, ki težijo k izražanju in samouresničitvi (Inglehart 1997).

V visoki moderni se sebstvo zave tudi množstva izbir. Nekateri avtorji sicer menijo, da je bilo sebstvo že v prvi moderni izpostavljeno povečanemu pretoku izkušenj s pomočjo medijev (Gergen 2000; Giddens 1991). Ta proces je v pozni moderni še bolj zaostren. Zaradi medsebojne prepletenosti globalnih digitaliziranih tehnoloških in abstraktnih sistemov, ki preplavljajo posameznikovo vsakdanje življenje, postane vsakdanje izkustvo v pozni moderni do skrajnosti mediatizirano (Gergen 2000; Giddens 1991). Vse to vodi k fenomenu »pluralizacije življenjskih svetov« (Berger v Giddens 1991, 83). Zasičenje sebstva z mnogoterimi realnostmi mediatiziranih izkustev naj bi vodilo v pozni moderni do stanja razcepljenosti sebstva v več delov, ki ustrezajo družbenemu kontekstu, v katerem se znajde sebstvo v določenem trenutku (Gergen 2000; Stivers 2004).

In kako je z medosebnimi odnosi v pozni moderni? Predpostavljamo lahko, da so omenjeni fenomeni v družbenih pogojih pozne moderne povezani z novimi načini sklepanja odnosov. Še posebej je tu pomembno prijateljstvo kot odnos s potencialom vnovičnega ugnezdenja posameznika v družbo, pri čemer moramo upoštevati, da se razlikuje od predmodernih odnosov ugnezdenja po svoji neobvezni in nepredpisani naravi. V pozni moderni morajo posamezniki ustvarjati ne le svoje individualne biografije, temveč morajo aktivno izgraditi tudi arhitekturo svojih socialnih vezi in mrež (Beck in Beck-Gernsheim 2002, 23). Ker izginjajo tradicionalne oblike prostorsko zgoščenih skupnosti, postaja konstrukcija in vzdrževanje arhitekture posameznikovih osebnih vezi v pozni moderni zadeva osebnega angažmaja (Beck in Beck-Gernsheim 2002; Pahl in Spencer 2004; Roseneil in Budgeon 2004; Wellman, Carrington in Hall 1988). V tem kontekstu je bil še posebej vpliven Giddensov koncept »čistega razmerja« kot razmerja, ki ni več zasidrano v zunanjih strukturah, kot so družbene norme ali družbeni razred, marveč je odvisno zgolj od zadovoljstva, ki izhaja iz razmerja samega (Giddens 1991; 1992). Eden od ciljev te raziskave je preveriti, ali lahko ta konceptualni okvir apliciramo tudi na sodobna prijateljstva. V kontekstu prijateljstva lahko recimo postavimo vprašanje, ali so razmerja, ki temeljijo zgolj na svoji prostovoljni naravi do določene mere negotova? Medosebni odnosi so postali glavni lokus posameznikovega iskanja ontološke varnosti (Giddens 1991; Luhmann 1998). Lahko torej sklepamo, da je tovrsten pritisk na sodobna razmerja v nasprotju z njihovo krhko naravo, saj so razmerja namreč prostovoljna?

To v nadaljevanju vodi k nejasnim implikacijah glede podpore. Kako zanjo pomeni, da jo je na splošno mogoče črpati iz dejavno konstruiranih osebnih odnosov in, v primeru te disertacije, iz prijateljstva? Wellman iz dejstva, da ljudje v zahodnih družbah ne živijo več v tesno povezanih stalnih skupnostih, temveč v bolj razpršenih, šibko spletenih mrežah, ki se nenehno spreminjajo, izpeljuje, da se po različne vrste podpore ne morejo več zateči k posamezni lokalno omejeni skupini, ampak morajo, če želijo pridobiti različne vrste podpore, vzdrževati raznolike vezi (Wellman 1979; Wellman 1998; Wellman in Wortley 1990). Zato je pomembno raziskati, kakšne so posledice za ljudi, ki imajo tako negotove vire podpore (Wellman 1998). Ambivalentnost osebnih odnosov v pozni moderni priznavajo mnogi družbeni teoretiki (Bauman 2003; 2009; Beck in Beck-Gernsheim 2002; 2006; Jamieson 1998; Giddens 1990, 1991, 1992; Pahl 2000), sicer v različni meri in z različnimi interpretacijami. Prav zato v pričujočem delu nameravam postaviti pod vprašaj občutje ambivalentnosti sodobnega prijateljstva. Kako trdna so današnja prijateljstva pri soočenju z sodobnimi družbenimi pogoji? Nadalje, koliko in do katere mere lahko sodobno prijateljstvo, utemeljeno na osebni izbiri, ponudi podpore?

Na osebne odnose naj bi vplivalo tudi zgoraj omenjeno mnoštvo sebstev. Že Simmel je zatrdil, da so moderni ljudje preveč »unikatno individualizirani«, da bi popolnoma razumeli drug drugega, in zato tudi moderno prijateljstvo ponavadi selektivno pokriva le določen del posameznikove osebnosti (Simmel 1950). Posledice tega se izražajo tudi v pozno modernih prijateljstvih; in tudi zato se razmerja, ki temeljijo le na določenem delu posameznikovega sebstva, imenujejo lomljiva (Gergen 2000, 179). Bauman trdi, da so tovrstna razmerja v večji meri nagnjena k temu, da se prekinajo (Bauman 2000; 2003). Ta tip razmerij imenuje »povezave«, ki jih je – drugače kot razmerja, katerim so partnerji zavezani – lažje skeniti in jih prekiniti (Bauman 2003, xii).

Še ena značilnost razmerij v pozni moderni, ki jo moramo omeniti, je njihova manjša odvisnost od fizične bližine zaradi radikalnih sprememb tehnološkega strukturiranja vsakdanjega življenja v pozni moderni, ki je v nasprotju z življenjem v tradicionalnih družbah ali celo v obdobju zgodnje industrijske moderne (Allan 1998, Castells 2001; 2003; Gergen 2000; Giddens 1991; Wellman 1998; Wellman in Wortley 1990). Na tej podlagi je tudi vloga tehnološke komunikacije pri oblikovanju in ohranjanju oddaljenih prijateljstev pomembno vprašanje.

Izhodišče raziskave je bil razvoj fenomenologije prijateljstva – z željo razumeti bistvo oziroma vsebino sodobnega prijateljstva, kar bi potem služilo za oporo nadaljnji analizi oblik prijateljstva in njihovega dinamičnega vidika v pozni moderni.

Prvo raziskovalno vprašanje je potemtakem, kako posamezniki v pozni moderni doživljajo prijateljske odnose glede na trajanje vezi? Bolj natančno vprašanje je, ali se vse hitreje spreminjajoč družbeni kontekst pozne moderne doživlja kot nekaj, kar vpliva na trajnost prijateljskih vezi, oziroma, ali je morda prijateljstvo pri svoji odpornosti na spremembe družbenih oblik pozne moderne subverzivno?

Drugo raziskovalno vprašanje je, ali prijateljska razmerja v pozni moderni postajajo vse bolj parcialne narave prav zaradi mnoštva družbenih okolij, v katerih se posameznik v pozni moderni nahaja. Resnična intimnost v razmerju ne zahteva le razkritja banalnih skrivnosti, marveč tudi popolno samorazkritje pred drugo osebo (Schnarch v Štulhofer in Miladinov 2004). Predpostavili smo, da je takšno razkritje zaradi vse hitrejšega spreminjanja družbenih form tvegano. V sociološki teoriji je predvidena kompenzacija za vse večjo negotovost vezi oblikovanje razmerij bolj družbene narave na način mrež (Bauman 2003). Vendar smo predpostavljali, da tovrstna razmerja ne zadovoljujejo potrebe po resnični intimnosti, kot smo jo zgoraj definirali, ker imajo bolj družben značaj. Če povzamemo, smo na tej podlagi zastavili vprašanje, ali se prijateljstvo v pozni moderni doživlja kot vse bolj negotovo in se zato resnična intimnost premešča v druge sfere, kot sta recimo terapevtska in družinska sfera. Navsezadnje nas je zanimalo, ali lahko predpostavljeno prilagoditev prijateljstva v pozni moderni povežemo s posameznikovimi občutki osamljenosti, ki obstajajo nakljub njegovim zadovoljujočim družbenim razmerjem (Bellah et al; Renner 2000; Stivers 2004).

Raziskavo smo izpeljali s kvalitativnimi raziskovalnimi orodji, s pomočjo osebnih intervjujev v prvem delu, ter fokusnih skupin v drugem delu raziskave. V prvem delu smo naredili 50 osebnih intervjujev na srečanjih s 50 respondenti. Za metodo vzorčenja je bila uporabljena metoda snežne kepe. Sprva smo sicer nameravali izvesti raziskavo na vzorcu mladih ljudi med 15. in 24. letom starosti, vendar smo se na podlagi mnenja člana komisije, da je vzorec preširok, saj vključuje tako najstnike kot mlade odrasle, ki se med seboj razlikujejo po načinu sklepanja prijateljstev – kar bi še bolj razširilo že tako široko temo –, potem odločili za zožanje vzorca na starost med 20. in 30. letom. Potemtakem lahko zatrdimo, da je bilo po demografskih kriterijih vzorčenje namensko. Nadalje je bil raziskovalni načrt izoblikovan znotraj teoretskega okvirja koncepta pozne moderne in v skladu populacijo mladih odraslih v postindustrijskih družbah, saj smo pričakovali, da imajo respondenti postmaterialno vrednotno orientacijo (Inglehart 1997). Za mladino je v postindustrijskih družbah značilno podaljšano obdobje prehoda v odraslost (Cote 2000; Arnett 2004). Ta podaljšani prehod se dogaja zaradi pomanjkanja zunanjega vodenja in notranjih virov, ki so na voljo za odraščanje, obenem pa zaradi negotovega ekonomskega konteksta pozne moderne, ki je pogojen z deregulacijo trga dela, kar se nadalje kaže v negotovosti zaposlitev (Beck in Beck-Gernsheim 2001; Cote in Allahar 1996; Cote 2004; Mulder 2009). Opažamo tudi močno zvišanje starosti, pri kateri se partnerji odločajo za zakon in starševstvo, kar izhaja iz podaljšanega izobraževanja (Arnett 2004). Vse te spremembe sestavljajo novo življenjsko fazo, ki se izoblikuje v pozni moderni in izraža tipične značilnosti tako mladosti kot odraslosti (Arnett 2004): ponavadi traja od poznega najstništva do poznih dvajsetih let (prav tam). To obdobje je v literaturi običajno imenovano kot »mladi odrasli« (Ule 1996), a ker se njena definicija in starostne meje razlikujejo, sem se namesto tega odločila uporabiti Arnettov koncept »nastajajoče odraslosti« (Arnett 2004). Ta koncept namreč natančneje zajame značilnosti tega življenjskega obdobja, saj, kot pravi Arnett, termin »mlade odraslosti« pomeni, da je bila zgodnja faza odraslosti že

dosežena (Arnett 2004). Vendar to za mlade ljudi v pozni moderni ne velja, ker niso naredili prehoda, ki se je skozi zgodovino povezoval s statusom odraslosti, in ker sami sebe umeščajo v obdobje med najstništvom in odraslostjo (Arnett 2004). Odločili smo se tudi, da morajo izbrani respondenti prebivati v hrvaški prestolnici vsaj dve leti, čeprav ni nujno, da je Zagreb tudi mesto, kjer so odraščali. Ker so nas zanimali »nastajajoči odrasli« s postmaterialističnimi vrednotami, je to vključevalo tudi njihovo zgoraj opisano podaljšano obdobje prehoda v odraslost. To obdobje najlažje prepoznamo po podaljšanem obdobju izobraževanja, tj. pridobivanju terciarne izobrazbe. Ena od posebnosti Hrvaške je, da se največja univerza nahaja v Zagrebu in zato tam terciarno izobrazbo pridobiva tudi mnogo nastajajočih odraslih. Prihod v Zagreb je torej stopnica v življenju, ki pomeni zapuščanje starševskih gospodinjstev v mestu odraščanja, in za skupino nastajajočih odraslih zaznamuje prehod v odraslost. Če govorimo o modernizaciji, je Zagreb, kot bomo pokazali v nadaljevanju, ekonomsko najbolj moderniziran del Hrvaške. Ker je največje urbano središče, to s seboj prinaša tudi najvišjo stopnjo kulturne modernizacije na Hrvaškem. Zato smo tudi predpostavili, da bi nastajajoči odrasli, ki živijo v Zagrebu ali so tja prišli pridobivat terciarno izobrazbo, najbolj ustrezali kriteriju postmaterialne vrednotne orientacije. Poleg tega smo se odločili, da morajo nastajajoči odrasli v Zagrebu prebivati vsaj dve leti. To je zagotavljalo, da so respondenti vsaj nekaj let preživeli v družbenih pogojih pozne moderne in so ti na njih torej vplivali. V vzorec smo zato vključili le respondente, ki so bili starejši od 20 let. Da bi to preverili, smo vprašanja glede stopnje njihove postmaterialistične naravnosti, vključili na koncu vprašalnika.

Vprašalnik za intervju je bil sestavljen v polstrukturirani obliki. Na koncu je bil dodatek z vprašanji, ki so preverjala postmaterialno orientacijo respondentov.

Kmalu po začetku intervjuvanja, še v testni fazi, sem opazila, da respondenti o prijateljstvu govorijo na dva različna načina. Prvi način govora je izhajal iz njihove osebne izkušnje, medtem ko je bil drugi – bolj distanciran od njihovega osebne izkustva – diskurz o prijateljstvu. Kot problematično me je presenetilo to, da ni bilo nobene očitne povezave med osebnim izkustvom in diskurzom o prijateljstvu. Najprej sem pomislila, da so respondenti diskurze uporabili kot projektivno tehniko in z njimi izrazili občutja in izkušnje, ki so jih imeli za družbeno manj sprejemljive. A to možnost je izključeval način, na katerega se se razlikovale osebne izkušnje in diskurzi. Na primer, nekateri respondenti, ki so poročali o največkrat pozitivnih osebnih izkušnjah s prijateljstvi in so svoja prijateljstva na splošno imeli za pozitivna in pomembna, so vseeno izrazili negativne predstave o sodobnih prijateljstvih, ko so o njih govorili na ravni diskurza. Zato sem dobila vtis, da je to problem epistemološke narave.

Pri reševanju tega metodološkega problema in pri oblikovanju metodološkega okvira analize, sem se oprla na razlikovanje, ki ga Ann Swidler vpelje med diskurzi in praksami (Swidler 2005, 83-84). Za Ann Swidler je kultura nekaj, kar ne moremo opazovati neposredno v glavah posameznih družbenih akterjev (Swidler 2005). To spoznanje me je prešinilo tudi pri moji raziskavi; pokazalo se je, da

povezave med idejami, ki ji imeli respondenti o prijateljstvu, in njihovim delovanjem niso bile vedno neposredne in jasne. Kot rečeno, Swidlerjeva ta metodološki problem rešuje z razlikovanjem med praksami in diskurzi. Prakse so po njenem vsakodnevne rutine družbenih akterjev, ki so avtomatske v pomenu spontanosti in samoumevnosti, v največji meri so fizične in priučene (Swidler 2005). S pomočjo Levi-Straussa pravi, da se dopolnjujejo z diskurzi, ki »omogočajo, da se posvetimo pomenu ne da bi se ukvarjali s tem, ali posamezni akterji verjamejo, mislijo ali delajo v skladu z določenimi idejami« (Swidler 2005, 84). Zato sem se odločila, da bom analizo raziskave utemeljila na metodološkem razlikovanju diskurza o prijateljstvu od njegove osebne izkušnje. Na ravni diskurza so se različni načini govora o prijateljstvu, tako sem predpostavljala, nanašali bolj na kulturne prakse kot na osebno izkustvo, zato se tudi niso vselej ujemali drug z drugim. To je bil metodološki okvir za analizo intervjujev, ki je s seboj prinesel tudi idejo, da bi za metodo triangulacije uporabili fokusne skupine. Predvidevala sem, da bo skupinska narava fokusnih skupin kot raziskovalne metode premestila poudarek z osebnih izkušenj na diskurze o prijateljstvu. Poleg tega Bloor idr. predlagajo, da fokusne skupine lahko uporabimo na koncu raziskave, če želimo sodelujočim omogočiti komentiranje predhodne analize, kar lahko potem uporabimo za razširitev in poglobitev prvotne analize (Bloor idr. 2001). Ker sem ocenila, da posebnosti in pogoji določenih fenomenov, ki so govorili o tipih prijateljstva, ter njihova dinamika z intervjuji ni bila razložena v zadovoljivi meri, sem se odločila za vključitev določenih intervjuvancev še v fokusno skupino. Predvidevala sem tudi, da mi bo ta poteza omogočila vrednotenje določenega fenomena iz različnih vidikov. Moja predpostavka je namreč bila, da bosta dve različni raziskovalni metodi poudarili dve različni dimenziji fenomena: in sicer, da bo skupinska interakcija v fokusnih skupinah spodbudila diskurze o prijateljstvu, ki so med intervjuji, osredotočenimi na osebno izkustvo, vzniknili le sporadično. Prepostavljala sem tudi, da lahko dinamični vidik prijateljstva znotraj družbenih pogojev pozne moderne bolje ovrednotimo s pomočjo fokusnih skupin. Ocenila sem, da bo to s pomočjo triangulacije povečalo veljavnost študije (Denzin in Lincoln 2005; Golafshani 2003; Mathison 1998; Stake 2010).

Zato sem respondente, ki so sodelovali v intervjujih, zaprosila še za sodelovanje v fokusnih skupinah. Velja, da za raziskavo majhnega obsega zadostuje tri do pet fokusnih skupin, da bi pridobili dostop do raznolikih perspektiv, ki se pojavijo med diskusijo (Tonkiss 2012). Tako sem izpeljala pet fokusnih skupin. Manjše skupine je lažje voditi, veljajo pa tudi za primernejše, kadar je govora o temah, ki so lahko občutljive narave (Bloor idr. 201; Denscombe 2010; Holloway in Wheeler 2010; Morgan 1998). Iz tega sledi odločitev za majhne fokusne skupine z največ petimi respondenti. Vprašalnik za fokusne skupine je bil razdeljen na dva dela. V prvem delu so bili respondentom predstavljeni koncepti, ki smo jih izpeljali iz intervjujev s pomočjo fenomenologije prijateljstva. Potem sem jih vprašala, kaj vsak od konceptov pomeni njim samim, ko gre za prijateljstvo. Potem ko smo vzpostavili konsenz glede pomena, sem jih zaprosila, da nadalje razdelajo, kako pomembna je za prijateljstvo vsaka posamezna značilnost in kakšna je njihova dinamična funkcija v prijateljstvu kot procesu. Skupinsko interakcijo

smo v fokusnih skupinah uporabili, da bi identificirane komponente prijateljstva postavili v medsebojni odnos in tako prepoznali njihovo dinamično vedenje v procesu sklepanja in ohranjanja prijateljstev. Respondentom smo potem predstavili tudi teme, ki so se pojavile z analizo diskurzov o prijateljstvu med intervjuji, in jih zaprosili za njihovo mnenje o tem.

Analiza se je začela z namenom, da bi zapopadi bistvene poteze določenih tipov razmerij – resničnega prijateljstva – s pomočjo fenomenologije. Potem smo zbrali teme, ki so se med intervjuji pojavile kot glavne značilnosti prijateljstva v pozni moderni, in jih vzeli za izkustvena stališča, ki sestavljajo prijateljski odnos; dodali pa smo tudi interpretativne ocene, da bi pomene tesneje povezali z njihovimi družbenimi konteksti. Respondentom v fokusnih skupinah smo kot teme predstavili tudi diskurze, ki so se pojavili med intervjuji, in jih tako tudi analizirali. Ugotovitve na podlagi fokusnih skupin so bile analizirane z metodo analize celotne skupine, pri kateri je skupina posamezna enota analize in jo obravnavamo na enak način kot enoto, ki jo sestavlja posamezen podatek (Ritchie idr. 2003). Analizo fokusnih skupin smo izvedli najprej s pomočjo ročnega kodiranja, kode iz različnih skupin smo potem primerjali in iskali skupne.

Analiza podatkov je pokazala, da so se ugotovitve fokusnih skupin razlikovale od ugotovitev na podlagi intervjujev. Med analizo smo opazili, da so fokusne skupine dejansko podale precej bogatejše podatke glede diskurzov o prijateljstvu, ki so se med intervjuji pojavljali le sporadično. Da bi izgradila trdnejšo teorijo in uporabila kode iz fokusnih skupin, sem se vrnila k analizi intervjujev in poskušala ugotoviti, katere dodatne dimenzije so se pojavile in katere prvotne kode moram izpopolniti ali celo znova premisliti. Izdelala sem dve različni vrednotenji sodobnega prijateljstva; statično analizo oblik prijateljstva in analizo vsebine posameznih oblik ter analizo dinamičnega vidika sodobnih prijateljstev glede na principe, ki organizirajo njihovo skepanje, ohranjanje in prekinitve ter so umeščeni v družbene pogoje pozne moderne.

Vendarle pa moramo dodati, da je takšna raziskava podvržena določenim omejitvam. Ugotovitve kvalitativnih študij po njihovi naravi ne moremo posplošiti na način, na katerega je to možno pri kvantitativni paradigmi. Ker je vzorec te raziskave nereprezentativen in demografsko namenski, in četudi smo respondente po tem kriteriju pridobivali z metodo snežne kepe, ugotovitev ni moč posplošiti na širšo populacijo. Vseeno pa jih lahko do določene mere posplošimo znotraj kvalitativne raziskovalne tradicije, še posebej glede termina »prenosljivosti«, kateremu nekateri avtorji pripisujejo primeren tip posplošitve za kvalitativno raziskovalno tradicijo in ki pomeni, da lahko ugotovitve prenesemo na druge podobne družbene kontekste (Gobo 2008; Lincoln in Guba 1985). Druga omejitev študije izhaja iz uporabljenega načina vzorčenja. Zaradi postopka vzorčenja z metodo snežne kepe se je v petih primerih zgodilo, da je respondent po zaključenem intervjuju za naslednjega respondenta predlagal svojega prijatelja ali prijateljico, potem pa je predlagani prijatelj zavrnil sodelovanje v raziskavi, ker je temo diskusije razumel kot preveč negotovo ali zasebno, da bi o njej govoril z



neznano osebo. Iz tega lahko izpeljemo, da lahko v primeru občutljivih tem, med katere sodijo intimna razmerja, tovrstno vzorčenje vodi do izključitve določenih delov populacije. To govori tudi o morebitni pristranosti ugotovitev, in sicer o tem, da bi izkušnje in izzivi prijateljstva v pozni moderni, ki jih opisujemo v tej študiji, za bolj introvertirane nastajajoče odrasle lahko bile drugačne. A v vzorcu so bili nekateri respondenti, ki so o introvertiranosti kot o svoji pomembni značajski lastnosti poročali sami bodisi je bila ta občutena med njihovim opisom lastnega družabnega življenja, kar do neke mere zavrača to omejitev raziskave. Kljub temu sem mnenja, da je pri premisleku glede morebitnih omejitev raziskovalnih ugotovitev možnost, da je vzorec pristranski, nujno vzeti v obzir. Dodatna omejitev te raziskave je tudi v izgrajenih konceptualnih tipih prijateljstva. Kadar je fokus raziskave fenomen takšne kompleksnosti, kot je prijateljstvo – sestavljeno tako iz osebnega in družbenega – obstaja omejitev, na katero raziskovalec družbe neizbežno trči. V pričujoči raziskavi so bile raziskane vse možne variacije pogojev, v katerih so moji respondenti sklepali, vzdrževali in opuščali prijateljstva. Ker so prijateljska razmerja poleg družbenih sprememb podrejena variacijam osebnih izkušenj, kar neizogibno vpliva na načine njihovega sklepanja in ohranjanja, bi bilo nepremišljeno trditi, da so bile v raziskavi tolikšnega obsega, kot je ta, zajete vse možne variacije prijateljskih tipov. Z drugimi besedami, tipe prijateljstva, ki smo jih premislili v tej disertaciji, moramo obravnavati kot weberjanske idealne tipe, prikladne orientacijske točke za opisovanje družbene realnosti pozne moderne, ki jih lahko deloma prilagodimo v skladu z variacijami posebnih pogojev. Priporočeno je, da v tem kontekstu razumemo tudi raziskovalne ugotovitve.

Znanstveno relevantnost predlaganega raziskovalne teme je mogoče prepoznati v prispevku k razumevanju neformalnih osebnih odnosov v pozni moderni onstran domene romantičnih partnerstev. Poleg tega je povezava ocene mikro konteksta prijateljstva v statični obliki in njegovih dinamičnih vidikov z družbenimi pogoji pozne moderne za tovrstno analizo zagotovo prednost pri razumevanju tako vsebine prijateljstva kot njegovega pomena in strukturnih variacij. V disertaciji predlagam, da prijateljstvo integrira posameznika v družbo drugače kot strukturno bolj utrjena razmerja, zato moramo njegove potenciale za družbeno integracijo obravnavati s posebno pozornostjo. Zanimanje za vez med posameznikom in družbo v luči moderne obstaja vse od začetkov sociološke misli pa do sodobnih teorij (Bellah idr. 1986; Durkheim v Emirbayer 2003; Pescosolido in Levy 2002; Putnam 2000; Simmel 2001; Tönnies 1955). *Ovrednotenje te vezi v kontekstu prijateljstva je torej tudi stvar širšega sociološkega zanimanja.*

*Dodati moramo, da moja prvotna raziskovalna vprašanja raziskovalnega dela izhajajo iz teoretskega okvirja, ki temelji večinoma na britanski in severnoameriški literaturi, kar pomeni, da vsebuje prepostavke, ki do določene mere izhajajo iz tujega družbenega konteksta. Ker je bila raziskava narejena na Hrvaškem, je bilo nujno oceniti, ali za hrvaški družbeni kontekst veljajo kakšne posebnosti. Velika Britanija in ZDA se namreč po stopnji modernizacije do določene mere razlikujeta od Hrvaške. Tomič Koludrovićeva in Petrić dokazujeta, da je Hrvaška le delno prestala proces druge*

modernizacije (Tomič Koludrović in Petrić 2007b). Potemtakem je bilo nujno najprej določiti, do katere mere je respondentom v tej raziskavi skupna izkušnja uspešnega prehoda v odraslost v družbenih pogojih pozne moderne. To sem preverjala z dodatnimi vprašalniki na koncu vsakega intervjuja in ugotovitve so bile v skladu s predpostavkami o vzorcu. Čeprav vedenje respondentov odraža posebnosti hrvaškega družbenega konteksta in poudarja preživetvene vrednote v večji meri, kot bi lahko sklepali iz postmaterialistične naravnosti, večina njihovih odgovorov kaže v smer postmaterialistične vrednotne naravnosti. To sem razumela kot pokazatelj tega, da sem pri nastajajočih odraslih, ki trenutno živijo v Zagrebu in so bodisi zaključili terciarno izobraževanje bodisi še študirajo, dregnila v del hrvaške mladine, ki živi v pogojih pozne moderne. Zato lahko z gotovostjo trdim, da je ta del populacije dejansko dovzeten za družbene procese pozne moderne na splošno in torej tudi za tiste procese, ki se odvijajo na področju medosebnih odnosov.

Že kmalu po začetku raziskave sem opazila, da so se raziskovalna vprašanja, ki sem jih zastavila, ko sem prijateljstvo še razumela enodimenzionalni fenomen, izkazala kot preveč poenostavljena za kompleksno družbeno realnost pozne moderne. Podcenila sem namreč obseg, do katerega delovanje ljudi uporablja kulturo v svojo lastno korist. Kadar gre za prijateljstva, Hrvaški nastajajoči odrasli uporabljajo to, kar Ann Swindler imenuje »strategijo delovanja«, torej da dane kulturne izbire uporabljajo za to, da bi razrešili značilen zbir vprašanj z značilnim načinom reševanja problemov (Swindler 2001, 86). Pomembno je poudariti, da strategije delovanja ne delujejo nujno na zavestni in racionalni ravni, temveč bolj kot vključevanje načinov mišljenja oziroma ocenjevanja situacij v posameznikovo vedenje, ki se potem izraža na primer z določenim tipom organizacije razmerij (Swidler 2001). V kontekstu prijateljstva hrvaški nastajajoči odrasli uporabljajo točno določeno strategijo delovanja, in sicer razločevanje med dvema tipoma prijateljstva – družbeno bližjim ter bolj oddaljenim. V zgodnji fazi intervjujev sem odkrila, da je strategijo razločevanja med različnimi tipi prijateljstva spontano uporabljala večina respondentov. Na to lahko gledamo kot na strategijo delovanja, ki se povezuje z družbenimi pogoji pozne moderne, v katerih visoko diferencirana družbena realnost z množtvom družbenih kontekstov, organizacija razmerij, ki ni vezana na posamezen kraj, ter ločitev časa in prostora, zahtevajo razlikovanje tipov razmerij glede na njihovo časovno in prostorsko organizacijo. Moji respondenti so prvemu tipu prijateljstev rekli »resnična« in poudarjali njihovo drugačnost od ostalih vrst prijateljstva. Resnična prijateljstva so organizirana okoli polja intimnosti in so deležna posebne skrbi. Ker so respondenti med pripovedovanjem pogosto postavljali v »naravno« nasprotje dva tipa prijateljskih praks, sem se odločila, da tej logiki sledim tudi v svoji raziskavi in pri analizi pridobljenih podatkov. Da bi ugotovila, kako izgledajo te družbene prakse prijateljstva, sem najprej prevprašala bistvene poteze enega, »resničnega« tipa prijateljstva in jih potem uporabila za ozadje, v nasprotju s katerim sem določila razlike med resničnim in drugimi tipi prijateljstva.

*Iz analize podatkov, pridobljenih med nastajajočimi odraslimi na Hrvaškem, izhaja, da je prijateljstvo kompleksen družbeni odnos, ki je pomemben, ker temelji na osebni izbiri. A vendarle je prijateljstvo tudi odnos, ki se najpogosteje razvija na podlagi nadaljujočega se družbenega časa, ki ga skupaj preživljata dva posameznika. Iz tega sledi, da prijateljstvo – čeprav je utemeljeno na osebni izbiri – pogosto izhaja iz institucionaliziranih okolij, v katerih v pozni moderni mladi ljudje preživljajo velike količine skupnega družbenega časa z drugimi posamezniki. Skupen družbeni čas omogoča vzpostavitev zaupanja in poznavanja druge osebe, kar vodi k intimnosti, ki velja za najpomembnejšo vsebino prijateljstva in omogoča izoblikovanje drugih značilnosti resničnega prijateljstva. Kot smo že omenili, je osebni angažma oziroma osebno delovanje odločilni element v skepanju, ohranjanju in prekinitvi resničnih prijateljstev. To v kontekstu pozne moderne, za katero so značilne individualizirane identitete in nedefinirani pogoji družbenih identitet, odpira možnost samoodločanja in je intrinzično povezano z drugimi značilnostmi prijateljstva: z avtentičnostjo in s sprejemanjem. Prijateljstvo ponuja polje avtentičnosti in s pomočjo osebne izbire prijatelja, ki sprejema avtentičnost drugega, omogoča samopotrditve. Eden od predpogojev za nastanek prijateljstva je zaupanje. Zaupanje se vzpostavi s skupnimi izkušnjami, ki omogočajo afektivnost in preverjanje, ali je prijatelj vreden zaupanja. Iz prepričanja v dobronamernost prijatelja izhaja občutek njegove zaveze in zmožnosti sprejemanja avtentičnosti drugega, na čemer temelji zaupanje. Intimnost je glavna differentia specifica resničnega prijateljstva, ki ga ločuje od bolj površinskih prijateljstev, ki veljajo za bolj družbeno oddaljene. Ključna dimenzija intimnosti je samorazkritje; dajanje svoje intimnosti prijatelju na razpolago in pričakovanje enakega v zameno. To ustvarja medsebojno poznavanje prijateljev, kar nadalje omogoča zmožnost sprožanja in previdevanja določenih odzivov in s tem lažjega usmerjanja razmerja. Intimnost je ena od najbolj pomembnih potez prijateljstva, in sicer tako pomembna, da je pogosta navajana kot differentia specifica resničnih prijateljstev in drugih, družbeno bolj oddaljenih razmerij. Intimnost daje resničnemu prijateljstvu posebno vrednost, saj omogoča refleksivno vsebino pri posameznikovi evalvaciji. Ali drugače, prijateljstvo z refleksivno evalvacijo ponuja izgradbo temeljnih kamnov posameznikovega sebstva. Prijateljstvo je vir refleksivnosti tudi za posameznikovo samopotrjevanje, saj utrjuje njegovo samorazumevanje in samospoštovanje. Refleksivnost, ki jo ponuja prijateljstvo, je posebnega sociološkega pomena, saj je povezana z vsebino posameznikove avtentičnosti, ki je v prijateljskih odnosih sprejemana. To pomeni, da nima zveze s posameznikovim položajem na družbeni lestvici, vseeno pa daje vrednost njegovemu subjektivnemu družbenemu položaju. Obenem pomeni, da ima resnično prijateljstvo velike potencialne vgnezdjenja posameznika v družbeno, toda onstran objektivnega družbenega položaja na družbeni lestvici. Dobronamernost do prijatelja je še ena od ključnih normativnih potez resničnega prijateljstva. Prav to, da imamo prijateljevo dobro vedno v mislih, naj bo prisoten ali odsoten, zagotavlja vzpostavitev in ohranjanje zaupanja. Na splošni ravni potrebuje prijateljstvo zanesljivost; v obliki zaupanja v prijateljevo podporo, ko je ta potrebna. Resnično prijateljstvo lahko uspeva le pod pogojem avtentičnosti; odprtega povabila tako na oder kot v zaodrje prijateljevega družbenega uprizarjanja. To je povezano*

tudi s sprejemanjem; vključuje prepričanje, da bo prijatelj cenil obe plati družbenega uprizarjanja. Trdimo lahko, da je avtentičnost tudi prepogoj; omogoča varen kontekst za sproščanje emocij. Podpora je tudi ena od glavnih potez prijateljstva, saj je prijateljstvo pogosto definirano kot razmerje, ki ponuja podporo, pri čemer sta ključni emocionalna podpora in podpora pri samoodločanju. Slednja je povezana s posameznikovim identitetnim projektom, ki na ta način s prijateljstvom potrjuje. Pri ohranjanju prijateljstva se osebni angažma izraža kot trud, za katerega se na obeh straneh pričakuje, da bo premagal morebitne notranje ali zunanje preizkušnje, s katerimi se prijateljstvo lahko sooči. Ta vidik osebnega angažmaja je v prijateljstvu nenaklonjenih družbenih pogojih pozne moderne, med katere sodita recimo pomanjkanje časa in življenje v geografsko oddaljenih predelih, še posebej poudarjen. Kot nujen del prijateljstva se doživlja tudi zabava, ki pa ima za partnerje vsakega posameznega razmerja subjektiven pomen. Vzajemnost tudi sodi med nujno sestavino resničnega prijateljstva in pomeni enakomerno dajanje in jemanje, toda ne na način jaz-tebi-ti-meni. Implicitno je namreč razumljena kot dolgoročen princip, kot temelj resničnega prijateljstva. Zato mora biti vzajemnost spontana in ne simultana ter obenem precej situacijska: kot pričakovanje prijateljeve vzajemnosti, kadar je ta potrebna. Implicitna narava principa vzajemnosti postane razvidna s prekinitvijo prijateljstva, če ta princip ni upoštevan. Ko uvidimo, da so vse te značilnosti prepletene, se prijateljstvo razkrije kot kompleksen in krhek družbeni odnos, ki pred partnerje pogosto postavlja naloge občutljive narave. Ker smo v tej raziskavi ugotovili, da je resnično prijateljstvo kompleksen odnos, katerega vzpostavljanje je pogojeno z velikimi vložki časa in truda in katerega ohranjanje zahteva iskanje ravnotežja med potencialno nasprotujočimi načini vedenja, ni presenetljivo, da je resnično prijateljstvo po mnenju večine respondentov omejeno po številu.

Drugi tip prijateljske prakse, imenovan družbeno prijateljstvo, se od resničnega prijateljstva razlikuje po svoji družbeni organizaciji. V tovrstni praksi prijateljstva razmerje ni organizirano v tolikšni meri glede na svojo vsebino, temveč glede na koristi, ki jih ima takšna zveza, kot je recimo praksa socializacije v določene kontekste. Zato smo te prijateljske prakse v analitičnem delu zbrali pod imenom »družbeno prijateljstvo«.

Ta dva tipa prijateljstev se po svoji organizaciji razlikujeta. Če se resnično prijateljstvo organizira glede na svojo vsebino, se družbeno prijateljstvo uravnava po določenih kontekstih, v katerih družbenih akter preživlja čas, ali po skupnih aktivnostih. Poleg tega je vsebina teh dveh tipov prijateljstva različna; resnično je organizirano okoli polja intimnosti, medtem ko družbeno prijateljstvo poudarja družabnost. Tipa se razlikujeta tudi po koristih, ki jih posamezniku prinaša razmerje; pri resničnem prijateljstvu se razmerje organizira okoli samega sebe, v družbenem prijateljstvu pa ponavadi obstaja pričakovanje določene koristi, ki ne izhaja iz samega razmerja, kot je preživljanje časa z nekom, ki je prijeten, ali govorjenje o svojih zanimanjih. V okviru socialnih prijateljstev zato lahko opazujemo različne vrste praks. Glavna razlika obstaja med prijateljstvi, ki so organizirana glede na določen kontekst, v katerih se družbena akterja srečata, in na tista, ki so

organizirana glede na skupne aktivnosti. Prva sem poimenovala kontekstualna družbena prijateljstva, medtem ko sem druga poimenovala situacijska družbena prijateljstva. A zakaj socialno prijateljstvo ni poznanstvo? Nekateri od respondentov so sicer določena prijateljstva, ki jih v svoji nalogi uvrščam v okvir 'socialnega prijateljstva', imenovali kot »poznanstva«. Poleg tega se socialno prijateljstvo v nekaterih značilnostih do določene mere prekriva s poznanstvom. Ker pa ni primerne terminologije za socialno partnerstvo, so jih moji respondenti včasih definirali kot »boljša poznanstva«. Ko sem respondente zaprosila za podrobnejšo razlago razlikovanja med tema dvema tipoma, so navedli razliko v občutenju družbene bližine in stopnji poznavanja druge osebe, ki ju pri družbenih prijateljih občutijo drugače kot pri znancih.

Respondenti so se pritoževali nad nekritično uporabo besede »prijatelj« pri številnih različnih družbeno-relacijskih praksah, ki so zajemala vse od prijateljev do znancev. Kljub temu se jim to zdi zgolj jezikovna praksa in zatrjujejo, da vsi razlikujemo med resničnimi prijateljstvi in nekritično uporabo besede prijatelj. Nekritičnost pojasnjujejo z odstotnostjo natančnejšega označevanja praks družbenega prijateljstva ter s potrebo po zaščitniških praksah, ko gre za znanstva.

Prav tako kot v primeru trpežnosti prijateljstva je to izkustvo hrvaških nastajajočih odraslih povezano s tipom prijateljstva. Medtem ko resnično prijateljstvo najpogosteje doživljajo kot vez vzdržljive narave, ki se je sposobna upirati strukturnim spremembam pozne moderne, družbenega prijateljstva ne vidijo nujno na tak način. Še več, pri družbenih prijateljstvih je poudarek pogosto prav na njihovi stalno spreminjajoči se naravi. Prav zato so družbeni pogoji pozne moderne bolj naklonjeni sklepanju družbenih prijateljstev, toda ti se obenem tudi lažje prekinajo zaradi svoje spremenljive narave. Obenem imajo lahko družbeni pogoji pozne moderne negativen vpliv na nujne pogoje za sklepanje in ohranjanje resničnih prijateljstev. Osebni angažma pogosto velja kot ključen dodatni pogoj, ki odloči o tem, ali se bo prijateljstvo ohranilo ali pa bo razpadlo. To obravnavamo v kontekstu individualizacije v pozni moderni. Nastajajoči odrasli ponavadi ne izgubljajo zaupanja v trdnost resničnih prijateljstev, četudi ta trčijo na neugodne strukturne pogoje pozne moderne. V teh pogojih je zanje vzdrževanje prijateljstva prek svetovnega spleta še posebej priročno. A v praksi včasih strukturne omejitve prevladajo nad posameznikovim delovanjem, še posebej kadar gre za ohranjanje resničnih prijateljstev. To smo potem osvetlili kot potencialno polje negotovosti na področju resničnega prijateljstva.

Odkrili smo tudi, da se parcialnost kot način sklepanja odnosov v pozni moderni odraža v tem, da ima večina respondentov prijateljska razmerja, ki zadovoljujejo le nekatere od njihovih potreb ali interesov. Večina respondentov v svojih odnosih tudi zares izkuša parcialnost. Večina bodisi poroča o tem, da imajo na splošno parcialna prijateljstva (23 od 50), bodisi o tem, da imajo nekaj celostnih prijateljstev in preostale parcialne (22 od 50). Pri opisovanju parcialnosti svojih prijateljstev pogosto uporabljajo fraze, kot »specializirani prijatelj« ali metafore, kot je »majhni svetovi prijateljev«. Ne

glede na to so respondenti večinoma poročali o svojem zadovoljstvu s takšnimi razmerji, pri čemer so jih uporabljali za kompenzacijo pri zadovoljevanju različnih potreb z različnimi prijateljstvi. V nasprotju z začetnimi predpostavkami smo nezadovoljstvo s takšno parcialno odnosnostjo le redko prepoznali. Še več, respondenti so kazali iznajdljivost pri uporabi takšnih odnosov za zadovoljevanje svojih potreb. Na ta način so prijateljstva med nastajajočimi odrasli na Hrvaškem dejansko, kot temu pravi Barry Wellman, »popredalčkana« (Wellman 2002). Ta trditev sledi Simmelu, ki je moderna prijateljstva opisoval kot v tolikšni meri diferencirana, da je socializacija s celostno osebnostjo postala zapletena, saj so »osebnosti individualizirane na morda preveč poseben način, da bi dovolile popolno vzajemnost razumevanja in dojemljivosti« (Simmel 1950, 326). Respondenti so tako pogosto opazali mnoštvo družabnih krogov, družbenih okolij in raznolikih pričakovanj, ki izvirajo različnih življenjskih poti. Zato se zdi, da se parcialna socializacija bolj primerna za zadovoljevanje posameznikovih mnogoterih potreb kot bolj homogena, na določeno okolje vezana družabnost, pri kateri ima določena oseba na voljo vire vseh vrst. V okviru strategije predalčkanja prijateljev respondenti nadalje predalčkajo tudi razumevanje. Z drugimi besedami, če se jim zdi, da jim v določenem prijateljstvu manjka razumevanja, ga bodo iskali pri drugih prijateljstvih. Čeprav se je predstava o samih parcialnih odnosih med nastajajočimi odraslimi izkazala za napačno, je bila raziskovalna predpostavka o parcialnih odnosih v pozni moderni na sledi družbene realnosti; hrvaški nastajajoči mladi večinoma uporabljajo tovrstne odnose v svojo korist, kar nas še dodatno napotuje na refleksivnost njihovih osebnih odnosov.

Na podlagi predloga člana komisije sem v nadaljevanju raziskovalni agendi dodala vprašanje odnosa med tehnologijo in sodobnimi prijateljstvi. Respondenti doživljajo, da tehnologija vpliva na način, kako se v pozni moderni prijateljstva sklepajo in – kar je še pomembneje – ohranjajo. Tehnologija internetnih komunikacijskih orodij se vse bolj uporablja za premoščanje ovir, ki jih pred prijateljstvo postavljajo družbeni pogoji pozne moderne, med njimi geografska mobilnost in razvejanost življenjskih poti. A vendarle je tehnologija med nastajajočimi odraslimi v tej raziskavi sprejeta z izjemno refleksivnostjo, ki prepoznava tako njene prednosti in potencialni vpliv na odtujevanje medsebojnih odnosov. Treba je dodati, da moramo te rezultate glede tehnologije in prijateljstva razumeti v kontekstu namenskega vzorca, torej življenjskega obdobja respondentov in ravni njihove izobrazbe. Današnji nastajajoči odrasli so namreč odraščali brez današnjih internetnih orodij, kot je Facebook, ali tehnologij, kot so pametni telefoni. Prav nasprotno, tako Facebook in pametni telefoni so postali široko uporabljani šele pred nekaj leti. Ker prav Facebook spreminja načine predstavljanja posameznikovega sebstva pred širšim občinstvom in tudi pred prijatelji, in ker pametni telefoni omogočajo stalno povezanost z njimi, lahko zatrdimo, da respondenti v te tehnologije med odraščanjem niso bili vpleteni tako kot so današnje mlajše generacije. Potemtakem lahko domnevamo, da so bolj sposobni refleksivnega kritičnega odnosa do njih kot sodobni najstniki. To je vsekakor domneva, ki bi jo bilo zanimivo preveriti s katero od bodočih empiričnih raziskav.

V naslednjem delu raziskave se ukvarjam z dinamičnim vidikom prijateljstva v pozni moderni. Družbeni pogoji pozne moderne se veliki meri prepletajo z dvema kategorijama, za kateri smo odkrili, da sta pomembni za sklepanje in ohranjanje resničnih prijateljstev: čas in trud. Vse večja geografska mobilnost in razvejanje življenjskih poti v pozni moderni vodijo do izoblikovanja različnih družbenih časov različnih družbenih akterjev (Urry 2009). Kot smo se videli, je pri organizaciji določenih tipov prijateljstev ključen čas. Zato se določeni načini organizacije družbenega časa odražajo tudi v prijateljstvih, v katera družbeni akterji vstopajo in jih negujejo. Z drugimi besedami, družbeni pogoji pozne moderne so bolj naklonjeni določenim tipom prijateljstev. V tem primeru to pomeni, da so bolj naklonjeni družbenim prijateljstvom, ker njihovo sklepanje ne zahteva skupnih in podaljševanih časovnih obdobij. Poleg tega so v tem kontekstu še posebej poudarjena kontekstualna družbena prijateljstva, ker so organizirana okoli spreminjajočih kontekstov in ohranjana samo tako dolgo kot traja družbeni kontekst, v katerem so bila sklenjena. Zato je princip sklepanja kontekstualnih družbenih prijateljstev princip takojšnje instrumentalnosti; spoprijateljjevanje zaradi zadovoljevanja drugih potreb, ponavadi potrebe po druženju v določenih kontekstih. Iz tega sledi, da družbena prijateljstva delujejo znotraj socialnih predelov, za katere je potreben manjši trud – kajti zanje se ne pričakuje nujno, da bodo dolgotrajna ali da bodo omogočala intimnost, zato se jih ne ohranja na način resničnih prijateljstev. Nadalje, nekateri respondenti o družbenih prijateljstvih govorijo na zelo nezavezujoč način. Družbeno prijateljstvo je zato bolj nagnjeno k razpustitvi kot resnično prijateljstvo. V tem pomenu so družbena prijateljstva tudi dejansko Baumanove povezave, osebna razmerja, v katere je lahko vstopati in jih razpustiti (Bauman 2003). Princip instrumentalnosti, četudi ničasne narave, je tudi v ozadju oblikovanja družbenih prijateljstev. To pomeni, da so situacijska družbena prijateljstva utemeljena s principom pridobivanja koristi, ki ne izhajajo iz razmerja samega – kot so recimo skupne aktivnosti. Ker družbena prijateljstva niso organizirana okoli določenega družbenega konteksta, temveč so organizirana s samostojno iniciativo družbenih akterjev, niso nujno odvisna od trajanja določenih družbenih kontekstov in zato niso nujno minljiva. Glede na časovno organiziranost so bolj podobna resničnim prijateljstvom.

Družbene pogoje pozne moderne lahko povežemo z dvema medsebojno povezanima pogojema, pod katerima se sklepajo prijateljstva; pomanjkanje časa ali osebnega angažmaja. Če razmerju manjka katera od teh značilnosti, gre potem v smer družbenih prijateljstev. Kako družbeni pogoji pozne moderne prispevajo k temu? Nekateri respondenti opažajo fenomen, ki sem ga poimenovala »osredotočanje na sebe«, pri katerem se sledenje svoji načrtani življenjski poti izraža z manj intenzivnim ukvarjanjem z drugimi in minimalnemu trudu, ki je vložen v razmerje. V tem kontekstu se razvija družbeno prijateljstvo. Pomanjkanje časa kot posebni pogoj lahko še dodatno pospeši družbena prijateljstva, saj je predpogoj za sklepanje resničnih prijateljstev podaljševan skupni družbeni čas. To v največji meri izkusijo zaposleni nastajajoči odrasli, ki imajo za socializacijske vidike svojega življenja na voljo manj časa. Ker družbeno prijateljstvo zahteva manj časa in truda, da se vzpostavi,

mu ti posebni pogoji ustrezajo. V primeru nekega respondenta je bilo zanimivo slišati, kako posebni pogoj, kot so številni interesi, vodi k družbenemu prijateljstvu namesto k resničnemu. To je bila posameznica, ki je izkazovala visoko stopnjo refleksivnosti in mnogotere, pogosto nasprotujoče interese oziroma zanimanja, kot je zanimanje za umetnostno zgodovino in ljudsko glasbo. Njegovi nasprotujoči interesi se izražajo v izkušnji, da je bil le redko popolnoma razumljen v posameznem razmerju. Za strategijo delovanja je respondent zato izbral vzdrževanje parcialnih prijateljstev.

Ko govorimo o resničnih prijateljstvih, jih v pozni moderni najbolj ogrožajo pomanjkanje časa in osebnega angažmaja. Kot smo že omenili, je za zaposlene nastajajoče odrasle oziroma za tiste, ki ob delu študirajo, čas redek vir. Oboji priznavajo vpliv teh pogojev na vsakdanjo organizacijo življenja, kar se na področju odnosov odraža s pomanjkanjem energije, ki bi jo namenili ohranjanju prijateljstev. Še en možen scenarij v pozni moderni je desinhronizacija med različnimi družbenimi časi zaposlenih prijateljev, kar še dodatno otežuje socializacijo. V tem primeru se pokaže kot pomembna strategija spletnega vzdrževanja prijateljstva s pomočjo spletnih komunikacijskih orodij. A vendarle ta strategija ne zadovoljuje in zahteva nadaljno kompenzacijo za zamujeno druženje o med vikendi. Če se družbeni akter osredotoča le na strategijo spletnega vzdrževanja razmerij, bo to najverjetneje vodilo v zmanjšanje intenzivnosti stika s prijateljem in sčasoma tudi k prekinitvi prijateljstva ali njegovi prilagoditvi na raven družbenega prijateljstva. Zato lahko časovna desinhronizacija vsakdanjih družbenih praks prijateljev dolgoročno pripelje k oddaljevanju od resničnega prijateljstva. Pomanjkanje časa od družbenih akterjev zahteva tudi to, da o prijateljstvu razmišljajo refleksivno in preračunljivo. Princip preračunljivosti se ne ujema zahtevami resničnega prijateljstva in ima lahko nezaželene posledice pri njegovem ohranjanju. V raziskavi smo odkrili, da sta najpomembnejša posebna pogoja za ohranjanje prijateljstva v nenaklonjenih družbenih pogojih osebno prizadevanje in razumevanje. Iz tega in iz splošnih diskurzov respondentov, lahko razberemo, da je osebni angažma osrednja kategorija respondentovega diskurza o prijateljstvu. To lahko povežemo s splošnim individualiziranim pristopom k življenju v pozni moderni (Beck in Beck-Gernsheim 2002). V tem diskurzu osebni angažma pogosto obvelja za ključen faktor uspehov ali neuspehov družbenih akterjev; podobno lahko občutimo v diskurzih o prijateljstvu, še posebej tistih, ki jih hrvaški nastajajoči odrasli uporabljajo, ko govorijo o razpadanju prijateljstev. Še eno zaznano tveganje za prijateljstva v pozni moderni je povezano z razvejanjem življenjskih poti različnih prijateljev, recimo selitvijo v geografsko oddaljene predele ali življenjskimi potmi, ki so se razcepile na različna družbena področja z različnimi življenjskimi stili, zanimanji ali faznimi spremembami v poteku življenja. Osebno prizadevanje ponovno velja kot ključen posebni pogoj, ki odloča o tem, ali se bo prijateljstvo nadaljevalo.

V pridobljenih podatkih smo odkrili tudi razliko med dojemanjem prijateljstva v majhnih in v večjih družbenih okoljih pri respondentih, ki imajo izkušnje z obema okoljema. To v disertaciji postavimo v kontekst splošnega fenomena povečane diferenciacije in ohlapne narave družbenega življenja v večjih urbanih okoljih v nasprotju z bolj čvrsto in stabilno naravo v manjših družbenih področjih, ki se v



pozni moderni še naprej spremljajo in raziskujejo (Fischer 1982; Wellman, Carrington in Hall 1988; Wellman 2001). V skladu s tem so bila v tej študiji prijateljstva v večjih družbenih okoljih tudi občutena kot bolj skladna s postulatoma individualizacije kot tista v manjših družbenih okoljih. Za prijateljstva v manjših družbenih okoljih velja, da pri ohranjanju vezi ponujajo več integracije in varnosti. Obenem sprožajo tudi občutke večje regulacije, in sicer glede manjše izbire njihovega sklepanja in prekinjanja, nagnjena pa so tudi h konformnosti. To daje določeno težo trditvi, da prijateljstva v manjših okoljih spominjajo na prijateljstva v manj moderniziranih oblikah skupnosti, medtem ko so tista v večjih okoljih oblikovana bolj v skladu z logiko individualizacije. V tem pomenu je izkušnja prijateljstva v večjem družbenem okolju v pozni moderni tudi zares bližja izkušnji čistega razmerja.

Sklepni del disertacije se ukvarja s tipi podpore, ki so dostopni v prijateljstvu in v družini. Predpostavljene premestitve intimnosti nismo prepoznali, smo pa opazili premeščanje podpore. Pri različnih vrstah osebnih odnosov so se pojavljala pričakovanja posebnih vrst podpore. V kontekstu navadne čustvene podpore prijateljstvo med hrvaškimi nastajajočimi odraslimi velja za nenadomestljivo in se izraža kot vsakodnevno svetovanje ali čustvena refleksivnost. Glede te podpore ima prijateljstvo prednost pred družino: večina respondentov (43 od 50) bi se v primeru rednih čustvenih problemov najprej obrnila na prijatelje in mnogo bi se obrnila le nanje (39 od 50). Zakaj imajo prijateljstva kot vir čustvene podpore prednost pred družino? Prijatelji ponavadi veljajo za neobremenjene s strukturnimi omejitvami družinskih razmerij. Respondenti pravijo, da starše vidijo kot bolj »nevtralen« vir podpore, saj želijo biti osvobojeni pričakovanj, ki prihajajo z družinskimi vezmi. Respondenti, ki imajo dolgotrajna romantična razmerja, pogosto navajajo partnerje kot pomemben vir čustvene podpore kljub zadovoljujočim prijateljstvom (12 od 50). Poleg tega so v primerih dolgotrajnih razmerij ta pogosto navajana kot primarni vir čustvene podpore, torej pred prijatelji. To lahko pojasnimo z bolj pogostimi stiki s partnerjem kot s prijatelji, pa tudi z drugačno naravo romantičnih partnerstev kot osebnih razmerij od prijateljstev; prva imajo namreč dodatno fizično dimenzijo, ki pripomore k intimnosti. Družina je v kontekstu običajne čustvene podpore manj pogosto navajana, in sicer le v nekaterih primerih (5 od 50) skupaj s prijatelji; nadaljnjih 6 od 50 respondentov kot primarni vir tovrstne podpore navaja nuklearno družino. To se dogaja v demokratiziranem odnosu starš-otrok, ki temelji na enakosti, odprtosti in bolj spominja na prijateljstvo kot na tradicionalni odnos starš-otrok. To se dogaja tudi v primerih respondentov, ki so zelo blizu svoji primarni družini ne glede na demokratizacijo odnosov, in v primerih respondentov, ki so izkusili krhkost prijateljstva. Kadar gre za bolj otipljive oblike podpore, kot je finančna podpora, je zanimivo, da je situacija drugačna od običajne emocionalne podpore. Večina respondentov (35 od 50) bi se v primeru, da bi potrebovali finančno pomoč, obrnila najprej na družino. Ko smo še naprej preverjali, zakaj bi se respondenti obrnili najprej k družini in ne k prijateljem, smo opazili različno dožemanje družinskih in prijateljskih vezi. Kot je bilo v intervjujih pogosto poudarjeno, je družina občutena kot

vez, ki je obvezna, medtem ko prijateljstvo temelji na osebni izbiri. Zato se v primeru prošnje po finančni pomoči za razmerje, ki je obvezno, pričakuje, da jo bo izpolnila, medtem ko je razmerje, ki temelji na osebni izbiri za takšno zahtevo pogosto občuteno kot preveč ambivalentno. Nekateri respondentni so prepričani, da denar vpeljuje implikacije obveznosti v prijateljsko razmerje, kar je v nasprotju s prostovoljnim temeljem, na katerega naj bi se razmerje opiralo. Drugi pogoj, ki v primeru finančne pomoči vpliva na zatekanje nastajajočih odraslih k družini, je življenjska faza, v kateri se nahajajo. Zanje je namreč tipično, da na Hrvaškem v kontekstu tako podaljšanega prehoda v odraslost kot visoke brezposelnosti ne delajo. Zato nastajajoči odrasli vedo, da jim njihovi sovrstniki niso zmožni finančno pomagati. A vendarle obstaja skupina respondentov (7 od 50), ki daje prednost prijateljem pred družino v primeru, ko potrebujejo finančno pomoč. To se dogaja, če imajo s svojo primarno družino pretrgane vezi ali če družina živi v težkih finančnih pogojih. Nekaj je tudi respondentov (3 od 50), ki izkazujejo odklon od vzorca, za katerega so značilna podaljšana pričakovanja finančne podpore staršev. Ti respondenti, stari med 23 in 27 leti, so po svoji oceni prestari, da bi v tem življenjskem obdobju starše prosili za finančno pomoč.

Poleg običajne čustvene podpore me je zanimalo, na koga bi se respondenti obrnili v primeru potrebe po čustveni podpori večje obsega, kot je težka bolezen. Težka bolezen je primer pomembnejšega negativnega dogodka v življenju, kar je koncept, ki smo ga prevzeli iz psihologije, kjer označuje dogodke, ki so lahko zelo stresni in imajo negativen vpliv na potek posameznikovega življenja in njegovo zdravstveno stanje: mednje sodijo smrt partnerja ali družinskega člana, ločitev, težka bolezen, izguba službe, problemi v službi ali pomanjkanje formalne izobrazbe (Meeuwesen 2006, 63). Zanimivo je, da je bila pri tej čustveni podpori družina bolj vpletena kot prijatelji, kar je v nasprotju z običajno čustveno podporo, kjer je izstopajo prijatelji. Nadalje več kot polovica respondentov (23 od 50) pravi, da bi pomoč najprej iskali v družini, pri čemer nekateri (14 od 50) jasno poudarjajo družino kot glavni vir podpore. Ko smo poizvedovali dalje, so mnogi dejali, da je kljub zadovoljujočim prijateljskim razmerjem družinska podpora takšna podpora, na katero se lahko zanesejo in ji zaupajo. V primerih dveh respondentov, ki sta se oprla na prijatelje, je bil negativni življenjski dogodek smrt staršev. Z drugimi besedami, če so bili starši prisotni, so se respondentni, ki so doživljali negativne življenjske dogodke prvenstveno obračali nanje tako za čustveno podporo kot za skrb. V primerih težkih bolezni kot velikega negativnega življenjskega dogodka me je zanimala le čustvena podpora, potem sem pa sem med intervjuji začela vključevati tudi bolj otipljivo obliko podpore v teh pogojih, kot je skrb za prevoze v bolnišnico, obiskovanje zdravnikov, itd. To vrsto pomoči so vključevali, da bi poudarili, da bi bili v starši primeru skrbi primarni vir podpore. V tem kontekstu prijateljstvo na splošno velja za prostovoljno razmerje, ki je preveč krhko, da bi ga obremenjevali s krizami in stiskami tolikšnih razsežnosti. Višji vložek družine v posameznikovo dobrobit na splošno velja za glavni razlog, da se obrnejo na družino v primerih velikih negativnih življenjskih dogodkov. Pet respondentov je poročalo o tem, da so se v iskanju podpore po takšnih dogodkih obrnili na

strokovnjake. Večina od njih se je obrnila na psihologe (4 od 5), medtem ko je eden obrnil na duhovnika. Pomembno je opaziti, da vsi od njih poročajo o zadovoljujočih prijateljstvih. Iz njihovih odgovorov je bilo razbrati, da je bila za njihova stanja, ki so jih sprožili negativni življenjski dogodki, podpora prijateljev ne zadošča.

Za te rezultate je zgovorno tudi to, da je kontekst, sestavljen iz dveh študij iz drugačnih sociokulturnih miljejev in na podlagi različnega vzorca, kljub temu nakazal podobne rezultate. Prva študija je bila Wellmanova študija intimnih vezi, ki jih spleta osebne mreže odraslih v okrožju Easty Work v Torontu (Wellman 1979; Wellman in Wortley 1990), druga pa je bila na anketnem vprašalniku utemeljena študija odraslih v severni Kaliforniji (Fischer 1982). Ti dve raziskavi sta odkrili, da so bila prijateljstva najpogosteje uporabljena za druženje in emocionalno podporo, medtem ko je bila družina pri bolj otipljivih oblikah podpore, kot je finančna pomoč ali dolgotrajnejša oskrba, ključni vir podpore, pa tudi primarni vir podpore in oskrbe v primeru resnih kriz (Fischer 1982; Wellman in Wortley 1990; Wellman 2001).

Vse to napotuje na partikularnost prijateljstva kot družbenega razmerja in na omejen obseg podpore, ki jo ponuja. Stopnja, do katere so se respondenti pripravljene obrniti na prijatelje za podporo razkriva izkustvo prijateljstva kot razmerja, ki je zaznan kot kvalitativno drugačen od družinskih odnosov in potemtakem primeren le za določene vrste podpore. Z drugimi besedami, če gre za podporo, je prijateljstvo specializirana vez, najbolj primerna za običajno čustveno podporo, medtem ko v primerih večjih vložkov, naj bodo ti materialni ali čustveni, obstaja težnja po premestitvi pričakovanj glede podpore na družinsko sfero, saj je prijateljstvo pogosto doživljano kot preveč krhko za tovrstne zahteve. To zaznavanje specializacije vezi med nastajajočimi odraslimi na Hrvaškem ima skupaj s kontekstom odkritij iz drugih sociokulturnih miljejev nekatere implikacije za splošni pomen prijateljstva v pozni moderni. Poleg tega je izhodišče, na podlagi katerega moramo preizprašati vse univerzalne trditve o tem, da prijateljstvo nadomešča družinske vezi. Če je prostovoljna narava prijateljstva občutena kot glavna vir dvoma glede obsega, v katerem se lahko zanesemo na prijateljstvo, potem do neke mere tudi pritruje dvomu o tem, da prijateljstvo na splošno nadomešča družinske vezi. Poleg tega namiguje, da je prijateljstvo med nastajajočimi odrasli na Hrvaškem razumljeno bolj kot odnos, ki je primeren za emocionalno refleksivnost in družabništvo in ne kot odnos, na katerega se lahko zanesemo v primeru, ko so ogroženi eksistenčni pogoji posameznikovega preživetja.

Da odgovorimo na zadnje raziskovalno vprašanje: povezave med občutji osamljenosti, ki obstajajo navkljub zadovoljujočim prijateljstvom, s predpostavljeno prilagoditvijo prijateljstva nismo odkrili. Ta občutja so namesto tega povezana s specializirano funkcijo prijateljstva in s tem, kar sem imenovala »prazne točke pri prijateljski podpori«. So del družbenega izkustva respondentov, pri katerem ne sodelujejo ali ne morejo sodelovati zaradi pogojev, ki niso povezani s prijateljskim odnosom. Z

drugimi besedami: ta občutja pripadajo individualnim izkušnjam, ki so onkraj dometa prijateljske podpore. Glede teh točk posameznik lahko občuti osamljenost. Odkrila sem štiri vrste praznih točk, ki potencialno ustvarjajo občutja osamljenosti, ker jih je v okviru prijateljske podpore nemogoče nasloviti. Prva je strukturna točka, pri kateri posamezniku primanjkuje vključenosti v družbeni sistem in iz tega naslova potem občuti osamljenost kljub zadovoljujočim prijateljskim odnosom. To velja na primer za daljša obdobja brezposelnosti. Druga točka je individualizirano izkustvo, pri katerem respondentov prijatelj ni prestal enake izkušnje kot respondent in zato se tudi ni zmožen z njo povezati. Najbolj pogosti primeri za to so različne telesne izkušnje, kot so nosečnost ali določene bolezni. Pri tretji prazni točki posamezniki občutijo osamljenost kljub zadovoljujočim prijateljskim razmerjem in temu pogosto pravijo eksistencialna samota. Eksistencialna samota prepozna ta tip osamljenosti kot eksistenčno osamljenost, ki ne izhaja iz nezadostnih družbenih stikov in lahko kljub njim vztraja (Yalom 1980). Zadnji od odkritih virov osamljenosti kljub zadovoljujočim prijateljski podpori je odsotnost romantičnega partnerja. Zato je osamljenost kljub zadovoljujočim prijateljstvom ponavadi občutena, ko se respondent nahaja v položaju, v katerem prijatelj ne more sodelovati. Četudi respondent občuti, da lahko deli takšno izkušnjo s prijateljem, obstaja omejen obseg, do katerega se prijateljevo izkustvo lahko ujema z njegovim. To je potencialni vir občutij osamljenosti in napotuje na omejen domet podporne funkcije prijateljstva.

Če povzamemo, sodobno prijateljstvo je, sodeč po tej raziskavi, bolj kompleksen fenomen kot smo sprva predvidevali. Odgovori na prvotno zastavljena raziskovalna vprašanja so se izkazali za bolj kompleksna kot je bila njihova prvotna formulacija. Zato se je prvo raziskovalno vprašanje v tej študiji ukvarjalo s tem, kako posamezniki v pozni moderni občutijo trajnost vezi v prijateljskih razmerjih. Ali moderno prijateljstvo postaja utekočinjeno s tem, da ga vse lažje razpustimo in je torej vse bolj podvrženo fragmentaciji, ali pa ima bolj subverziven značaj pri odpornosti na omenjene spremembe? Je prijateljstvo v pozni moderni občuteno kot vse bolj razpoložljivo ali še vedno velja za razmerje bolj trpežne narave?

Podobno kot pri poimenovanju prijateljstva je glede trpežnosti in gotovosti, ki iz njega izhajata, pričakovati, da se bo ujemalo z značilnostmi določenih tipov družbene prakse prijateljstva. Družbena prijateljstva spadajo med prijateljstva, ki so nase vzela to minevajočo in površinsko naravo sodobnih razmerij. V tej raziskavi se je pokazalo, da njihovo oblikovanje zaznamuje pomanjkanje truda, časa ali celostnega razumevanja, ki je potrebno za razvoj resničnega prijateljstva. Pokazalo se je tudi, da jih zaznamuje načelo instrumentalnosti ali trenutne instrumentalnosti, kar so respondenti zaradi vzajemnosti videli kot pozitivno. Zaradi pomanjkanja truda, ki je vložen v takšna razmerja in njihovo organizacijo glede na prikladnost, namesto glede na vsebino razmerja, jih lahko obravnavamo kot nagnjena k razpoložljivosti. V tem pomenu tudi zares spominjajo na Baumanove »povezave« (Bauman 2003, xii); tudi zares so razmerja, ki temeljijo na subjektivnih potrebah posameznikov, in vanje lahko z lahkoto vstopamo in jih prekinjamo. To, kot smo že zapisali, še posebej velja za

kontekstualna prijateljstva, ki prenehajo obstajati z razpustom družbenega konteksta, v katerem so se vzpostavila. Hkrati se tudi resnična prijateljstva umeščajo v družbeno polje, ki je prevzelo upiranje strukturnim spremembam pozne moderne. Resnična prijateljstva temeljijo na partikularnosti partnerja v odnosu, obzirnost do drugega je zelo pomembna v takšnem odnosu in se izraža z lastnostmi, kot so zaupanje, taktnost in dobrohotnost, obenem pa je ena od pomembnejših značilnosti tudi podaljševanje trajanja razmerja. To je tudi razlog, zakaj resnično prijateljstvo bolj odporno na družbene pogoje pozne moderne kot družbeno prijateljstvo. Slednje je tudi manj trajno. Če govorimo o idealni praksi, se za resnično prijateljstvo pričakuje, da bo vztrajalo tudi pod nenaklonjenimi družbenimi pogoji pozne moderne, kot so pomanjkanje časa ali razvejanje življenjskih poti. V tem kontekstu so respondenti še posebej poudarjali pomembnost osebnega prizadevanja oziroma angažmaja in razumevanja kot dveh pomembnih dimenzij za vzdrževanje prijateljstva v nenaklonjenih časovnih ali prostorskih pogojih. Kot smo že dejali, to lahko razumemo kot simptom individualizacije v pozni moderni, v kateri niso individualizirana le sebstva in posamezne biografije, marveč tudi za dejavnike, ki vplivajo na razmerja, velja, da so pod posameznikovim lastnim nadzorom. Prijateljstvo je še posebej nagnjeno k temu diskurzu, saj je prostovoljno in je osebni angažma potreben tudi za njegovo prekinitev. Ko se resnično prijateljstvo sooči z ogrožajočimi strukturnimi omejitvami, se pričakuje, da se stopnja osebnega prizadevanja in razumevanja poveča na obeh straneh razmerja. To velja še posebej takrat, ko edemu od partnerjev primanjkuje časa za vzdrževanje odnosa. Pod temi pogoji in v primeru selitve na oddaljena geografska področja je za nastajajoče odrasle pri ohranjanju razmerja zelo pomemben spletni »prostor tokov«. Nastajajoči prijatelji tudi pod najzahtevnejšimi pogoji ne izgubijo zaupanja v trpežnost resničnega prijateljstva. Prav v primeru geografske mobilnosti nekatera prijateljstva ne vzdržijo tega manjka povezovanja, ker to navsezadnje vodi v pomanjkanje skupnega izkustva in torej tudi medsebojnega védenja in intimnosti. To je nujno področje potencialne negotovosti resničnega prijateljstva kot družbenega razmerja, ki temelji na osebni izbiri. Zato lahko zaključimo, da je prijateljstvo med hrvaškimi nastajajočimi odraslimi v pozni moderni doživeto kot dolgoročno in kratkoročno razmerje, glede na svoj tip in funkcijo, ki naj bi ju zadovoljilo.

Drugo raziskovalno vprašanje te disertacije je bilo, ali so prijateljska razmerja po svoji naravi postala vse bolj parcialna. Cilj je bil raziskati, ali sodobni posameznik v prijateljska razmerja vstopa na delni način, tako da v različna razmerja daje različne dele svojega sebstva. Ali takšen način odnosnosti spodbuja posameznikova občutja, da znotraj enega razmerja ne more biti celostno razumljen?

Razultati nakazujejo, da je parcialnost dejansko način sklepanja odnosov v pozni moderni. Večina respondentov je zares občutila parcialnost prijateljstev, in sicer v smislu, da so v večini primerov zadovoljevala le del njihovih potreb in zanimanj. Respondenti se niso čutili razumljene znotraj posameznega razmerja, a so takšne odnose imeli za zadovoljujoče. Da bi kompenzirali manjko celostnega razumevanja znotraj posameznega razmerja, so si pomagali z iskanjem različnih vrst delnih razumevanj v različnih parcialnih razmerjih. Začetne predpostavke disertacije so torej pravilno

predvidele izkustvo orientiranosti na parcialnost v sodobnih razmerjih. Kompleksno družbeno realnost pozne moderne, v kateri so lokalitete v daljšem kontinuiranem obdobju le redko skupne in v kateri se življenjske poti pogosto razhajajo, lahko povežemo z individualiziranimi eksistencami, kar se še nadalje povezuje s parcialnostjo v odnosih. Da bi se posamezniki s tem spoprijeli, uporabljajo strategijo predalčkanja razumevanja, tj. ločijo pričakovanja po določeni vrsti razumevanja v določenih vrstah prijateljskih vezi, zato lahko zapišemo, da prijateljska razmerja veljajo za specializirane vezi. Sklepamo lahko, da ta diferenciacija prijateljstva služi kot strategija zadovoljevanja posameznikovih socializacijskih potreb v visoko diferencirani družbeni realnosti pozne moderne. Ker je začetno raziskovalno vprašanje ni upoštevalo možnost obstoja mnogoterih tipov prijateljstva, je spregledalo tudi možnost celostnosti v posameznem razmerju. Resnično prijateljstvo se je dokazalo kot takšno razmerje. Če smo parcialno razumevanje v parcialnih prijateljstvih tudi dejansko prepoznali, je bila pred resnična prijateljstva postavljena zahteva po celostnem razumevanju. Pri razmerjih v pozni moderni smo zato prepoznali tako popredalčkano kot celostno razumevanje.

Naslednje raziskovalno vprašanje, postavljeno na začetku raziskave, se je ukvarjalo s premestitvijo resnične intimnosti iz prijateljstva v druge sfere, kot je družinska in terapevtska. Zaradi negotovosti vezi smo predpostavili, da je bila intimnost premeščena iz intimnih sfer v družinsko in terapevtsko sfero. Poleg tega smo predpostavili, da se je to kompenziralo z oblikovanjem bolj omrežij bolj družabne vrste, in se torej vprašali še, ali obrat k vse bolj družbeni naravi prijateljstva predstavlja dodaten razlog za premestitev intimnosti iz prijateljske v druge sfere?

Rezultati raziskave so se znova pokazali kot bolj kompleksni od začetnega vprašanja. In sicer z raziskavo premestitve resnične intimnosti v druge ne-prijateljske sfere nismo potrdili, saj resnično prijateljstvo v največji meri temelji na intimnosti. Obenem se je pokazalo, da je intimnost zadržana zunaj prijateljskih con, za katere velja, da so bolj minljivega značaja in ki nimajo predpogojev za izoblikovanje intimnosti. To so cone družbenega prijateljstva. Med drugim smo tudi odkrili, da se negotovost glede prostovoljne narave prijateljskih vezi izraža v različnih vrstah premestitev. Namesto intimnosti se pričakovanja podpore v nekaterih primerih nahajajo zunaj prijateljskih con. Medtem ko vsakdanja čustvena podpora velja za ključno lastnost prijateljstva, se zahteva po njej, kadar gre za večje posameznikove vloške, pogosto umešča izven prijateljstva in se premesti v družinske in tudi terapevtske sfere. To se dogaja zaradi prostovoljne narave prijateljstva, ki je pogosto preveč krhko, da bi preneslo breme večjega materialnega ali energijskega vložka partnerja v prijateljskem odnosu. To govori o tem, da je prijateljstvo posebna vrsta specializirane vezi s posebno funkcijo običajne čustvene podpore, ki se razteza vse do večjih tipov emocionalne podpore, toda v primerih eksistencialne ogroženosti velja za nezanesljivo vez. To razumevanje prijateljstva – če ga postavimo v kontekst z drugimi odkritji v drugih sociokulturnih miljejih – do neke mere pritruje dvomu, da je prijateljstvo kot razmerje sploh zmožno popolnoma nadomestiti družinska razmerja, saj drži že to, da je funkcija teh dveh vrst vezi drugačna. V tej študiji se je pokazalo, da je prijateljstvo v nekaterih primerih tudi zares

prevzelo nekatere funkcije, ki so se doslej pripisovale družini, recimo v primeru, ko sta respondentu umrla oba starša. Respondenti sicer niso najbolj naklonjeni temu, da bi prijateljstvo obremenjevali s tolikšnimi bremenmi, ker se zavedajo njegove prostovoljne narave. Zato je vprašljivo, ali ima prijateljstvo kot prostovoljna vez zmožnost vzdržati večje količine vložkov, ki se pretakajo zgolj v eni smeri. Še več, ta ni v skladu z normo vzajemnosti, ki jo vključuje struktura prijateljstva. Sklepi te raziskave so dejansko nakazali, da je prijateljstvo razmerje, ki je nabolj ustreza zadovoljevanju vsakdanjih čustvenih potreb. V tem kontekstu velja za nenadomestljivega. Na drugi strani je njegov potencial zagotavljanja podpore v pogojih, ki ogrožajo posameznikovo preživetje, omejen. Zdi se, paradoksalno, da je prav tisto, kar daje prijateljstvu največjo vrednost – njegova prostovoljna narava in dejstvo, da ga določa najmanj strukturnih omejitev – tudi njegova glavna šibkost, ko nanese na vprašanje zanesljivosti.

Zadnje raziskovalno vprašanje disertacije se je ukvarjalo s tem, ali so prežemajoči občutki osamljenosti v pozni moderni povezani s predpostavljenim predrugačenjem prijateljstva? Dokaza za to med nastajajočimi odrasli na Hrvaškem nismo našli. Občutja osamljenosti smo zaznali v vzorcu ter tudi pri respondentih, ki so poročali, da imajo sicer zadovoljujoča prijateljstva. Ta občutja niso v zvezi s predrugačenjem prijateljstva zaradi strategije predalčkanja razumevanja, ki ga respondenti uporabljajo. Namesto tega se je pokazalo, da so občutja osamljenosti povezana z omejenim razponom podpore, ki jo prijateljstva lahko nudijo. Določena področja, ki delujejo kot prazne točke onstran dosega prijateljske podpore, so bile prepoznane; strukturni manko posameznikove integracije, odsotnost romantičnega partnerja, eksistenčno refleksivno preizpraševanje in individualizirano izkustvo, ki ni povezano z družbenimi pogoji pozne moderne, temveč bolj z individualizacijsko naravo samega izkustva telesnih ali psiholoških dogajanj, pri katerih drugi niso zmožni sodelovati. Če kljub temu odgovorimo na glavno raziskovalno vprašanje, glede občutij osamljenosti nismo prepoznali, da bi bila povezana s predpostavljenim pomnoženjem prijateljstva. V večji meri jih lahko povežemo z omejenimi funkcijami prijateljstev in s specializiranim načinom razumevanja prijateljstva.

Če povzamemo, sodobni prijateljski odnos se je v tej raziskavi pokazal kot razmerje, prilagojeno kompleksni družbeni realnosti pozne moderne. Zaradi odsotnosti longitudinalne raziskave prijateljstva skozi zgodnjo in pozno moderno, bi bilo nepremišljeno govoriti o prilagoditvi prijateljstva. A vendarle smo odkrili, da se je sodobno prijateljstvo prilagodilo na različne časovno-prostorske organizacije življenja v pozni moderni vsaj v dveh različnih oblikah, pri čemer je vsaka organizirana za zadovoljevanje drugačnih potreb, ki izhajajo iz različne časovno-prostorske organizacije. Nadalje, če se ozremo na ugotovitve v povzeti obliki, uzremo sodobna prijateljstva v podobi zelo posebnega razmerja. Razumemo ga kot specializirano razmerje, razdeljeno v več podkategorij glede na njegovo časovno-prostorsko organizacijo, funkcije, ki jih opravlja, in podporo, ki jo ponuja. Tudi njegovo funkcijo glede podpore in zmožnosti, da vključi širok razpon izkustev, razumemo kot omejeno.

Tovrstna specializirana metodologija prijateljstva, ki jo izkazujejo nastajajoči odrasli, napotuje na refleksivnost pri upravljanju prostovoljnih vezi v pozni moderni. Lahko bi zatrdili, da nastajajoči odrasli kažejo visoko raven zavedanja tega, katere vrste virov določena razmerja ponujajo in kako primerno z njimi ravnati. To je mogoče, kot smo že dejali, obravnavati kot del širšega fenomena individualizacije v pozni moderni in njene zahteve, da posameznik prevzame svoje življenje aktivno v svoje roke (Beck in Beck-Gernsheim 2002).

Nadaljnje implikacije teh ugotovitev predlagamo s pomočjo premisleka kompleksne narave resničnega prijateljstva kot razmerja, kar je bilo mogoče razbrati že iz njegove fenomenologije. Resnično prijateljstvo se je razkrilo kot kompleksno razmerje, ki pogosto zahteva pretanjeno krmarjenje med potencialno nasprotujočimi zahtevami. Da bi razvilo svojo polno vrednost mora poleg vseh teh zahtev biti tudi samozadostno razmerje. Navsezadnje mora vzdržati tudi vse omejitve, ki jih njegovim temeljem postavljajo potencialno neugodni strukturni pogoji pozne moderne. Resnično prijateljstvo se mora ohraniti brez kakršnega koli strukturnega upravljanja, temveč na podlagi osebnega prizadevanja vpletenih akterjev. Vse te zahteve, postavljene pred razmerje, ki temelji na prostovoljstvu partnerjev, lahko razumemo kot visoka pričakovanja. Zaradi teh pričakovanj lahko doživljamo, da je kot razmerje resnično prijateljstvo negotovo.

Negotovost lahko nadalje povežemo z zanesljivostjo prijatelja v določenih situacijah. Intimnost se namreč zdi kot oblika samorazkritja, odkritja pred drugo osebo in deljenja podrobnosti posameznikovega intimnega življenja z njim ali z njo. To za hrvaške nastajajoče odrasle ni tvegano, intimnost pravzaprav razumejo predpogoj za nastanek in obstoj resničnega prijateljstva. Kot tvegano razumejo zanašanje na prijatelja takrat, ko bi to zahtevalo večje investicije prijateljevih virov v posamezno situacijo, predvsem materialnih pa tudi čustvenih virov. Zato se ambivalentnost prijateljstva v pozni moderni skriva v tem, da zanesljivost prijateljstva ni vprašljiva, kadar gre za vsakdanje zadeve, toda postane negotovo, ko so zahteve virov višje od zahtev vsakdanjih situacij.

Koncepta negotovosti, predpostavljenega v začetku raziskave, v tej obliki pri prijateljskem razmerju nismo našli. Namesto tega smo prepoznali, da nastajajoči odrasli izkazujejo pomembno stopnjo osebnega angažmaja pri upravljanju s tovrstno negotovostjo osebnih vezi. To upravljanje se izraža s strategijo delovanja, s katero so prijateljstva, ki veljajo za nezanesljiva, premeščena na raven manjših pričakovanj – na raven družbenih prijateljstev – in v skladu s tem se uravnava tudi posameznikovo vedenje in pričakovanja. Povečana refleksivnost nastajajočih odraslih tako varuje prijateljske odnose v pozni moderni pred negotovostjo, vsaj kar se njihove vsakdanje rabe tiče.





