



LUNDS
UNIVERSITET

DEPARTMENT of PSYCHOLOGY

***The “sweet” process of Amae and its link to attachment:
a cross-cultural study comparing Japanese speaking and
non-Japanese speaking individuals***

Katia Guérin

Master's Thesis (30 hp)
Spring 2018

Supervisor: Åse Innes-Ker

Abstract

(English)

For a long time, Amae has been being considered an emotion culturally unique to Japan and an indigenous concept. However, cross-cultural studies are rare and often contain many limitations. Amae is also often associated with the concept of attachment, but the relationship between the two concepts have yet to be determined. The current study was exploratory and aimed to investigate further cultural differences between Japan and Western societies associated with Amae and its relationship to attachment. A sample of 168 participants answered an online questionnaire in either English or Japanese. This questionnaire contained a 28 items scale for Amae and a 38 items scale for attachment. Participants were divided into a Japanese speaking group and a non-Japanese speaking group. Results indicated differences between the groups for the amae scale, as well as a relationship between certain Amae types and attachment types. However, further research is needed to assess more specifically the cultural differences that can occur between Japan and Western societies, as well as the Amae-attachment relationship.

Keywords: Amae, attachment, indigenous concept, culturally unique, emotion, cross-cultural, Japanese speaking, non-Japanese speaking

Abstract

(Japanese)

日本だと、「甘え」は日常用語だが、外国語に訳せないことで、心理学で長年注目されている。日本特有な概念ではないかと考える研究者もいる。また、甘えと愛着が親密な概念と考えられる。そのため、本研究では、異文化に違いがどれぐらい甘えに影響するかと、甘えと愛着の関係を調べる目的だった。甘え尺と愛着尺を組み合わせたオンライン調査が作られ、英語と日本語で回答していただいた 168 人を分析した。結果、日本語の喋れる人や喋れない人に意外な差が出た。しかし、この差が単なる異文化か別な原因か、さらに研究する必要がある。

キーワード: 甘え、愛着、日本特有、感情、異文化、文化の違い、日本語、
外国語、甘え尺度、愛着尺度

Introduction

Amae is a Japanese concept also considered as a culturally unique emotion, and as it is the case for many other words or concepts in many languages or cultures that are impossible to translate, its meaning is hard to grasp while not knowing Japanese language and Japanese culture. And while there is no doubt about how a certain country's society and culture can diverge from another, is it possible though to recognize the existence of a non-universal emotion?

Japan has for a long time been perceived as a mysterious land with a culture and concepts that were different from other countries, being an islandic country is one but not the only reason to have forged this impression of Japan. From an historical point of view, Japan has closed itself from the rest of the world during Edo period (1603-1868), during those few centuries foreigners were refused the right to enter Japanese territory, and trades with the outside world were reduced to the point that Japan has become an auto-sufficient feudal society, which might have help its reputation to be unique and mysterious in various ways. During Meiji period (1868-1912) the power was restored to the Emperor who then made the decision to open the country and to modernize it, and which resulted on a sudden and very quick westernization of Japan. And during WWII, the US government also made efforts to prove that Japanese people were different from American citizens. As a result, the first book to introduce Japanese society to Western readers, named *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword* (Benedict, 1946), presented Japan as being a "shame society" opposed to the American "guilt society". Nevertheless, Benedict never set foot in Japan before publishing her book, which was written based on the literature, movies, and other information about Japan she could access during the war. Taking another perspective, Uemura (2014) justifies the difference in American and Japanese ethics by the place that religion holds in those two countries. It is well known that Christianity's values are strongly anchored in American society and its laws

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

(e.g.: God bless America), while in Japan Buddhism and Shintoism (Japanese traditional polytheist religion) are more like a mix of tradition, customs, and beliefs. Compared to most American citizens, Japanese people are commonly perceived as not very religious, which could be explained by the fact that Japanese society rely more on other social mechanisms such as *Amae*, rather than religious values.

What is *Amae*?

The concept of *Amae* was first introduced in 1956 in the US by Doi, who then expressed that Japanese language might influence Japanese psychology to a great extent. He first defined *Amae* as “to depend and presume upon another’s love”, but also focused on the emergence of *Amae* within young children and how it affects mother-child interactions. It is important to note that Doi introduced *Amae* in a post war context where the differences between Western societies and the Japanese society were still strongly emphasized as Borovoy (2012) has highlighted. Later, Doi (1973) presented *Amae* as a “key concept” to understand both the Japanese society and Japanese individuals from a psychological perspective. In 1992, he revised his definition of *Amae* as “to depend and presume upon another’s love or bask in another’s indulgence” (Doi, 1992).

Amae (甘え) is a noun, and its common verbal form *Amaeru* is translated as “to engage in *Amae*” (see Glossary). Kumagai (1981) also alerted about the distinction between *Amaeru* and *Amayakasu* (see Glossary), where *Amaeru* could be translated into indulge oneself in love (receiving point of view) and *Amayakasu* into defer the love to another (giving point of view). It is however important to note that *Amayakasu* is more often used in negative way, and thus its meaning would be closer to the verb “spoil”. All are written with the same Japanese ideogram (Kanji) as the word sweet, and like the word sweet in English, *Amae* is used in various ways, slightly changing its meaning according to context. This is one

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

of the reasons why Amae's true meaning is so hard to grasp, especially without knowing Japanese. Amae could be translated as coaxing, pouting, whining, sulking, wheedling, being spoiled or pampered (Johnson, 1993) but also by cherishment (Young-Bruehl & Bethelard, 2000), meanwhile Lewis and Ozaki (2009) compared Amae to the British term "mardy". But none of those words appropriately cover the concept itself.

The "problem" with Amae's definition

While Doi's definition (1992) remains controversial in the research community. For instance, in a 1986 study, Takemoto asserts that Doi neglects to consider the basics Amae interactions, focusing only on mother and child. Takemoto also argues that Amae can benefit both interacting sides and that Doi's vision closely linking Amae and dependence could not express that essential side of Amae. Similarly, Kumagai and Kumagai (1986) argue that Doi's conception of Amae is overly dependent on the dependence criteria, largely ignoring the reciprocity of Amae and how it involves the concept of trust. Overall Doi's interpretation of Amae is viewed as including the negative Amae more than the positive one, which result on people engaging into Amae looking needy, whiny and capricious.

Moreover, the fact that the book *Amae no kozo* (甘えの構造) (Doi, 1971) was translated in English as *The Anatomy of Dependence* (Doi & Bester, 1973) instead of direct translation "The construction of Amae", has altered the perceived meaning of Amae, turning it as a misinterpreted concept solely related to dependence. For this reason, a distinction between the concepts of Amae and dependence is necessary to be able to understand Amae. While both Amae and dependence are responses to a situation in which an individual try to control his/her environment, the main difference between those two concepts lies "in successful *amae* episodes, because the inappropriate behavior or request is accepted, the *amae* requester can control the outcome of the situation" (Yamaguchi-Ariizumi, 2006),

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

meanwhile a dependent person fails to control the outcome of the situation. Another difference between Amae and concept such as dependence is that “*amae* can be described as the presumption on others for indulgence and acceptance” (Yamaguchi, 2004) and that this presumed acceptance of an “inappropriate” behavior or request is part of the essence of Amae.

Behrens (2004) also argues that the person engaging in Amae has indeed the expectation of being understood or accepted, which is why Amae is close to major concept like relatedness and attachment rather than dependence. She also emphasizes that Amae is a cluster of behaviors that can be either seen as positive or negative depending on the degree of intimacy and the age of the person engaging in Amae. Behrens’ work is to this day the most complete review of Amae, in which she categorizes different types of Amae that have been presented such as the Affectionate (or sometimes called Emotional) Amae, the Manipulative Amae, the Reciprocal Amae, the Obligatory Amae, and the Presumptive Amae. Each one of those categories is then characterized by: motivation, behavior, relationship and interactant; as well as the stages they relate to (infancy, childhood, or adulthood). The Affectionate Amae is the only one that emerges during childhood, whereas Obligatory Amae and Manipulative Amae only emerge during Adulthood. However, Kim and Yamaguchi (1995) have made an additional distinction between Vertical Amae (mother-child) and Horizontal Amae (adults) as they represent more easily the “hierarchy” between interactants.

Another distinction often made between different types of Amae is between Positive and Negative Amae, where Positive Amae would be pleasant and fundamental (Niiya & Harihara, 2012), relating to satisfaction and would be linked to social competences (Rothbaum & Kakinuma, 2004). More recently, Niiya (2016) suggested that being asked a favor can increase one’s liking toward the requester as the request signals his/her desire to feel closer, which relates to engaging in Amae behavior. It also appears that adult’s Amae can

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

be a useful tool for adjustment to a new environment as Amae, which is a highly adaptive concept, could help to enhance relationships (Niiya, 2017). But there is more to be discovered about Amae, especially on how adults use Amae in their interactions and how they can benefit from it. Even though many studies about adult Amae already exist, some focusing on romantic relationships (Marshall, Kim & Aikawa 2011) or even adult Amae and attachment (Marshall, 2012; Rothbaum & Kakinuma, 2004), most of this research on Amae is published solely in Japanese (Fujihara & Kurokawa, 1981; Huang, 2017; Inagaki, 2007; Kobayashi & Kato, 2007; Kobayashi, 2016; Nishimura, 2009; Tamase & Iwamuro, 2004; Tamura & Ogawa, 1989; Tani, 2016).

The problem with previous studies

There are two main problems encountered with previous studies about Amae: a) most studies only use a small sample size; and b) most studies are not cross-cultural. The first limitation of Amae's studies is that the participants are most likely to be a small number of Japanese undergraduate students, to the point that Tamase and Wakimoto (2003) developed an Amae scale for undergraduate students. Such homogenous and small samples make Amae even harder to relate to for non-Japanese speaking people, and it is hard to tell to what extent Amae is universal. Especially when there is no direct translation in most languages and that western people seems to have a hard time understanding the concept itself. It could be that there is some culturally appropriate and inappropriate Amae in a certain context, as we all acknowledge that some type of physical interactions can be a greeting in a certain country and almost prohibited in another country.

Moreover, rare are the cross-cultural studies, and the ones existing have a hard time adapting tools and measuring Amae. For example, Niiya, Ellsworth and Yamaguchi (2006) had to adapt some scenarios they used to measure Amae so that the situations would be

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

familiar to American participants. Nevertheless, they did find common ground for both Japanese and American students (e.g. changing from 3 days to one week, the number of days a friend asked to stay at the participant's apartment to adjust the level of inconvenience perceived). For instance, the closer they estimated the friendship, the more easily they would accept an "inappropriate" request (such as having a roommate asking for help to fix a computer in the middle of the night). However, American students seemed to think that receiving an "inappropriate" request gave them more control over a relationship which was not the case for Japanese students. This shows that cultural differences indeed emerge for Amae. But the small and homogenous sample size of the study is still a problem, especially with respect to validity.

Importantly, Gjerde (2001) has criticized the concept of Japan's specific "uniqueness" pointing out that Nihonjinron (日本人論、the study of Japanese culture) is based on the assumption that Japan is different to any other culture, and he also claims that focusing on differences will only highlight and prove those differences instead of finding similarities. Another of Gjerde's warning is that cultural values might not represent daily experiences. This might especially be true in the case of Amae, as Yamaguchi and Ariizumi (2006) observe, Amae is an everyday phenomenon in Japan and a word used every day. This is the reason a folk psychology approach was adopted to study Amae in the first place. They also hypothesized that even though Amae sometimes appears as a negative concept, it is on the contrary often perceived as an expression of love. This argument relates to how a person engaging in Amae can be perceived as a loving and socially skilled, while a person that doesn't might be perceived as someone cold and that never expresses love. In that sense Amae seems to be very close to attachment styles and behavior.

How is Amae connected to attachment?

Amae and attachment have similar aspects as both are first manifested at around 9 months old, both represent a desire for increased closeness (especially during stressful times), and both attachment and Amae have been studied in infants (Vereijken, Riksen-Walraven, & Van Lieshout, 1997) before the research expanded to include adolescents and adults (Rothbaum-Kakinuma, 2004). Doi (2001) also claims that Bowlby's theory on attachment is relevant to Amae for mother and child interactions. One important distinction, however is that Bowlby (1982) defined attachment behavior as "seeking and maintaining proximity to another individual", adding that infants are attached to their caregivers for safety and survival, which diverges from Amae behavior. Yamaguchi and Ariizumi (2006) also observe that the concept of attachment studied in Western societies cannot compare to Amae as they are two different concepts.

Despite the differences between Amae and attachment, they are still closely related as "attachment can be a source of *amae*, but it should not be equated to *amae*, which involves an inappropriate behavior or request" (Yamaguchi & Ariizumi, 2006). Speculations about Amae being related a certain type of attachment are not rare. The first hypothesis was that since Amae behavior are very ambivalent they must also be involving some insecure-ambivalent behaviors (Type C) (Rothbaum et al., 2000). Nevertheless, Kim and Yamaguchi (1995), as well as Behrens (2004) argues that in Japan, Amae tends to associate with securely attached children rather than insecure-ambivalent children. Later, Yamaguchi claimed that "two types of *amae* were distinguished: desirable and undesirable *amae*. Of the two types of *amae*, desirable *amae* was associated with securely attached children, whereas the undesirable *amae* was associated with insecurely attached children" (Yamaguchi, 2004) but that even in Western societies securely attached individuals appears more adapted socially and would be

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

more prone to show the desirable kind of Amae, even though the relationship between Amae and attachment is yet to be defined.

Aim of the study

Therefore, to avoid the limitations found in Amae research, this study aims to focus on adult participants of mixed cultural background. This study also aims to compare Amae and adult attachment differences between Japan and Western societies. To measure Amae, the Amae Type Scale (ATS) created by Kobayashi and Kato (2009), which validity has been tested (Kobayashi and Kato, 2015), has been translated and back translated to ensure its validity. This scale divides, Amae in four different types: the childish-play Amae (子どもっぽく振る舞う甘え), the “do it for me” Amae (代わりにしてもらおう甘え), the very touchy Amae (べたべたと身体的な接触を求める甘え), and the materialistic Amae (物質的援助を求める甘え). However, this scale has only been used in Japanese to measure Amae among Japanese participants, which is why using a translated version to compare multi-cultural groups is exploratory.

Even though many scales to measure attachment already exist both in English and Japanese (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Collins & Read, 1990; Yamaguchi, 2009), this study implements the Experiences in Close Relationships Inventory (ECR) developed by Brennan, Clark, and Shaver (1998). One reason for choosing this scale rather than another, was that the scale measures adult attachment in close relationships and is a 7-points scale like the Amae scale, to avoid confusing participants with a change of measures. Moreover, the validity as well as the reliability of the ECR has been asserted by Sibley, Fischer and Liu (2005) and the questionnaire is widely used in different countries. But more importantly, the scale has been translated in Japanese by Nakao and Kato (2004) and has been the most commonly used scale to measure adult attachment in Japan since then. Even though, a short

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

version of the Experiences in Close Relationships Inventory (12 items) has been developed by Wei Russell, Mallinckrodt, and Vogel (2007), in this study the full version of the questionnaire (36 items) has been used. The scale divides attachment in 3 different types: secure, avoidant and anxious.

This study is exploratory as no previous literature was found using the same scales for Amae and attachment together. The main aim of this study is to measure to what extent Japanese speaking participants and non-Japanese speaking participants differ on their perception of Amae and the way they engage in Amae behaviors. This study also aims to improve understanding of the relation between Amae and attachment styles, by comparing attachment style and Amae style. As an additional insight into Amae, this study will also aim to collect data on how Amae can be differently perceived depending on the partner (lover, friend, family etc.). Some cultural differences are expected to be found, as certain type of behavior, including Amae, are considered as socially inappropriate depending on cultural context.

Methods

Participants

Participants were recruited online, through the following platform: Facebook, LinkedIn, Reddit or Survey tandem; where the survey have been posted. The whole data set used for analysis contained data from 165 participants, 83 females, 78 males and 4 others. The mean age of the participants was 30.74 ($SD=10.55$). All participants were between the age of 18 and 65 years old. Data was collected from both Japanese speaking and non-Japanese speaking participants, without any criteria regarding nationality or country of residency. The first sample (English-version) consisted of 84 participants (51 females, 31 males, 2 others) who took the English version of the survey. The mean age of the participants

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

was 26.52 ($SD=8.00$). The second sample (Japanese-version) consisted of 84 participants (32 females, 47 males, 2 others) who took the Japanese version of the survey. The mean age of the participants was 35.11($SD=11.12$). Three participants were under 18 years old and were removed from the data set.

Materials and measures

General information. Participants were asked to list general information such as the gender identity, their age, their mother tongue, if they lived abroad for more than a year (if yes, in which country), as well as their current occupation to ensure that the sample was not composed of students only.

Amae Type Scale (ATS). Created by Kobayashi and Kato (2009), the scale contains 28 items divided into four different types: the childish-play Amae, the “do it for me” Amae, the very touchy Amae and the materialistic Amae. Originally published in Japanese, the scale was translated and back translated into English to ensure validity for the English version. On a scale of 1 (Never) to 7 (Most of the time), participants were asked to rate how much the proposed situation (e.g. “I start pouting on purpose to get attention from my partner”) correspond to their behaviour when they interact with the person they chose to picture earlier.

Adult Attachment Scale. To measure attachment, the Experiences in Close Relationships Inventory (ECR) developed by Brennan, Clark, and Shaver (1998) was used, as well as its Japanese version translated by Nakao and Kato (2004). The scale contains 36 items that participants had to rate from 1 (Disagree Strongly) to 7 (Agree Strongly). The proposed statements concerned how participants feel about the relationship with the person they were picturing earlier, as well as relationships in a more general way (e.g. “I am very comfortable being close to my partner”; “I worry about being alone”).

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

Complementary information. Participants were asked who they pictured during the questionnaire (e.g. partner/lover, an ex, a very close friend, a family member etc.), for how long they have known each other (or what family member) and if they would describe their relationship as either very good, good, somewhat good, complicated or one-sided.

Participants were also free to add any information they found relevant about that person.

Amae-related information. Participants had to rate their level of Japanese ability according to the following options: to a fluent/native level (N1-2), to some extent/ somewhat a few phrases (N3-4), only a few words, not at all. This particular question aimed to: a) verify that participants who took the Japanese-version indeed understood enough Japanese to answer the questionnaire correctly; b) verify that participants who indicated Japanese as a mother tongue indicated again being fluent; c) have information to divide participants into a Japanese-speaking group and a non-Japanese speaking group. Participants were also asked if they were familiar with the term Amae before participating in the study, and if they did in which context it was, participants were also asked to give a definition of Amae if possible. In the Japanese version, participants were asked how important they thought Amae was, and how much they thought it influenced relationships.

Amae definition and feedback. After answering the Amae-related questions, participants were given a definition and explanations about Amae. Finally, participants had the option to give feedback or ask questions if they needed to do so.

Analytical approach

First, a Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to assess the normality of the ATS and ECR scales and find outliers. Then a principal component analysis (PCA) was conducted to explore the components of both scales. To compare Japanese speaking group and non-

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

Japanese speaking group, independent-samples t-test were conducted. And finally, a correlation (Pearson) was used to investigate the relationship between Amae and attachment.

Ethics and surveys

Pre-data collection, the study was investigated to be sure it would respect the ethics rules of where the study was conducted. The method to collect data being an online survey, no direct control of the participants' real age could have been realistically achieved. However, since the study is targeting adults, any data from participants under 18 years old were automatically deleted. Therefore, this study did not require any parental consent. While this study did collect demographic data and data about personality traits, sensitive data (such as: race or ethnic origin, political opinions, religious or philosophical convictions, membership in trade unions or political organizations, or data that relate to health, sexual life, or criminal offences) were not be collected during the entire time of the study. Moreover, none of the following methods were used in that study: any method involving a physical intervention on research participants, nor method seeking to affect the subject physically or mentally, or method that pose a risk of mental or physical harm, as well as no biological material that can be traced back will be taken from a living person. This study did not go against any rules of the Swedish Ethical Review of Research Involving Humans and aimed to protect participant's anonymity as much as possible.

The study has been registered on Open Science Framework (OSF) pre-data collection as well. Then, the surveys were both created through Google Form and posted on several platforms (Linkedin, Facebook, Reddit, and Survey Tandem).

The two surveys, the English version, and the Japanese version (See Appendix) were created on Google Form, both of same design and containing same amount of questions. However, the surveys were not identical in that the word Amae was clearly used in the

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

Japanese version and not in the English one. Another important difference between the surveys is one question on the Japanese version, where participants were asked to write about how much they thought Amae was important or would impact their relationships. By contrast, the English, survey they were asked in which context they had heard about Amae (if any).

Procedure

The participants were recruited online, and their participation was completely voluntary. After opening the link to the survey and before agreeing to answer further questions, the participants were informed that the data collected would be treated anonymously and with utmost confidentiality but that anonymised data may be made available to researchers and possibly used for novel purpose. Participants were also indicated that the questions will concern their relationship with their closest one. It was also made clear that since participation is voluntary, they had a right to drop out of the survey at any time without giving a reason, and with no consequence to them. The time taken to answer either surveys varied from 10 to 30 minutes according to some participant feedbacks.

After answering demographic data related questions, participants were given indications to answer both the Amae Type Scale and the Experiences in Close Relationships Inventory. Participants were asked to picture someone they have a close relationship with, preferably a partner or a lover, but they could also choose to picture an ex, a close friend, or a family member while rating the presented statements. They could however not choose to picture a child or a baby, as they were explicitly told to picture someone they interact with as an equal or have adult-level interactions with. Participants were asked to keep picturing the same person during the whole task. The second part of the survey was the 28 items of the ATS, followed by the 36 items of the ECR as the third part. Then, for the fourth part,

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

participants had to answer questions about the person they were picturing. In the fifth part, participants were asked their level of Japanese fluency as well as their knowledge about Amae.

Even though some information about the study were given to the participants, information about Amae were not transmitted to the participants before starting the survey. The aim of the survey was not to deceived participants, but to avoid influencing their answers, a definition of Amae was not given to them until after they answered all the questions, just before they submitted the survey. Participants were thanks for their participants, had the possibility to give feedback and were reminded that could at any time send an email with their potential questions.

Regarding the surveys, several points should be taken into consideration when analyzing the data. First, in the Japanese version of the questionnaire, the word Amae is clearly used (and not in the English one) which might impact to some extent the participants approach to certain questions. Second, the ECR scale is a self-report measurement of adult attachment, results could be influenced by the participants' perception of themselves. And finally, since securely attached participants are often more numerous than other types, the results should be interpreted carefully.

Results

Descriptive

Overall, 54% participants indicated speaking Japanese fluently (47% as mother tongue) and 12% indicated speaking it to a good extent. Participants from the first sample (English-version) reported not speaking Japanese for 41%, speaking Japanese to a good extent for 21% and being fluent in Japanese for 12% (4% as mother tongue). Most participants from that sample (80%) indicated to have never heard of the term Amae, while

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

20% indicated being familiar with the term. All participants within the second sample (Japanese-version) indicated speaking Japanese to a fluent level (98%) or to a good extent (2%). When asked about Amae, 64% of the participants from this sample indicated being generally familiar with the term, 31% considered only knowing the term Amae but had no further knowledge about it, and 5% were familiar with research about Amae.

Participants indicated that their mother tongue was one of the following: American sign language, Chinese, Dutch, English, Finnish, French, German, Icelandic, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Lithuanian, Macedonian, Russian, Slovak, Spanish, Swedish, Turkish or Urdu. Only 32% of the participants indicated that they had lived abroad for more than a year. When asked for their current occupation, 57% of the participants indicated that they were employed, 32% were students, 4% as unemployed, 4% working and studying at the same time, and 3% as full-time parent.

Before conducting any further analysis, a new variable was created within the data-set to separate participants in two groups. All participants from the Japanese version were included into the Japanese speaking group, while participants from the English version were included into the Japanese speaking group on the condition that Japanese was either their mother tongue or that they indicated being fluent (level N1-N2). The Japanese speaking group consisted of 91 participants (37 females, 52 males, 2 others), and the mean age of the participants was 34.23 ($SD=10.94$). The non-Japanese speaking group consisted of 74 participants (46 females, 26 males, 2 others), and the mean age of the participants was 26.45 ($SD=8.28$).

While answering the survey 47% of participants pictured a family member, 26% a partner or lover, 17% pictured an ex, and 10% a close friend. However, when separating groups: Forty two percent of Japanese speaking participants pictured a family member whereas only 8 % of the non-Japanese speaking did so. However, 70% of the non-Japanese

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

speaking participants pictured a partner or a lover, when only 32% of the Japanese speaking participants did so. For the rest of the Japanese speaking participants, 18% pictured an ex, and 9% a close friend. And the rest of non-Japanese speaking participants, 12% pictured an ex, and 10% a close friend.

Most participants (41%) indicated having a very good relationship with the person they pictured, 30% rated their relationship as good, 19% as somewhat good, 9% as complicated and 3% as one-sided (only observed in the sample collected with the Japanese-version). For Japanese speaking participants 42% described their relationship as very good, 31% as good, 9% as complicated and 2% as one-sided. As for 57% of non-Japanese speaking participants described their relationship as very good, 31% as good, 7% as somewhat good and 5% as complicated.

Normality

To assess the normality of both samples, several tests have been conducted both on the Amae Type Scale (ATS) and the Experiences in Close Relationships Inventory (ECR). Scores were combined by using the means of both scales (ATS ($M=76.35$); ECR ($M=112.38$)). A Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to test for normality for both Amae Type Scale and Experiences in Close Relationships Inventory. Both had a Sig. value of .20, indicating that the data set met the assumptions of normality for both scales. No outliers were found for the ECR, while the ATS comported one outlier. After careful examination of the data, the outlier was from the Japanese speaking group, it did not appear to be any kind of coding mistake but rather a participant who scored high on many ATS items (20 out of 28 items that the participant rated 7). Therefore, the outlier was not removed from the sample and analysis were conducted with the outlier.

Principal Components Analysis

The 28 items of the Amae Type Scale (ATS) were subjected to principal component analysis (PCA) using SPSS version 24. Prior to performing PCA, the suitability of data for factor analysis was addressed. Inspection of the correlation matrix revealed the presence of many coefficients of .3 and above. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (OKM) value was .89, exceeding the recommended value of .6 and reached statistical significance, supporting the factorability of the correlation matrix. Principal component analysis revealed the presence of 4 components with eigenvalue exceeding 1, explaining (36.66%, 13.29%, 7.30%, and 5.10%) of the variance respectively. An inspection of the scree plot revealed a clear break after the fourth component. Cronbach's α for the four subscales ranged from .69 to .92.

The 36 items of the Experiences in Close Relationships Inventory (ECR) were also subjected to principal component analysis (PCA) using SPSS version 24. Prior to performing PCA, the suitability of data for factor analysis was addressed. Inspection of the correlation matrix revealed the presence of many coefficients of .3 and above. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (OKM) value was .86, exceeding the recommended value of .6 and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity reached statistical significance, supporting the factorability of the correlation matrix. Principal component analysis revealed the presence of 4 components with eigenvalue exceeding 1, explaining (24.57%, 19.57%, 7.88%, and 4.70%) of the variance respectively. An inspection of the scree plot revealed a clear break after the fourth component. Cronbach's α for the four subscales ranged from .88 to .92.

Comparison of Japanese speaking sample and non-Japanese speaking sample

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the Amae scores for Japanese speaking and non-Japanese speaking participants. The scores for each sub-group of Amae were average for each participant, resulting in four scores for: the childish play Amae,

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

the “do it for me” Amae, the very touchy Amae, and the materialistic Amae. As results, the means of the non-Japanese speaking group were higher than the Japanese speaking group for every Amae type.

There was a significant difference in scores for the childish-play Amae type for Japanese speaking participants ($M=19.44$, $SD=11.10$) and non-Japanese speaking ($M=26.49$, $SD=11.03$); $t(163) = -4.07$, $p = .000$. The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference = -7.05 , 95% CI: -10.47 to -3.63) was medium (eta squared = $.09$). According to the guidelines proposed by Cohen (1988), values of the eta squared between $.01$ and $.05$ would represent a small effect, values between $.06$ and $.13$ would indicate a moderate effect, and values from $.14$ on would indicate a large effect.

There was a significant difference in scores for the “do it for me” Amae type for Japanese speaking participants ($M=26.44$, $SD=13.70$) and non-Japanese speaking ($M=31.23$, $SD=10.50$); $t(162,46) = -2.57$, $p = .01$. The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference = -4.84 , 95% CI: -8.57 to -1.21) was small (eta squared = $.04$)

There was a significant difference in scores for the very touchy Amae type for Japanese speaking participants ($M=15.27$, $SD=7.82$) and non-Japanese speaking ($M=24.72$, $SD=7.67$); $t(163) = -7.78$, $p = .000$. The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference = -9.44 , 95% CI: -11.84 to -7.04) was rather large (eta squared = $.27$)

There was no significant difference in scores for the materialistic Amae type for Japanese speaking participants ($M=5.31$, $SD=3.74$) and non-Japanese speaking ($M=6.01$, $SD=2.92$); $t(163) = -1.33$, $p = .19$. The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference = $-.71$, 95% CI: -1.76 to $.34$) was very small (eta squared = $.01$).

The same independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the attachment scores for Japanese speaking and non-Japanese speaking participants. The scores for each sub-group of attachment were average for each participant, resulting in four scores for: the avoidant

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

attachment type, the anxious attachment type and the secure attachment type. As results, the means of the Japanese speaking group had a higher mean for the avoidant type, however, the non-Japanese speaking group were higher for both the anxious type and the secure type.

There was a significant difference in scores for the avoidance items for Japanese speaking participants ($M=61.59$, $SD=17.84$) and non-Japanese speaking ($M=46.27$, $SD=18.63$); $t(163) = 5.38$, $p=.000$. The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference= 15.32 , 95% CI: 9.70 to 20.95) was large (eta squared= .15)

There was no significant difference in scores for the anxiety items for Japanese speaking participants ($M=56.97$, $SD=22.88$) and non-Japanese speaking ($M=60.63$, $SD=22.44$); $t(163) = -1.03$, $p=.30$. The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference= -3.67 , 95% CI: -10.68 to 3.34) was very small (eta squared=.01)

There was a significant difference in scores for the secure items for Japanese speaking participants ($M=39.93$, $SD=12.27$) and non-Japanese speaking ($M=51.99$, $SD=10.81$); $t(163) = -6.61$, $p=.000$. The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference= -12.05 , 95% CI: -15.65 to -8.45) was rather large (eta squared=.21)

Correlation

The relationship between Amae and Attachment was investigated using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumption of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity. The correlation between the different Amae types and different attachment types for the whole sample are presented in Table 1, for the Japanese speaking group are presented in Table 2, and for the non-Japanese speaking group are presented in Table 3. Interpretation of the results were done according to the guidelines proposed by Cohen (1988), where values between .10 and .29

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

would represent a small effect, values between .30 and .49 would indicate a moderate effect, and values from .50 and on would indicate a large effect.

Table 1

Correlation between Amae types and attachment types for all participants

Descriptive statistics (N=165)

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. The childish play Amae	-						
2. The "do it for me" Amae	.61**	-					
3. The very touchy Amae	.57**	.40**	-				
4. The materialistic Amae	.55**	.49**	.28*	-			
5. Avoidant attachment type	-.27**	-.34**	-.54**	-.09	-		
6. Anxious attachment type	.35**	.41**	.23**	.33**	.14	-	
7. Secure attachment type	.37**	.49**	.61**	.22**	-.82**	.16*	-

Note. *indicates $p < .05$. ** indicates $p < .01$.

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

As shown in Table 1, the relationship between the different Amae types were positive and significant ($p=.000$ for all). However, for attachment, the relationship between the avoidant type and the secure type was negative and significant ($p=.000$), whereas the anxious type had a positive and significant relationship with the secure type, and a positive but non-significant relationship with the avoidant type ($p=.86$). Moreover, most correlation between Amae types and attachment types were significant.

For the avoidant attachment type: there was a medium negative and significant correlation with the childish play Amae type; a medium negative significant correlation with the “do it for me” Amae; a strong negative significant correlation with the very touchy Amae; and a small negative and non-significant correlation with the materialistic Amae ($p=.24$).

For the anxious type: there was a medium positive and significant correlation with the childish play Amae type; a medium positive significant correlation with the “do it for me” Amae; a small positive significant correlation with the very touchy Amae; and a medium positive significant correlation with the materialistic Amae.

For the secure type: there was a medium positive and significant correlation with the childish play Amae type; a medium positive significant correlation with the “do it for me” Amae; a strong positive significant correlation with the very touchy Amae; and a small positive significant correlation with the materialistic Amae.

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

Table 2

Correlation between Amae types and attachment types for Japanese speaking sample

Descriptive statistics (n=91)

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. The childish play Amae	-						
2. The "do it for me" Amae	.59**	-					
3. The very touchy Amae	.48**	.28**	-				
4. The materialistic Amae	.60**	.51**	.24*	-			
5. Avoidant attachment type	-.11	-.26*	-.33**	-.05	-		
6. Anxious attachment type	.32**	.34**	.23*	.25*	.14	-	
7. Secure attachment type	.22**	.44**	.39**	.23*	-.74**	.11	-

Note. *indicates $p < .05$. ** indicates $p < .01$.

As shown in Table 2, for the Japanese speaking group as well, the relationship between the different Amae types were positive and significant ($p = .000$ for all). However, for attachment, the relationship between the avoidant type and the secure type was negative and

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

significant ($p=.000$), but positive and non-significant for the anxious type ($p=.17$). Secure and anxious types had a positive but non-significant relationship ($p=.28$). Moreover, most correlation between Amae types and attachment types were significant.

For the avoidant attachment type: there was a small negative and non-significant correlation with the childish play Amae type ($p=.29$); a small negative significant correlation with the “do it for me” Amae; a medium negative significant correlation with the very touchy Amae; and a small negative and non-significant correlation with the materialistic Amae ($p=.65$).

For the anxious type: there was a medium positive and significant correlation with the childish play Amae type; a medium positive significant correlation with the “do it for me” Amae; a small positive significant correlation with the very touchy Amae; and a small positive significant correlation with the materialistic Amae.

For the secure type: there was a small positive and significant correlation with the childish play Amae type; a medium positive significant correlation with the “do it for me” Amae; a medium positive significant correlation with the very touchy Amae; and a small positive significant correlation with the materialistic Amae.

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

Table 3

Correlation between Amae types and attachment types for non-Japanese

speaking sample

Descriptive statistics

(n=74)

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. The childish play Amae	-						
2. The "do it for me" Amae	.59**	-					
3. The very touchy Amae	.55**	.46**	-				
4. The materialistic Amae	.46**	.42**	.30**	-			
5. Avoidant attachment type	-.24*	-.36**	-.56**	-.07	-		
6. Anxious attachment type	.36**	.52**	.20	.45**	-.06	-	
7. Secure attachment type	.34**	.51**	.62**	.15	-.85**	.16	-

Note. *indicates $p < .05$. ** indicates $p < .01$.

As shown in Table 3, for the non-Japanese speaking group as well, the relationship between the different Amae types were positive and significant ($p = .000$ for all). However, for

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

attachment, the relationship between the avoidant type and the secure type was negative and significant ($p=.000$), but non-significant for the anxious type ($p=.59$). Secure and anxious types had a positive but non-significant relationship ($p=.18$). Moreover, most correlation between Amae types and attachment types were significant.

For the avoidant attachment type: there was a small negative and significant correlation with the childish play Amae type; a medium negative significant correlation with the “do it for me” Amae; a large negative significant correlation with the very touchy Amae; and a small negative and non-significant correlation with the materialistic Amae ($p=.56$).

For the anxious type: there was a medium positive and significant correlation with the childish play Amae type; a large positive significant correlation with the “do it for me” Amae; a small positive non-significant correlation with the very touchy Amae ($p=.09$); and a medium positive significant correlation with the materialistic Amae.

For the secure type: there was a medium positive and significant correlation with the childish play Amae type; a large positive significant correlation with the “do it for me” Amae; a large positive significant correlation with the very touchy Amae; and a small positive non-significant correlation with the materialistic Amae ($p=.21$).

Discussion

This study aimed to explore the potential differences between native/fluent and non-native/fluent speakers that could occur with a concept considered culturally unique or indigenous. And more particularly about how Japanese speaking individuals and non-Japanese speaking individuals would differ toward the concept of Amae. Another aim of the study was to develop a better understanding of how the concepts of Amae and attachment were related.

Factor analysis and exploring the scales

According to the principal component analysis, both Amae Type Scale (ATS) and Experiences in Close Relationships Inventory (ECR) contains four components. For the ATS, the components could be interpreted as the four subscales: the childish-play Amae type, the “do it for me” Amae type, the very touchy Amae type, and the materialistic Amae type. However, for the ECR, only three different types of attachment (secure, avoidant, and anxious) were expected. This fourth component was indeed pointed out by Nakao and Kato (2004) in the Japanese version, were they decided to exclude those components. This fourth component could be explained either as specific to a certain population (the Japanese one maybe) or either as an expression of the disorganized/disoriented attachment type, that is often overlooked. Nevertheless, the Experiences in Close Relationships Inventory is not a perfect scale, and has been since then revised (Sibley, Fischer & Liu, 2005) or shortened (Wei-Russell, Mallinckrodt & Vogel, 2007), but it does have a high reliability as asserted by Fraley, Waller and Brennan (2000).

Comparison between Japanese speaking and non-Japanese speaking

The results suggested differences between the Japanese speaking group and the non-Japanese group. For the Amae Type Scale, such results agree with previous cross-cultural study results (Niiya, Ellsworth and Yamaguchi, 2006). The means of the non-Japanese speaking group were higher than the Japanese speaking group for every Amae type. This suggests that the non-Japanese speakers tended to engage more into Amae behaviors or experience more of those behaviors than the participants of the Japanese speaking group.

Within the Amae Type Scale (ATS), only the materialistic Amae type was non-significant, with a very small effect size. This can be explained by the fact that many cultures

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

tend to differentiate between money and proof of affection, or that for many people asking a partner for money or other material things is not a common behavior.

The difference between the two groups for the “do it for me” Amae was significant but had small effect, which suggests that both groups do not differ significantly when asking for favors from their partner or relying on them. However, the non-Japanese speaking participants seemed to ask their partner for help more often than the Japanese speaking participants. Japanese language being known for its implicit or subtle phrasing, also called “sashi bunka” (差し文化), and people that are able to “read the atmosphere” (kuuki wo yomu, 空気を読む) are considered as socially fitting, whereas those who can’t are often marginalized and ostracized. It would then make sense that non-Japanese speaking individuals would have a more direct approach while communicating.

The difference between the two groups for childish play Amae was also significant but had a medium effect, which suggests that non-Japanese speaking participants would be more likely to engage in childish play behaviors than the Japanese speaking participants. However, the mean age of the non-Japanese speaking group was lower (by almost 10 years) and more participants from the Japanese speaking group were full-time parents, which might explain why participants from the first group would engage more in child-like behaviors.

Finally, for the very touchy Amae type, the difference between groups was significant and the effect was rather large. This suggests that non-Japanese speaking participants tend to engage more in physical Amae approaches (e.g. being physically close to someone, wanting physical contact whenever possible etc.) than the Japanese-speaking participants. One explanation for this difference would be that participants from the Japanese speaking group pictured a family member more often than non-Japanese speaking participants, so physical proximity or physical flirting would indeed be less common than with a romantic partner or a

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

lover. Another explanation would be that Western countries are known to have a more physical culture (e.g. the way people greet each other often involves touching) than many Asian countries. In Japan particularly, touching in public is often not considered an appropriate behavior.

As Niiya, Ellsworth and Yamaguchi (2006) point out, the cultural differences in Amae suggest that even though people can experience a certain emotion in a similar way, that experience is not identical between cultures. They add that cultural background adds specific nuance to certain emotional experiences, which seem to agree with this study findings. The findings also agree with Gjerde's (2001) critic on Japan's uniqueness often assumed before being proved, as while differences may have occurred in the two groups, both groups appeared indeed to understand behaviors related with the concept of Amae.

Some differences were also observed in the Experiences in Close Relationships Inventory between the two groups. The means of the non-Japanese speaking group were higher for both the anxious type and the secure type, while the Japanese speaking group had a higher mean for the avoidant type. Within the ECR, only the anxious type was non-significant with a very small effect size. For the avoidant type, there were significant differences between the two groups with a large effect size. This might suggest that the Japanese speaking group was comprised more avoidant type participants. Some people from that group reported having a one-sided relationship with the person they were picturing, and as they would act differently towards the person they pictured, compared to a people in steady relationship, could be partially explain such results. Differences between the two groups for the anxious type were non-significant and the effect was also very small. This suggests that both groups held about the same number of participants of the anxious type. However, differences between the groups for the secure type were significant and the effect

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

was rather large. This suggests that more participants in the non-Japanese group were of the securely attached type.

Comparison between Amae and attachment

According to the results obtained for the whole data set, the different types of Amae were related both positively, significantly, and rather strongly. This indicates that different types of Amae might be very closely related and it might be difficult to differentiate one from another. Alternatively, different types of Amae may be occurring at the same time or in similar types of settings. However, the relationship between different types of attachment types was more complex than the relationship between different Amae types. The avoidant type and secure type appeared to have a strong negative relationship for the whole sample. Both sub-scales comprised many of the same items (that were reversed in the case of the avoidant type) which could be an explanation to that polarity and why both sub-scales appeared to be clear opposites. The anxious type had a positive but non-significant relationship with the avoidant type, whereas it had a positive but significant relationship with the secure type. This might indicate that securely attached individuals in this study were also showing anxiety. This might explain why they engaged in Amae behaviors. Nevertheless, when separating the participants into the two groups, the relationship between avoidant and anxious type appeared to be negative but only for non-Japanese speaking participants. But, this result cannot be interpreted with any confidence for now.

For the whole sample as well as for each group, the relationship between Amae and attachment appeared to be positive. The only exception was the negative relation between Amae and the avoidant attachment type, which contradicts the theory that Amae is closely related to insecure-ambivalent behaviors (Type C) (Rothbaum et al., 2000). Overall, the results of the study appear to support the observations made by Kim and Yamaguchi (1995),

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

and Behrens (2004), arguing that Amae is closely associated with securely attached individuals. This also can be explained by the fact that Amae behaviors depend on the desire to get closer to another person and therefore differ from avoidant behaviors. The relationship between Amae and the anxious attachment type might be explained by the fact that anxious individuals will seek proof of affection by engaging in Amae behaviors. Securely attached individuals are also likely to engage in Amae behaviors for the same reason; however, some of their Amae behaviors may also reflect the trust they have in their partner.

Differences were found between the Japanese speaking group and non-Japanese speaking group when comparing both Amae and attachment types. In particular, there were pronounced differences between the very touchy Amae type and the anxious attachment type and the relationship between the materialistic Amae type and the secure attachment type. Both of those relationships were proved to be significant for the Japanese speaking group but non-significant ones for the non-Japanese speaking group. Those differences could be explained by underlying cultural or societal differences (that were not measured in the study) and the fact that both groups did not picture the same type of person. Most people of the non-Japanese speaking group pictured a partner or a lover (70.3%), while participants of the Japanese speaking group pictured a family member (41.8%) instead of a partner or a lover (31.9%). However, many participants from the Japanese speaking group indicated picturing their spouse as a family member, which shows that from a cultural point of view some participants would consider their spouse rather as a family member than as a partner or a lover. Moreover, only participants from the Japanese speaking group indicated having a one-sided relationship (2.2%). By contrast, a higher percentage of participants in that group (8.8%) indicated having a complicated relationship than participants in the non-Japanese speaking group (5.4%).

Participants' view of Amae

When asked for a definition of Amae, Japanese speaking participants gave definitions that could either be regrouped as negative, neutral, or positive. When describing Amae's negative side, some participants declared that Amae is a sign of dependence, or in some cases, abuse (e.g. people abusing/profiting from the healthcare system etc.). Others pointed out that some people use Amae to avoid a boring or annoying task or to manipulate people and receive a certain profit. It appears that, paired with a negative image, Amae is associated with words such as: spoiled, lazy, unreliable, egocentric, egoist, manipulative.

For the neutral point of view, participants argued that there are differences between child and adult Amae. They also pointed out that there are different aspects of Amae, and that it is important to distinguish between the psychological definition, which often tends towards the dependence criteria, or the tendency to seek attention by saying things such as "I am lonely"; and an everyday definition that is often involves affection and a way to deepen a relationship, as it involves a lot of trust.

As for the positive side of Amae, many participants described it as "letting down one's guard and showing one's true colors", "being accepted while showing weakness", or "being forgiven for showing weakness", which related to the positive conception of Amae and pleasant Amae as well as social competences and satisfaction, as mentioned in previous studies (Niiya, 2017; Niiya & Harihara, 2012; Rothbaum & Kakinuma, 2004). Some participants also added that it is an important and a wonderful thing to have someone to engage into Amae with.

Limitations and future research

Given the exploratory nature of this study, it was limited in several ways. Firstly, while online surveys allow for the recruitment of participants all over the world, they don't

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

allow the researcher to control the study environment, and the reliability of participant responses might be questioned. The fact that participants pictured different types of persons (instead of only a lover) might have influenced the data and differences between groups to an extent that was not measured within this study. The Amae Type Scale (ATS) translation's validity should also be verified more deeply to be able to be used more widely. Moreover, the fact that, in one version of the questionnaire, the word Amae is used and not in the other one, might have influenced the differences between groups. Further analysis would be necessary to verify to which extent participants have been influenced. The full version (36 items) of the Experiences in Close Relationships Inventory (ECR) has also been criticized for being too long and therefore hard to keep focus for populations other than college students (Wei et al., 2007), and the use of the shorter version could have been a wiser choice while targeting a wider population. Finally, some participants may have dropped out of the study even though no information on this was collected.

For future research, looking into gender, age differences or cultural background would most likely generate different results and deepen the understanding of Amae. Restricting participants to picturing only a certain type of person would also be a good way to ensure more control. Comparing results depending on the person the participants pictured could also be a subject for future research. As well as investigating positive and negative Amae or pleasant and unpleasant Amae more deeply in a cross-cultural context could also be a further step into Amae research.

Amae is such an ambiguous and polyvalent concept that it can relate to many different fields and types. Within psychology, Inagaki (2017) has explored narcissistic Amae and its relationship with anger and aggressive behavior. Amae can also have a certain impact during clinical therapy (Kobayashi, 2016) and especially group therapy as investigated by Nishimura (2009). Others have investigated the relationship between Amae and

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

epidemiology, investigating the relationship between Amae and the spread of sexually-transmitted diseases such as HIV as Onuoha and Munakata (2005) did. Or even its relationship to crime as explored by Kobayashi (2014). Finally, the relationship between Amae and attachment still remains unclear and further research would be needed in the future to assess the complete relationship that lies between those two concepts.

Conclusion

In conclusion, and in line with previous research, non-Japanese people also experience Amae just as Japanese do, however their experience of it seems to differentiate to some extent. In this study, results indicated that non-Japanese speaking participants seem to engage more in Amae than Japanese speaking participants. However, to measure to what extent those results are due to cultural differences was not something that could be measured within this study. Due to several limitations of the study, the relationship between Amae and attachment remains unclear, though results indicate that Amae is somewhat opposed to avoidant attachment style, contradicting the suggestions of older studies. Amae seems to be more prevalent among anxious and secure types, as those types will be more likely to seek confirmation of affection and involve trust and acceptance to a certain extent.

In contrast to previous studies, this study was able to collect data from participants from more than two different countries and that are not only undergraduate students. Even though, Amae still remains a culturally specific concept given the fact that no equivalent term exists in another language. Nevertheless, Amae is not a culturally unique emotion as people from various cultural background appear to understand the concept, distinguish Amae behaviour and engage in it in the same way as Japanese people do, and even sometimes even more. Therefore, the reason that Amae doesn't have a translation in most languages might be explained by the importance that Amae bears in a certain society. If

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

Japanese society might be based on certain concepts such as Amae as some researchers have previously suggested, Western societies might not be based on the same concepts and therefore explain why they would lack the need of such a word.

References

- Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, *61*(2), 226-244. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.61.2.226
- Behrens, K. Y. (2004). A multifaceted view of the concept of amae: reconsidering the indigenous Japanese concept of relatedness. *Human Development*, *47*(1), 1-27.
- Benedict, R. (1946). *The chrysanthemum and the sword: Patterns of Japanese culture*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Borovoy, A. B. (2012). Doi Takeo and the Rehabilitation of Particularism in Postwar Japan. *Journal Of Japanese Studies*, *38*(2), 263-295. doi:10.1353/jjs.2012.0056
- Bowlby, J. (1982). Attachment and loss: Retrospect and prospect. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *52*(4), 664-678.
- Brennan, K. A., Clark, C. L. and Shaver, P. R. (1998). "Self-report measurement of adult attachment: An integrative overview". In *Attachment theory and close relationships*, Edited by: Simpson, J. A. and Rholes, W. S. 46-76. New York: Guilford.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale : L. Erlbaum Associates, 1988.
- Collins, N.L., Read, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *58*(4), 644-663.
- Doi, T. (1971). 「甘え」の構造. [The Construction of Amae]. 弘文堂. (in Japanese)
- Doi, T. (1973). The Japanese patterns of communication and the concept of amae. *Quarterly Journal Of Speech*, *59*(2), 180.
- Doi, T. (1992). On the Concept of Amae. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, *13*(1), 7-11.
- Doi, T. (2016). Takeo Doi: Chapter 3: Amae and transference-love. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*, *36*(2), 179-182.

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

- Doi, T., Bester, J. (1973). The anatomy of dependence (Vol. 101). *Tokyo: Kodansha International*.
- Fraley, R. C., Waller, N. G., & Brennan, K. A. (2000). An item response theory analysis of self-report measures of adult attachment. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 78*(2), 350-
- Fujihara, T., Kurokawa, M. (1981). 対人関係における「甘え」についての実証的研究 [An empirical study of Amae (dependence) in interpersonal relations]. *実験社会心理学研究, 21*(1), 53-62. (in Japanese)
- Gjerde, P. (2001). Attachment, culture, and amae. *The American Psychologist, 56*(10), 826-827. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.56.10.826.
- Huang, L. (2017). 「甘え」の言語的起源 [The Linguistic Origin of "Amae"]. *HABITUS, 21*, 43-58. (in Japanese)
- Inagaki, M. (2007). 自己愛的甘え尺度の作成に関する研究 [A development of Narcissistic Amae Scale]. *パーソナリティ研究, 16*(1), 13-24. (in Japanese)
- Inagaki, M. (2017). 「自己愛的甘え」と怒り・攻撃行動についての一考察 [A Consideration on the Relation Between Narcissistic Amae, Feelings of Anger and Aggressive behavior]. *京都聖母女学院短期大学研究紀要, 46*, 70-76. (in Japanese)
- Johnson, F. A. (1993). *Dependency and Japanese socialization: Psychoanalytic and anthropological investigations into Amae*. New York: New York University Press.
- Kim, U., & Yamaguchi, S. (1995). Conceptual and empirical analysis of *amae*: Exploration into Japanese psychological space (1). In Proceedings of the 43rd Annual Conference of the Japanese Group Dynamics Association (pp.158.159). *Tokyo: Japanese Group Dynamics Association*.

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

- Kobayashi, M., Kato, K. (2007). 「情緒的甘え」と「道具的甘え」との区別の実証的意義の検討:青年期の甘え欲求の違いと甘えタイプからの分析を通して [Examining empirical significance of the distinction between emotional and instrumental amae]. *九州大学心理学研究*, 8, 41-52.
- Kobayashi, M., Kato, K. (2009). 「情緒的・道具的甘え尺度」の構成の試み [A development of emotional and practical amae scale]. *九州大学心理学研究*, 10, 81-92. (in Japanese)
- Kobayashi, M., Kato, K. (2015). 甘えタイプ尺度 (ATS) の構成の試み. [Constructing the Amae-Type Scale (ATS) from the Perspective of Self- and Other-views] *青年心理学研究*, 26(2), 95-108. (in Japanese)
- Kobayashi, R. (2014). 罪を犯した人との面接でみられる「甘え」のアンビヴァレンス [Ambivalence of "Amae" in the Interview with Persons Who Commit a Crime]. *西南学院大学人間科学論集* 9(2), 243-265. (in Japanese)
- Kobayashi, R. (2016). 甘えたくても甘えられない—関係臨床のコツ [Ambivalence of "Amae" : Some Keys in the Clinical Viewpoint of Relationship]. *西南学院大学人間科学論集* 11(2), 147-171. (in Japanese)
- Kumagai, H. (1981). A dissection of intimacy: A study of 'bipolar posturing' in Japanese social interaction—amaeru and amayakasu, indulgence and deference. *Culture, Medicine and Psychiatry*, 5(3), 249-272.
- Kumagai, H., & Kumagai, A. (1986). The Hidden "I" in Amae: "Passive Love" and Japanese Social Perception. *Ethos*, (3), 305.
- Lewis, J. R., & Ozaki, R. (2009). Amae and Mardy A Comparison of Two Emotion Terms. *Journal Of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 40(6), 917-934.

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

- Marshall, T. C. (2012). "Attachment and amae in Japanese romantic relationships." *Asian Journal Of Social Psychology* 15, no. 2: 89-100. *SocINDEX with Full Text*, EBSCOhost (accessed January 16, 2018).
- Marshall, T. C., Kim, C., & Aikawa, A. (2011). Day-to-day experiences of amae in Japanese romantic relationships. *Asian Journal Of Social Psychology*, 14(1), 26-35.
doi:10.1111/j.1467-839X.2010.01323.x
- Nakao, T., Kato K. (2004). 成人愛着スタイル尺度 (ECR) の日本語版作成の試み [Constructing the Japanese version of the Adult Attachment Style Scale (ECR)]. *心理学研究*, 75(2), 154-159. (in Japanese)
- Niiya, Y. (2016). Does a Favor Request Increase Liking Toward the Requester?. *Journal Of Social Psychology*, 156(2), 211-221.
- Niiya, Y. (2017). Adult's amae as a tool for adjustment to a new environment. *Asian Journal Of Social Psychology*, 20(3/4), 238-243. doi:10.1111/ajsp.12184
- Niiya, Y., Ellsworth, P. C., & Yamaguchi, S. (2006). Amae in Japan and the United States: An exploration of a 'culturally unique' emotion. *Emotion*, 6(2), 279-295.
doi:10.1037/1528-3542.6.2.279
- Niiya, Y., & Harihara, M. (2012). Relationship closeness and control as determinants of pleasant amae. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 15(3), 189-197.
- Nishimura, K., (2009). 愛は甘いか? 「甘え」 の分析と集団療法プロセス [Is Love Sweet? Analysis of Amae and the Group Therapeutic Process]. *国際基督教大学学報*. IA 教育研究= *Educational Studies*, 51, 65-77. (in Japanese)
- Onuoha, F., & Munakata, T. (2005). Implications of amae for HIV risk in Japanese young adults. *Adolescence*, 40(158), 397-402.

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

- Otaki, K. (2015). Japanese characteristics associated with the concept amae. *Networked Digital Library of Theses & Dissertations, EBSCOhost* (accessed January 16, 2018).
- Rothbaum, F., & Kakinuma, M. (2004). Amai and attachment: security in a cultural context. *Human Development, 47*(1), 34-39.
- Rothbaum, F., Weisz, J., Pott, M., Miyake, K., & Morelli, G. (2000). Attachment and culture: Security in the United States and Japan. *American Psychologist, 55*(10), 1093-1104.
- Sibley, C. G., Fischer, R., & Liu, J. H. (2005). Reliability and Validity of the Revised Experiences in Close Relationships (ECR-R) Self-Report Measure of Adult Romantic Attachment. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*(11), 1524.
doi:10.1177/0146167205276865
- Taketomo, Y. (1986). Amai as metalanguage: A critique of Doi's theory of amae. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis, 14*(4), 525-544.
- Tamase, K., Wakimoto, M. (2003). 大学生用「甘え」尺度の作成に関する研究 [Development of an AMAE Scale for College Students]. *Bulletin of Nara University of Education. Cultural and social science 52*(1), 209-219. (in Japanese)
- Tamase, K., Iwamuro, H. (2004). 関係性の維持と個の主張に関わる問題: 「甘え」とアサーションを指標として [An Issue of Maintaining Human Relationships with Others and Expressing Individual Self in Society : Using Amai and Assertion Scale Scores as Indices]. *Bulletin of Nara University of Education. Cultural and social science 53*(1), 37-45. (in Japanese)
- Tamura, F., Ogawa, K. (1989). 自己受容と対人関係: 自己受容尺度と「甘え言語連想検査」 [Self-acceptance and dependency in interpersonal relationships : by use of self-acceptance scale and the word association test of "Amai"]. *横浜国立大学教育紀要*, 29, 87-103. (in Japanese)

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

- Tani, F. (2016). 「甘え」の多義性 [Ambiguity of Amae]. *青年心理学研究*, 27(2), 146-150. (in Japanese)
- Uemura, K. (2014). Spirituality and the Concept of 'Amae' or the Desire to Be Loved. *Eubios: Journal Of Asian And International Bioethics*, 24(1), 5-6.
- Vereijken, C. M., Riksen-Walraven, J. M., & Van Lieshout, C. F. (1997). Mother-infant relationships in Japan: attachment, dependency, and amae. *Journal Of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 28(4), 442-462.
- Wei, M., Russell, D. W., Mallinckrodt, B., & Vogel, D. L. (2007). The Experiences in Close Relationship Scale (ECR)-short form: Reliability, validity, and factor structure. *Journal of personality assessment*, 88(2), 187-204.
- Yamaguchi, M. (2009). 愛着機能尺度 (Attachment-Function Scale) 作成の試み [Development of Attachment Function Scale (AFS)]. *パーソナリティ研究*, 17(2), 157-167. (in Japanese)
- Yamaguchi, S. (2004). Further clarifications of the concept of amae in relation to dependence and attachment. *Human Development*, 47(1), 28-33.
- Yamaguchi, S., & Ariizumi, Y. (2006). Close Interpersonal Relationships among Japanese: Amae as Distinguished from Attachment and Dependence. In U. Kim, K. Yang, K. Hwang, U. Kim, K. Yang, K. Hwang (Eds.), *Indigenous and cultural psychology: Understanding people in context* (pp. 163-174). New York, NY, US: Springer Science + Business Media. doi:10.1007/0-387-28662-4_7
- Young-Bruehl, E., & Bethelard, F. (2000). *Cherishment: A Psychology of the Heart*. New York: Free Press.

Glossary

Amae: noun, formed with the Kanji (ideogram) for “sweet”, it can be translated as
(甘え) coaxing, pouting, whining, sulking, wheedling, being spoiled or pampered.

Amae is closely related to asking for or giving affection, its process also involves trust as well as both two persons (that could be defined as a receiver and a giver) to be complete.

Amaeru: most common verbal form of Amae, often described as “to engage in Amae”;
(甘える) can be perceived either in a positive or negative way depending on the context.

Amaeru can be paired with words such a Kuru (come) or Ageru (give in) and transform into Amaete-kuru (coming for affection) or Amaete-ageru (giving into affection)

(e.g. This cat keeps rubbing against my leg (Amaete-kuru), I want to pet it (Amaete-ageru))

Amayakasu: another verbal form of Amae, described as “to purposely spoil someone”; used
(甘えやかす) mainly in a negative way.

(e.g. Stop giving candies to the kids you are spoiling (Amayakasu) them!)

Amaenbo: noun describing a person that engage often in Amae; can be either negative or
(甘えん坊) positive.

(e.g. This girl like to be pampered (she is an Amaenbo))

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

Amaetai: verbal form of Amae that imply the will or intention to engage in Amae and

(甘えたい) receive affection; either negative or positive as it expresses one's wish.

(e.g. My boyfriend has been very cold lately, I want him to pay more attention to me (Ametai))

For more information about Amae from a linguistic perspective:

Otaki, K. (2015). Japanese characteristics associated with the concept amae. *Networked*

Digital Library of Theses & Dissertations, EBSCOhost (accessed January 16, 2018).

Appendices

Appendix A: Questionnaire (English)

Cultural differences and emotions

Thank you very much for taking interest in this study. The following questionnaire are part of a study conducted within a MSc Programme of Psychology at Lund University (Sweden), by Katia Guérin and supervised by Åse Innes-Ker.

As you might know or even have sometimes experienced, some concepts or words only exist in certain languages and cultures and are hardly translatable. This study focuses on two concepts: attachment and Amae (a Japanese concept) and how they are related to each other.

You might not be as familiar with Amae as you are with attachment, but both concepts are related to relationships in a broad sense. Just like attachment, Amae related behaviours vary on the intimacy of the relationship. To avoid influence your answers during the questionnaire a complete definition of Amae will not be provided now but will be at the end of the survey.

Before starting the survey, it is important that you take into consideration the following points:

- All the data collected will be treated anonymously and with utmost confidentiality
- Anonymised data may be made available to researchers and possibly used for novel purpose
- Participation is voluntary, and you have a right to drop out of the survey at any time without giving a reason, and with no consequence to you
- The questions will concern your relationship with your closest one
- The survey takes approximately 5-10minutes
- You have a right to access the final version of the thesis

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

By clicking on “I agree to participate in the study” below, you are agreeing that:

- (1) You have read and understood the information above
- (2) You are aware of the potential risks (if any)
- (3) You are taking part in this research study voluntarily (without coercion)
- (4) Anonymised data only may be shared in public research repositories

⇒ I agree to participate in the study

And, if you have any questions, feel free to contact:

Katia Guérin

katia.sotsuron@gmail.com

Part 1: General information

Please indicate the gender you identify to: 1. Male 2. Female 3. Other

Please indicate your age: *Multiple choice*

Please indicate your mother tongue:

Have you ever lived for more than a year in away from your home country? 1. Yes 2. No

If yes, please indicate which country (in case you lived in several choose the one you stayed the longest): *Multiple choice*

Please indicate if you are currently: 1. Studying 2. Working 3. Other ()

Part2: Instructions

People interact with each other with different level of intimacy, seeking love or attention, transgressing or establishing boundaries. We are interested in the kind of interactions you experience in your closest relationships.

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

We will now ask you to rate some statements while picturing someone very close to you, preferably your partner or lover. If you are currently single you can picture whoever you want, it can be: an ex, your best friend, a family member, etc... The person you are picturing cannot be a child or a baby, it must be someone you interact with as an equal or have adult-level interactions with.

Keep in mind that you must picture ONE person, and that person should be the SAME during the whole questionnaire.

Once you have decided who to picture, please answer the following questions:

While picturing how you interact with that person normally please indicate how much the proposed situation correspond to your behaviour: 1: Never ~ 7: Most of the time

1. I want to have physical contact with my partner whenever possible
2. I want to stick physically close to my partner
3. I enjoy playing around with my partner (ex: tickling each other etc.)
4. I flirt in a physical way to get attention from my partner
5. I act childishly on purpose just to get attention from my partner
6. I enjoy being touched and pampered by my partner
7. I sigh loudly on purpose, so my partner will take pity on me and try to cheer me up
8. I start pouting on purpose to get attention from my partner
9. Whenever something I don't like happens, I turn immediately to my partner and complain loudly because I want to be spoiled
10. I say things on a whim just to test how much my partner can take
11. I tend to act in a childish way in front of my partner
12. I speak in a childish way with my partner without realizing it

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

13. If something doesn't go the way I want it to, I start sulking to make things go my way
14. I behave in a clumsy way, so my partner will help me out
15. I behave in a certain way, so my partner will call me cute
16. I like to ask my partner to borrow their possessions (ex: a sweater etc.)
17. I make my partner buy me the things that I desire
18. Whenever I can get money from my partner, I will actively ask for it
19. Whenever I am troubled or don't know what to do, I rush to my partner asking for her/his opinion and advise
20. When I have a task to complete, I will immediately ask for help
21. When I don't understand something instead of looking it up, I tend to rely on my partner to help me out
22. I tend to rely on my partner for everyday necessities
23. I tend to make my partner do the tasks or chores I should have done
24. When something upset me, I expect my partner to listen to me and keep me company
25. If a task seems too difficult I will not put much effort in it and instead leave it to my partner
26. I tend to rely on my partner to do tasks or chores for me
27. Whenever I am troubled, I expect my partner to help me out
28. I feel cherished when my partner acts out for me

Part 3:

The following statements concern how you feel about the relationship with your partner (the person you were picturing earlier) as well as relationships in a more general way. Respond to each statement by indicating how much you agree or disagree with it.

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

1: Disagree Strongly ~ 7: Agree Strongly

1. I prefer not to show a partner how I feel deep down.
2. I worry about being abandoned.
3. I am very comfortable being close to my partner.
4. I worry a lot about my relationship.
5. Just when my partner starts to get close to me I find myself pulling away.
6. I worry that my partner won't care about me as much as I care about them.
7. I get uncomfortable when my partner wants to be very close.
8. I worry a fair amount about losing my partner.
9. I don't feel comfortable opening up to my partner.
10. I often wish that my partner's feelings for me were as strong as my feelings for him/her.
11. I want to get close to my partner, but I keep pulling back.
12. I often want to merge completely with my partner, and this sometimes scares him/her away.
13. I am nervous when my partner gets too close to me.
14. I worry about being alone.
15. I feel comfortable sharing my private thoughts and feelings with my partner.
16. My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away.
17. I try to avoid getting too close to my partner.
18. I need a lot of reassurance that I am loved by my partner.
19. I find it relatively easy to get close to my partner.
20. Sometimes I feel that I force my partner to show more feeling, more commitment.
21. I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on my partner.
22. I do not often worry about being abandoned.

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

23. I prefer not to be too close to my partner.
24. If I can't get my partner to show interest in me, I get upset or angry.
25. I tell my partner just about everything.
26. I find that my partner don't want to get as close as I would like.
27. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with my partner.
28. When I'm not involved in a relationship, I feel somewhat anxious and insecure.
29. I feel comfortable depending on my partner.
30. I get frustrated when my partner is not around as much as I would like.
31. I don't mind asking my partner for comfort, advice, or help.
32. I get frustrated if my partner is not available when I need him/her.
33. It helps to turn to my partner in times of need.
34. When my partner disapprove of me, I feel really bad about myself.
35. I turn to my partner for many things, including comfort and reassurance.
36. I resent it when my partner spends time away from me.

Part 4: Complementary information

Please tell us more about the person you were picturing during the survey.

Who did you picture:

- a) Your partner/lover
- b) An ex
- c) A very close friend
- d) A family member
- e) Other:

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

Please indicate for how long you have been with or have known that person for. Or if you pictured a family member how they are related to you:

How would you describe your relationship with that person:

- a) Very good: only rarely arguing
- b) Good: arguments happen but you always find a way to make up
- c) Somewhat good: you have up and downs, but you do care about each other
- d) Complicated: you are not really sure how to qualify this relationship
- d) One-sided: you always feel like you are the one making efforts

If there is any other information, you would like to transmit us about that person. Please feel free to write it here.

Part 5: Amae-related information

We would also like to know a bit more your background and are interested to know if you are familiar we our research topic.

We would like to know how much Japanese you can speak/understand:

- a) To a fluent/native level
- b) Somewhat a few phrases
- c) Only a few words

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

d) Not at all

Have you ever heard of Amae before participating in this study?

a) Yes

b) No

If you answered yes, in what context did you hear about Amae?

What definition would you give of Amae?

What is Amae?

Amae is a word/concept/emotion supposedly unique to Japan. Amae can be roughly translated by: coaxing, pouting, whining, sulking, wheedling, being spoiled or pampered, and cherishment. But none of those words convey the exact same meaning as Amae.

In psychology its most common definition is: “to depend and presume upon another’s love or bask in another’s indulgence” (Doi, 1992). However, many researchers find this definition too narrow and it is important to note that: “when conceptualized, *amae* represents a cluster of behaviours, an emotional or internal state, and a philosophical construct for Japanese people that can be viewed either positively or negatively, depending on what is deemed appropriate with respect to maturity or degree of social intimacy” (Behrens, 2004). Amae is

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

also believed to be related to concepts such as relatedness and attachment since a person engaging in Amae has indeed the expectation of being understood or accepted.

In this study we are interested in comparing Japanese speakers and non-Japanese speaking individuals. We think that the behaviors that comprises Amae also exists within other cultures, even though they have not created a single word for this state.

Feedback

We are interested to know how you felt about the study or if you have anything you would like to transmit us. Please use this space to write freely.

Thank you very much for answering this survey!!

Thanks to your participation this study will be a very interesting one.

If you are interested in the result of the study, would want further information or have any questions, feel free to contact:

Katia Guérin

katia.sotsuron@gmail.com

Thesis supervisor:

Åse Innes-ker

ase.innes-ker@psy.lu.se

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

Senior lecturer at Lund University, Psychology department

Lund University Psychology Department:

Paradisg. 5 P och Allhelgona Kyrkog. 14 O, 14 M,

Box 123, 221 00 Lund

SWEDEN

Appendix B: Questionnaire (Japanese)

文化の違いと感情

本研究に興味を持っていただいております。このアンケートはスウェーデンにあるルンド大学の心理学部大学院生の論文のために作られたものです。گران・カティアから実行され、イーネス・カー・オーサから指導されている研究です。

国や言語、または文化の違いで言葉による概念を訳せない場合も珍しくありません。日本語でよく使われる「甘え」はその中の一つです。長年間、「甘え」が海外の研究者に興味を引っ張りながら研究されているようですが、「甘え」がとても複雑な概念であり、日本語がわからない方には理解しづらいものです。ただし、「甘え」と「愛着」が繋がっているようで、本研究ではその二つの概念の関係性を図るために作られました。

アンケートに答える前に以下の注意点を読みください：

- 収集されたデータはすべて匿名で、機密保持になります
- 匿名になったデータは公開される場合は、他研究に使われる可能性もあります
- 途中で気持ちが悪くなったり、止めたくったりすることがあれば、理由を教えずに自由にいつでも回答を辞めて構いません
- 質問の中では親しい人との関係についてお聞きします
- アンケートは5～10分程度かかります
- 最後に出来上がった論文（英語のみ）にアクセスする権利はもちろんあります。

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

「はい、参加したいです」をクリックしている場合は以下の項目を賛成することとなります。

1. 上記の内容を読んで理解しました
2. 本研究におけるリスク（ある場合）を把握しています
3. 自己意識で本研究に参加します
4. 収集された情報を公開する場合は匿名のデータのみになります

はい、参加したいです・いいえ、参加したくないです

質問や不明な点があればこちらにご連絡ください。

Katia Guérin（カティア・ゲラン）（英語・日本語：可）

katia.sotsuron@gmail.com

Part 1 : General information:

あなたのジェンダーは： 1. 男性 2. 女性 3. その他

あなたの年齢は： 歳

あなたの母国語は：

一年以上、他国に住んだことありますか？ 1. いいえ 2. はい

「はい」と答えました場合は、どの国でしたか？（複数の国の場合は滞在期間が一番長い方を選んでください）

現在の職業は： 1. 学生 2. 社会人 3. その他（ ）

Part 2: Instructions

人はいろいろな人に様々な形ややり方で甘えます。その中には、いい甘えもある、困った甘えもあるかもしれません。以下では、あなた自身が普段の生活の中で行っている甘えについてお聞きします。

なお、ここでは「甘える相手」として、身近な人、なるべく恋人を思い浮かべてください。現在独身であれば、他に親しい人を思い浮かんでも構いません例えは：元恋人、親友、家族など。しかし、その人が大人扱いでいなければなりません。ということで、子供や赤ちゃんは思い浮かんでいけません。思い浮かんでいる人は自分と同レベルな付き合い方が理想です。

回答中は一人の方だけを思い浮かんでいながら、その人を変えてはいけません。

思い浮かんでいる人が決まればどうぞ、次にを進み、回答を始めても大丈夫です。

それでは、あなたは普段、その相手に対して以下のような甘えをどのくらいしていますか。それぞれの文について下の7件尺度を用いて評定してください。

1: 全くしない～7: 非常によくする

1. 相手に抱きついたりべたべたしたりする。
2. 相手のそばにいつもくっついている。
3. 「くすぐりっこ」などをして、相手とじゃれあう。

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

4. ちょっかいをかけて相手の気を引こうとする。
5. わざと子どもっぽく振る舞って、相手の関心を引こうとする。
6. 相手に甘える。
7. たいしたことでもないのに、「あ〜ん」と泣きそうな声を出して、相手に「かわいそうだね」「よしよし」などと言ってもらおうとする。
8. わざとふてくされた態度をとって、相手の気を引こうとする。
9. ちょっとつらいことがあると、すぐ相手のところにいて駄々っ子のように泣いたり駄々をこねたりする。
10. どこまで相手が自分を甘えさせてくれるか、わざとわがままを言ってみせる。
11. 相手の前で子どもっぽいそぶりをしてみせる。
12. 相手に話すとき、いつの間にか子どもっぽい話し方で話している。
13. 気に入らないことがあると、すぐにすねたりして、ふてくされてみせる。
14. 子どものような(不器用な)失敗をしてみせて、相手に「もうだめだねえ」と言わせながら構ってもらう。
15. 「.....ちゃん、かわいいね」と言わせるような振る舞いをわざとする。
16. 相手が持っている物をねだる。
17. 自分がほしいものを、相手を当てにして買ってもらう。
18. お金がもらえそうだと「ねえ、ちょうだい」といってせがむ
19. 分からないときや困ったときには、すぐに相手に意見やアドバイスをもらおうとする。
20. 自分でしなくてはいけないことを、すぐに手伝ってもらう。
21. 分からないことがあったら、自分で調べないで、すぐに相手に教えてもらう。

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

22. 自分で出来る身のまわりのことを、代わりにしてもらおう。
23. 自分でやるべき用事を、相手にしてもらおう。
24. 自分が苦手なことを理由に泣きついて、相手にしてもらおう。
25. 自分でやるのが難しそうなことは、自分であまり努力もしないで、すぐに代わってもらおう。
26. 用事や仕事があるときには、相手をあてにして、してもらおう。
27. 困ると相手の助けを当てにして、してもらおう。
28. 甘えて、何かをしてもらおう。

Part 3:

次はあなたが対人関係の中で一般的に体験している気持ちや感じ方に、どのくらいよく当てはまりますか。先ほど考えていた人をまた思い浮かんで、以下の項目に答えてください。

1: 全く当てはまらない ~ 7: 非常によく当てはまる

1. 心の奥底で何を感じているかを相手に見せるのはどちらかというと好きではな。
2. 私は見捨てられるのではないかと心配だ。
3. 私は相手と親密になることがとても快い。
4. 私はいろいろな人との関係について、非常に心配している。
5. 相手が私と親密になろうとするやいなや、私は自分から相手との距離を取ろうとしている自分に気付く。
6. 私が相手のことを大切に思うほどには、相手が私のことを大切に思っていないのではないかと心配する。

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

7. 私は、相手が非常に親密になりたがってくると、いごこち悪く感じる。
8. 私は、相手を失うのではないかとけっこう心配する。
9. 私は相手に心を開くのに抵抗を感じる。
10. 私はいつも、相手が私に対していてくれる気持ちが、私が相手に対していてくれる気持ちと同じくらい強ければいいのになあと思う。
11. 私は相手と親密になりたいのだが、いつの間にかついつい後ずさりしていることが多い。
12. 私があまりにも気持ちの上で完全に一つになることを求めるために、ときどき相手はうんざりして私から離れていってしまう。
13. 私は相手があまり自分と親密になってくると、とてもイライラしてしまう。
14. 私はひとりぼっちになってしまうのではないかと心配する。
15. 私は、あまり人に話さないような自分の考えや気持ちを相手に話すことに抵抗がない。
16. 私が相手ととても親密になりたいと強く望むがために、ときどき相手はうんざりして私から離れていってしまう。
17. 私は相手とあまり親密にならないようにしている。
18. 私には、相手が私を愛してくれているということを何度も何度も言ってくれることが必要だ。
19. 私は比較的容易に恋人と親密になれると思う。
20. 私は、相手にもっと自分の感情や自分たちの関係に真剣であることを示させようとしているのを感じる 때가ときどきある。
21. 私は自分が相手に依存することをゆるすことがなかなかできないと思う。

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

22. 私は、（相手に）見捨てられるのではないかと心配になることはほとんどない。
23. 私は相手とあまりに親密になることがどちらかというとき好きではない。
24. 私は相手に自分のことを好きになってもらうことができなかつたら、私はきつと気が動転して、悲しくなつたり腹が立つたりする。
25. 私は相手に何でも話す。
26. 私は、私が親密になりたいと望むほどには相手は私と親密になりたいと思っていないと思う。
27. 私はたいてい、自分の問題や心配事を相手と話し合う。
28. 私は誰かとつき合っていないと、何となく不安で不安定な気持ちになる。
29. 私は相手に頼ることに抵抗がない。
30. 私は、私がいてほしいと望むほどに相手がそばにいてくれないと、イライラしてしまう。
31. 私は、相手になぐさめやアドバイス、助けを求めることに抵抗がない。
32. 私は、必要なときにいつでも相手が私のためにいてくれないとイライラする。
33. 困ったとき相手に助けを求めると、何かちょっとは（状況）よくなる。
34. 相手にダメだなあとと言われると、自分は本当にダメだなあと感じる。
35. 私は相手になぐさめや元気づけたりすることをふくめ、いろんなことで助けを求める。
36. 私は、相手が私のことをほっといて一人で何かをすることが重なるにつれて腹が立ってきてしまう。

Part 4: Complementary information

回答のために思い浮かんでいた人について伺いたいです。

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

選んだ人はどなたでしたか？

- a) 恋人
- b) 元恋人
- c) 親友
- d) 家族
- e) その他:

その人とどれくらい前に付き合ったり、または知り合いったりしましたか？家族の中から選んだ場合はどの関係ですか？

その人とはどういう風な関係ですか？

- a) とても良い: あまり喧嘩はしない
- b) 良い: たまには喧嘩するが、いつも仲直りする
- c) なんとなく: 良い時も悪い時も同じくらい多いが、お互い大切に思っているはず
- d) 難しい: この関係はあまりわからなくて困ることもある
- d) 片思い: いつも自分からの努力で関係が一応続いている

選んだ人についてにその他に伝えたいことがあれば、こちらに自由に記入してください。

Part 5: Amae-related information

あなたのバックグラウンドをもっと知ってから、あなたにとって甘えはどのようなものかすごく関心を持っています。

まずは日本語能力について伺いたいです。日本語はどれくらい通じていますか？

- a) 母国語・N1/2 レベル
- b) ある程度通じます・N3～4
- c) 数少ない単語ぐらい
- d) 全くわかりません

「甘え」という概念についてはどれくらい詳しいですか？

- a) 研究など読んだことがあります
- b) 一般人並みに詳しい
- c) 全く詳しくはない

自分にとって甘えをどういうものですか？知らない人にどういう風に甘えを説明できますか？

甘えは対人関係にどれくらい影響しているまたは、どれくらい大切だと思いますか？

Feedback

このアンケートにコメントやフィードバックがあれば、またはその他に伝えて欲しいことがあれば、こちらにご自由に記入できます。

甘えはなぜ興味深いですか？

甘えは日本人でしたらもちろん耳にしたことがある言葉だろう。甘える、甘やかす、甘えん坊など、甘えに関係する態度を表す言葉は様々ありますが、その言葉は日本語独特と考えらる。そして、面白いことに甘えは日本社会を理解するための重要な概念とされている。

ただし、外国の方が甘えを感じられないまたは理解できない訳ではないが、それをぴったり表す言葉が日本語にしかないと見られている。しかし、日本人または日本語が通じる方の中でも甘えの定義に差が出て、他国の人にさらに理解しづらくなる。甘えは親子関係からはじめ、大人や老人、患者さんのケアまでも研究され、とても幅広い概念である。ただし、甘えは人によってそれぞれな表し方があり、甘えのタイプと愛着スタイルが関係するのではないかと考えられる。

本研究では日本と海外における甘えの態度を比較するのが目的の一つである。そして、大人による甘えと愛着の関係性を明確にする目的もある。

AMAE AND ATTACHMENT

ご協力まことにありがとうございます！！

お陰様で素晴らしい研究になりそうなので、心の奥から感謝しております。

本研究の結果などに興味がある場合、または質問や不明な点があればこちらにご連絡ください。

Katia Guérin (カティア・ゲラン) (英語・日本語：可)

katia.sotsuron@gmail.com

指導教員 (英語・スウェーデン語のみ)

Åse Innes-ker (オーサ・イーネス・カー)

ase.innes-ker@psy.lu.se

ルンド大学, 心理学部

Lund University Psychology Department:

Paradisg. 5 P och Allhelgona Kyrkog. 14 O, 14 M,

Lund, SWEDEN