



**JULY 30<sup>th</sup>, 2022**

## **SYNTHESIS OF DOCUMENTS**

**06 Pages - Duration: 1h30**

(The candidate must read the following guidelines very carefully)

### **Instructions:**

From this file (i.e. a set of documents), provide a **synthesis note of 300 words** (a margin of more or less than 25 words is authorized). Every started edge that is beyond or below the authorized limits will be sanctioned. While counting the number of words, do not consider the title. Make sure you **mention the number of words at the end of the exercise**. Within the text of your synthesis, always **insert a well visible sign of two slash marks (/ /) after every fifty words**. The sign should be duplicated at the margin. Don't forget to **give a title to your note**.

### **Stakes of the exam:**

In any profession, and especially in the managerial field you are aspiring to, the synthesis-writing skills of accuracy, confrontation and brevity are crucial for decision making.

Hence, a synthesis is a compound, usually a shortened version, of several documents combined into another new continuous and coherent text, in order to **compare similarities and to highlight differences** between the documents. It then contains the important points in the documents and is **written in your own words**. Hence, your paraphrase and summary skills are tested, as well as your ability to distinguish the relevant ideas from those that are accessory. The correction of your style and expression is assessed as well.

### **Principles of the exam:**

Since synthesis is all about confronting points of view developed in various documents of a file, it implies that, above all, you must **strictly avoid** giving a personal point of view, citing a passage of the file or attempting to use or mention any other idea that is not in the documents.

Your summary note must have an **introduction**, a **body** and a **conclusion**.

The introduction must comprise a **clear statement of the problem** that highlights documents issues, then a **plan** that announces the aspects under which the note will be conducted.

# DOCUMENTS

## *Document 1*

Intuitively we know that friendship involves close relationships. There needs to be affection, caring for each other, some sort of commitment and reciprocity. Friendship is associated with attachment, closeness or intimacy, mutuality, esteem and respect. It requires being loving, supportive, and wishing well. It is about tolerance and putting up with the idiosyncrasies of your friends. Friendship can range from close to cordial, from affinity to rapport. It has been associated with gentle liking or passionate emotion. Friendship has been described in kinship terms: brotherhood or fraternity, and sisterhood. It can be applied to sexual, political and/or business partners, or even relationships between nation states.

Definitions of friendship owe much to the terminology of Ancient Greece. *Philia* is the Greek term most usually translated into English as ‘friendship’. *Philia* has been defined as a feeling of mild affection, less intense and less emotional than *eros* which is usually translated as ‘love’. Some commentators argue that there is little difference between *eros* and *philia* and both can be used to refer to love affairs that include physical desire and sexual relationships. Or both can be used to describe Platonic friendships as reciprocal loving relationships. Aristotle introduces the term *philia politika*, to represent the sorts of relationships appropriate between citizens. *Xenia* usually translated as ‘guest friendship’ is a ritualized form of friendship related to the bonds and moral obligations to strangers and citizens of other cities, and has association with the idea of hospitality and rendering assistance to strangers.

The Ancient Romans used the Latin term *amicitia* for friendship to describe a relationship that is more clearly distinguished from *amor*, or love. *Amicitia* does not have sexual connotations, and is used to refer to both personal and political relationships, and in particular is associated with the patron-client relationships that were important in imperial Rome. It describes goodwill in alliances, working cooperatively, not necessarily with warmth and affection, although this could be part of the relationship. *Amicitia* could be used for political advantage, and might be an arena for competition and an opportunity to demonstrate magnanimity.

Medieval Christians used both Greek and Roman words to refer to spiritual friendship. *Agape* has been interpreted as selfless unconditional love and was used to describe the friendship between man and his god, a triangulated relationship that also made possible virtuous friendships between men. In addition, *agape* has been used to describe both selfless neighbor love, as well as the love of the enemy. Some commentators believe that *agape* describes the relationship in Christian marriage that permits a moral practice of passionate *eros*. The Latin equivalent of *agape* is *caritas*, often translated as ‘charity’ or ‘generosity’ but used in the theological sense to refer to the love of God or love of Christ. For Thomas Aquinas, friendship founded on communication between man and God is *caritas*.

Heather Devere (2014), " The many meanings of friendship", *AMITY: The Journal of Friendship Studies*, vol. 2, n° 1, p.1.

## *Document 2*

Most work in network analysis of adolescent friendship ties conventionally assumes that friendships represent *liking* (and non-friendships represent non-liking or even disliking). Most also assume that whether person A is friends with B is distinct from whether B is friends with A, so the concept of friendship is *directional*. Even within this view of friendship as directed-liking, by modeling contagion on friendship

networks, researchers generally assume that friendship also represents directed social *interaction* (while non-friendship prevents interaction). In sum, such work entails the tacit assumption that friendship, liking, and interaction are well described by a single dimension, which can be captured by simply asking people to nominate their friends on a survey. Lastly, the elegance and analytical leverage of social network analysis derives from a strong but often implicit assumption of *equivalence*: In this case, ties are interchangeable (friends are friends) and non-ties are interchangeable (non-friends are non-friends, whether they be acquaintances, strangers, enemies, parents, or romantic partners). [...] The word friendship may have variable meanings because relational norms and structural expectations may vary across gender, age, or cultural differences.

[...] Notably, focus group participants hardly ever defined friendship as about liking someone else. Instead, students overwhelmingly defined friends as others who share a *mutual* agreement to behave as friends toward one another; that is, to abide by relational norms (e.g., *will stand up for me when others are against me, will never hurt me, will never tell anyone my secrets*). This definition stands in stark contrast to the conventional interpretation of friendship as directed-liking and interaction. Some interviewees further included structural expectations such as *someone who likes me or cares about me, who calls me his/her friend, who has much in common with me, or who has the same friends as me (part of my group)* within the definition of friendship. Such features raise provocative questions for research on reciprocity (a tendency for friendship nominations to be mutual), homophily (a tendency for people to nominate similar alters as friends), and transitivity (a tendency for people to nominate alters who are friends of their friends) as empirical regularities in adolescent friendship networks. Lastly, focus group discussions suggested that the definition of friendship may vary systematically by gender.

In the next step of the research, we took 11 distinct and exemplary features mentioned in focus groups and constructed a survey that asked students to rank these 11 features in importance to how they define friendship. [...] A principal component analysis of the rankings by all six cohorts reveals that friendship is not adequately represented by a single dimension, and that the most prominent dimension is not directly related to either liking or interaction. A ranking of features by respondents revealed that role-related prescriptive and proscriptive norms are the most central ingredients of their definition of friendship. Lastly, boys and girls differ in their emphasis on particular relational norms or structural expectations for the definition of friendship. Girls are more likely than boys to define friends as peers who like them, support them emotionally, keep their secrets, and never hurt them. Boys are more likely than girls to define friends as peers who call them friends, have similar interests, and have the same friends (part of the same group).

James A. Kitts & Diego F. Leal (2021), "What is(n't) a Friend? Dimensions of the Friendship Concept among Adolescents", *Social Networks*, n° 66, vol. 1, p. 161-162.

### ***Document 3***

Digital media have become central to the way adolescents experience their peer relationships. Friends use cell phones, social network sites, and instant messaging platforms to “hang out” with each other round-the-clock. Text messaging is a particularly effective way for adolescents to maintain a constant connection to their friends regardless of where they are or what they are doing. [...] With respect to social network use, Boyd (2007) found that adolescents use sites like Facebook and MySpace to hang out in a more public way, by posting pictures of themselves with their friends, leaving messages on each other’s pages, and listing their closest friends on their profiles. Furthermore, groups of friends often adopt a similar tone and style on their respective profiles. [...] Empirical evidence suggests that adolescents’ online peer communications have a positive effect on the quality of their friendships.

[...] The present study is part of a larger research project involving survey responses collected during March and April 2010 from 2079 students (1190 girls, 895 boys<sup>1</sup>) ages 11–19 (M<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> 15.4 years)

attending one of seven secondary schools on the island of Bermuda. With approximately 2,600 students attending senior school in Bermuda, overall, the survey sample contained roughly 80% of all senior school

**Table 1**  
Inventory of participants' digital media use.

Type of digital media used	Survey (n = 2079) <sup>a</sup>		Interview (n = 32)	
	n	%	n	%
Own cell phone	1808	94%	30	94%
Own Internet-enabled cell phone	–	–	17	53%
Maintain Facebook profile	1818	90%	29	91%
Former profile on MySpace and/or Hi-5	–	–	8	25%
Instant messaging (e.g. MSN, AIM, Skype)	1751	87%	25	78%
Twitter	–	–	3	9%
Email	1634	82%	30	94%
Games				
Play games on game console	1044	59%	25	78%
Play single-player online/cell phone games	879	50%	16	50%
Play multiplayer online games/virtual worlds	526	30%	5	16%
Online shopping	897	56%	13	41%
YouTube	1924	96%	30	94%
Surf the Internet for funny websites	–	–	20	63%
Visit entertainment/sports websites	–	–	19	59%
Visit information websites	–	–	15	47%
Look up information on Wikipedia	–	–	24	75%
Own laptop computer	1603	83%	–	–
Own portable media player (e.g. iPod)	1665	86%	24	75%

<sup>a</sup> Missing values not included in calculation of survey percentages.

students on the Island. [...] Thus, Bermudians including Bermudian youth dare exposed on a daily basis to the same sources of information and popular culture as most Americans. In addition, American and Bermudian youth engage in similar digital media activities, including text messaging, social networking, and instant messaging. It should be noted, however, that a higher proportion of Bermudian adolescents engage in these activities than American adolescents. Whereas 73% of U.S. adolescents with internet access use social network sites, 90% of the Bermudian survey respondents use them (Table 1). Cell phone ownership is also higher among Bermudian adolescents: 75% of U.S. adolescents compared to 94% of the survey respondents in this study. [...]

**Table 2**  
Demographic characteristics of participants.

Characteristic	Survey (n = 2079)		Interview (n = 32)	
	n	%	n	%
<b>Gender</b>				
Girls	1180	57%	15	47%
Boys	895	43%	17	53%
No answer	4	.002%	–	–
<b>Race</b>				
Black	1078	52%	21	66%
White	467	22%	10	31%
Other	323	16%	1	3%
No answer	211	10%	–	–
<b>School type</b>				
Public	1001	48%	8	25%
Private	1078	52%	24	75%
<b>School year</b>				
Grade 8 (Year 9)	252	12%	4	13%
Grade 9 (Year 10)	579	28%	8	25%
Grade 10 (Year 11)	470	23%	7	22%
Grade 11 (IB1)	397	19%	7	22%
Grade 12 (IB2)	381	18%	6	19%
<b>Mother's highest education level</b>				
Some high school	99	5%	2	6%
Finished high school	468	23%	7	22%
Some college	228	11%	9	28%
Finished college	586	28%	8	25%
School beyond college	218	10%	5	16%
Don't know	250	12%	1	3%
No mother	9	.4%	–	–
No answer	221	11%	–	–
<b>Father's highest education level</b>				
Some high school	173	8%	3	9%
Finished high school	463	22%	8	25%
Some college	175	8%	6	19%
Finished college	437	21%	7	22%
School beyond college	211	10%	3	9%
Don't know	348	17%	4	13%
No father	48	2%	1	3%
No answer	224	11%	–	–

Table 2 reveals that the demographic characteristics of the survey and interview samples are fairly well-aligned, with the exception of the over-representation in the interview sample of students attending

private school. This discrepancy can be explained by the fact that I chose to interview approximately the same number of students from each school in order to avoid placing a larger administrative burden on one school compared to another. The private schools are over-represented in the interview sample due to the fact that my study includes two large public high schools and five smaller private high schools. Notably, however, Table 1 shows that the digital media use of interview participants and survey respondents is comparable. Still, the school imbalance limits the generalizability of the findings reported here.

Katie Davis (2012), "Friendship 2.0: Adolescents' experiences of belonging and self-disclosure online", *Journal of Adolescence*, n° 35, p. 1528–1531.

### ***Document 4***

Throughout the lifespan friendships begin and end, taking on different meanings at each stage. As we age, our reasons for selecting our friends change. Some people have the same friends throughout their lives whereas others have different friends at each stage of life. Even though all stages of life are associated with different meanings for friendships, research shows that the closer the two people are in a friendship, the more positive enjoyment they experience. [...]

Hartup (1993) describes a best friend relationship as one characterized by mutual attractions and every day contact. Children describe their friends as others who share their toys with them; whereas adolescents may describe their friends as others who have the same interests, personalities, and play the same sports. Older adults may base their friendships on intimate, emotionally satisfying relationships because they view their time as limited in comparison to their younger counterparts.

Emily Pica & Karri Verno (2012), "The changing nature of friendships over the lifespan", *Modern Psychological Studies*, Vol. 17 n° 2, p. 36.

### ***Document 5***

In the hierarchy of relationships, friendships are at the bottom. Romantic partners, parents, children—all these come first. This is true in life, and in science, where relationship research tends to focus on couples and families. When Emily Langan, an associate communication professor at Wheaton College, goes to conferences for the *International Association of Relationship Researchers*, she says, "friendship is the smallest cluster there. Sometimes it's a panel, if that."

Friendships are unique relationships because unlike family relationships, we choose to enter into them. And unlike other voluntary bonds, such as marriages and romantic relationships, they lack a formal structure. You wouldn't go months without speaking with or seeing your significant other (hopefully), but you might go that long without contacting a friend. Still, survey upon survey upon survey shows how important people's friends are to their happiness. And though friendships tend to change as people age, there is some consistency in what people want from them.

"I've listened to someone as young as 14 and someone as old as 100 talk about their close friends, and [there are] three expectations of a close friend that I hear people describing and valuing across the entire life course," says William Rawlins, the Stocker Professor of Interpersonal Communication at Ohio University. "Somebody to talk to, someone to depend on, and someone to enjoy. These expectations remain the same, but the circumstances under which they're accomplished change."

The voluntary nature of friendship makes it subject to life's whims in a way that more formal relationships aren't. In adulthood, as people grow up and go away, friendships are the relationships most

likely to take a hit. You're stuck with your family, and you'll prioritize your spouse. But where once you could run over to Jonny's house at a moment's notice and see if he could come out to play, now you have to ask Jonny if he has a couple hours to get a drink in two weeks.

The beautiful, special thing about friendship, that friends are friends because they want to be, that they choose each other, is "a double agent," Langan says, "because I can choose to get in, and I can choose to get out." Throughout life, from grade school to the retirement home, friendship continues to confer health benefits, both mental and physical. But as life accelerates, people's priorities and responsibilities shift, and friendships are affected, for better or, often, sadly, for worse.

The saga of adult friendship starts off well enough. "I think young adulthood is the golden age for forming friendships," Rawlins says. "Especially for people who have the privilege and the blessing of being able to go to college." During young adulthood, friendships become more complex and meaningful. In childhood, friends are mostly other kids who are fun to play with; in adolescence, there's a lot more self-disclosure and support between friends, but adolescents are still discovering their identity, and learning what it means to be intimate. Their friendships help them do that.

Julie Beck (2015), "How Friendships Change in Adulthood", in *The Atlantic* (Health Column), October 22.