

## Placing Friendship in Context

Personal relationships have long been of central interest to social scientists, but the subject of friendship has been relatively neglected. Moreover, most studies of friendship have been social psychological in focus. *Placing Friendship in Context* is a unique collection bridging social psychological and social structural research to advance understanding of this important subject. In it, some of the world's leading researchers explore the social and historical contexts in which friendships and similar informal ties develop and how it is that these contexts shape the form and substance the relationships assume. Together, they demonstrate that friendship cannot be understood from individualist or dyadic perspectives alone, but is a relationship significantly influenced by the environment in which it is generated. By analysing the ways in which friendships articulate with the social structures in which they are embedded, *Placing Friendship in Context* redescribes such personal relationships at both the macro and the micro level.

REBECCA G. ADAMS is Associate Professor in the Department of Sociology at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. She has published widely on friendship, including two books with Rosemary Blieszner, *Older Adult Friendship: Structure and Process* (Sage, 1989) and *Adult Friendship* (Sage, 1992).

GRAHAM ALLAN is Reader in Sociology at the University of Southampton. His book publications include *Kinship and Friendship in Modern Britain* (1996) and, with Graham Crow, *Community Life* (1994).



## Structural Analysis in the Social Sciences

Mark Granovetter, editor

The series *Structural Analysis in the Social Sciences* presents approaches that explain social behaviour and institutions by reference to *relations* among such concrete social entities as persons and organisations. This contrasts with at least four other popular strategies: (1) reductionist attempts to explain by a focus on individuals alone; (2) explanations stressing the causal primacy of such abstract concepts as ideas, values, mental harmonies, and cognitive maps (thus, 'structuralism' on the Continent should be distinguished from structural analysis in the present sense); (3) technological and material determinism; (4) explanations using 'variables' as the main analytic concepts (as in the 'structural equation' models that dominated much of the sociology of the 1970s), where 'structure' is that connecting variables rather than actual social entities.

The 'social network' approach is an important example of the strategy of structural analysis; the series also draws on social science theory and research that is not framed explicitly in network terms, but stresses the importance of relations rather than the atomisation of reductionism or the determinism of ideas, technology, or material conditions. Though the structural perspective has become extremely popular and influential in all the social sciences, it does not have a coherent identity, and no series yet pulls together such work under a single rubric. By bringing the achievements of structurally oriented scholars to a wider public, the *Structural Analysis* series hopes to encourage the use of this very fruitful approach.

*For a list of titles in this series, please see the end of the book.*



# PLACING FRIENDSHIP IN CONTEXT

Edited by

REBECCA G. ADAMS AND GRAHAM ALLAN



PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE  
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 1RP, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, United Kingdom  
<http://www.cup.cam.ac.uk>  
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA <http://www.cup.org>  
10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, Melbourne 3166, Australia

© Cambridge University Press 1998

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1998

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

Typeset in Times NR 10/13 pt [SE]

*A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library*

*Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data*

Placing friendship in context / edited by Rebecca G. Adams and Graham Allan.

p. cm. – (Structural analysis in the social sciences)

ISBN 0 521 58456 6 (hardcover) – ISBN 0 521 58589 9 (pbk.)

1. Friendship. 2. Friendship – Sociological aspects. I. Adams, Rebecca G. II. Allan, Graham A. III. Series.

BF575.F66P53 1998

302.3'4 – dc21 98-15200 CIP

ISBN 0 521 58456 6 hardback

ISBN 0 521 58589 9 paperback

For Beth Hess and Eugene Litwak,  
who were among the first to place friendship in context



# Contents

<i>Notes on the contributors</i>	<i>page x</i>
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>xiii</i>
<b>1 Contextualising friendship</b>	<b>1</b>
Rebecca G. Adams and Graham Allan	
<b>2 The modernisation of friendship: individualism, intimacy, and gender in the nineteenth century</b>	<b>18</b>
Stacey J. Olikar	
<b>3 The gendered contexts of inclusive intimacy: the Hawthorne women at work and home</b>	<b>43</b>
Stephen R. Marks	
<b>4 Friendship and the private sphere</b>	<b>71</b>
Graham Allan	
<b>5 Rich friendships, affluent friends: middle-class practices of friendship</b>	<b>92</b>
Kaeren Harrison	
<b>6 Women's friendships in a post-modern world</b>	<b>117</b>
Pat O'Connor	
<b>7 Foci of activity as changing contexts for friendship</b>	<b>136</b>
Scott Feld and William C. Carter	
<b>8 The demise of territorial determinism: online friendships</b>	<b>153</b>
Rebecca G. Adams	
<b>9 Reflections on context</b>	<b>183</b>
Graham Allan and Rebecca G. Adams	
<i>Index</i>	<i>195</i>
	<i>ix</i>

## Contributors

*Rebecca G. Adams* is Associate Professor in the Department of Sociology at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. She received her Ph.D from the University of Chicago in 1983. Her major research interest is friendship patterns, especially as they are affected by geographic separation and by cultural and structural context. She has authored many articles on this topic and, with Rosemary Blieszner, co-edited *Older Adult Friendship: Structure and Process* (Sage, 1989) and co-authored *Adult Friendship* (Sage, 1992). Currently she is examining the cultural conventions and structural conditions affecting the development of friendships among the members of a non-territorial music subculture.

*Graham Allan* is Reader in Sociology at the University of Southampton, England. His research interests include many aspects of informal relations and domestic life. He has an MSc. degree from McMaster University, Canada, and a Ph.D from the University of Essex, England. As well as numerous papers on friendship, he is author of *Family Life* (Blackwell, 1985); *Friendship: Developing a Sociological Perspective* (Harvester-Wheatsheaf, 1989); and, with Graham Crow, *Community Life: An Introduction to Local Social Relationships* (Harvester-Wheatsheaf, 1994). *Family, Household and Society* (Macmillan), co-authored with Graham Crow, will be published in 1999.

*William C. Carter* is a Ph.D student in sociology at Louisiana State University. His other work with Scott Feld has examined tie strength in the contexts of foci of activity, including analyses of the effects of desegregation in schools on the development of interracial weak ties (published in *American Journal of Sociology*, 1998). He is currently working towards an

understanding of how individual identities are affected by the surrounding network of social relationships.

*Scott Feld* is Professor of Sociology at Louisiana State University. He recently edited a special issue of *Sociological Forum* (March, 1997) devoted to making mathematical thinking more useful in sociology. He is most intrigued with paradoxes of social life, including 'Why your friends have more friends than you do' (*American Journal of Sociology*, 1991), and 'When desegregation reduces interracial contact' (with William C. Carter in *American Journal of Sociology*, 1998). His ongoing work focuses upon social networks, collective decision-making processes, and applying sociology. He is currently writing a book entitled *Closely Knit: Principles of Social Networks*, and working with Katherine Rossier to study Louisiana's recent social experiment with covenant marriage.

*Kaeren Harrison* is a Teaching Fellow in the Department of Social Work Studies at the University of Southampton. Her main research interests are concerned with intimacy, marriage, and women's friendships, a topic on which she is completing her doctoral studies. She is also conducting research on marital affairs.

*Stephen R. Marks* is Professor of Sociology at the University of Maine, where he has taught since 1972. His published work and his ongoing interests centre on the sociology of close relationships, perspectives on multiple roles, and feminist approaches to analyses of social settings. His current research draws on a theory of 'role balance' to understand how married people can balance multiple roles while avoiding problems of overload. His chapter on the Hawthorne women in this volume deals with a similar matter: how did these women, who became such fast friends at work, integrate these friendships into the rest of their personal networks?

*Pat O'Connor* is Professor of Sociology and Social Policy at the University of Limerick, Ireland. Her publications in the early 1990s reflected a concern with mother-daughter relationships and with the emotional reality and supportive potential of friendships and kin ties. With the publication of *Friendships Between Women* (Harvester-Wheatsheaf, 1992), she became increasingly concerned with issues related to women and power within relationships and organisations. These have been reflected in studies of organisational culture, 'male' and 'female' agendas, and consensual

control. Her forthcoming book, *Changing Places – Women in Contemporary Irish Society* (Institute of Public Administration, Dublin, 1998), marks a further move to a macro level – locating women within the context of a changing but still patriarchal society. She is fascinated by the possibilities implicit in exploring the ways in which friendship can maintain or challenge established power structures, but has not figured out how to do this.

*Stacey J. Olicker* is Associate Professor of Sociology and Urban Studies at the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee. Her book, *Best Friends and Marriage: Exchange Among Women* (University of California Press, 1989), received Honorable Mention for the American Sociological Association Jessie Bernard Award. Her recent work on welfare politics and on the family lives of women on welfare has appeared in *Social Problems*, *Sociological Quarterly*, and *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*. *Caring and Gender* (Pine Forge Press), a sociology of caregiving, co-authored with Francesca Cancian, will be published in 1998.

## Acknowledgements

The idea for this book developed over more than a decade. We originally met at the 1986 Conference on Interpersonal Relationships in Tel Aviv, Israel, organised by Steve Duck and Robin Gilmour. Without this venue, it is unlikely that our paths would ever have crossed or that the idea for this collection would ever have occurred to either of us. Although we both firmly believe that the most exciting social scientific research is often interdisciplinary, we have retained strong identities as sociologists. Over the years, attending subsequent meetings of the International Society for the Study of Personal Relationships and of its sister organisation, the International Network on Personal Relationships, we recognised the need to articulate a sociology of friendship distinct from the perspectives offered by our colleagues in communications and psychology. At the 1994 International Conference on Personal Relationships in Groningen, Holland, with the encouragement of Program Co-Chairs Rosemary Blieszner and Bram Buunk, we began to organise this effort. Along with Robert Milardo, David Morgan, Pepper Schwartz, and Barry Wellman, we began an interest group on Contextual and Structural Perspectives on Relationships. Under the leadership of Michael Johnson, this group has continued to meet. At this same meeting, we organised a panel on Contextual Approaches to the Study of Friendship. Many of the contributors to this volume participated. It was during the discussion at this session that the idea for this volume emerged.

We would like to thank the colleagues mentioned above for contributing to the intellectual atmosphere that inspired us to organise this collection. In addition, we would like to acknowledge our department heads, David Pratto, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, and Roger Lawson, University of Southampton, for supporting our collaboration. We would also like to thank Jackie Rives for making Graham welcome at UNCG

when he visited and Julie Capone for secretarial assistance. Finally our thanks to Sue, Chris, Kahla, and Peter Allan for not minding too much about Graham's absences from England, and Steven and Hadley Iliff, Rebecca's family, for tolerating, and even enjoying, his visits to the United States.

# 1

## Contextualising friendship

Rebecca G. Adams and Graham Allan

It is clear that friendships play a significant part in many people's lives. Yet sociologists in general have paid these and other similar relationships relatively little attention in their efforts to understand the nature of social organisation. Even when their concern is explicitly with aspects of social integration, little heed is normally given to the specific realm of friendship. There are of course exceptions to this, as the work referenced in this volume attests, but generally sociologists have been content to leave the study of friendship to social psychologists. Most sociologists appear to take the view that, with modernity, and late modernity in particular, friendship and other linked informal ties are of small consequence socially and economically. The dominance of formal organisations is taken as synonymous with a decline in the importance of informal ties, though, as Silver (1990) has shown, the evidence for such a view is anything but convincing. Yet, with informal solidarities defined as being of only personal significance, analysis of them has largely been ceded to psychologists.

This is a challenge which social and other psychologists have taken on very actively. Over the past fifteen years, there have been major changes in the ways in which researchers analyse and understand friendships and other personal ties (Duck, 1990; Duck, Dindia, *et al.*, 1997). The starting point of this approach was a rejection of the dominant 'attributes' perspective within psychology, particularly for its disciplinary insularity and its focus on the properties of individuals within relationships rather than on the relationships themselves. Those involved made quite deliberate efforts to bring together specialists from a range of allied fields to inform one another of the different theoretical perspectives that could be applied to the study of relationships and to create a fuller and more sophisticated understanding of the internal dynamics of different personal relationships.

By the 1990s, this new paradigm of relationships was receiving considerable attention from scholars in different disciplines. Extensive research networks had been developed and new journals specialising in the analysis of personal relationships had been successfully established. Exciting new lines of research opened up, focusing on different aspects of relationship processes (i.e., affective, behavioural, and cognitive) and on different phases of relationships. (See Blieszner and Adams, 1992, for a summary of findings on these topics regarding friendship.) These researchers recognised the importance of treating relationships, be they ties of friendship, love, parenting, or whatever, as emergent ties with their own properties rather than as the consequence of the individual attributes each actor brings to the interaction. Put simply, this perspective recognised that it was *interaction* which mattered, and not just action. As part of their concern with relational properties, these researchers have highlighted *process* – the dynamic aspects of relationships and how they develop and change over time – far more than earlier attributional approaches did. They have also paid somewhat more heed to aspects of social structure lying outside specific relationships, particularly the effects of gender.

Yet, while the new paradigm has been interdisciplinary from its point of origin, this has been true more in principle than in practice. The new field of personal relationships is to be welcomed for generating fresh lines of enquiry and providing far better understandings of pertinent relationship processes than existed previously, but from a sociological perspective the portrayal they provide remains somewhat partial. To a degree, this is a criticism of sociology for its relative indifference to analysing informal ties like friendship at all, but especially in a fashion which fosters interdisciplinary discourse. The focus, however, in much of the research on relationships which has developed from a broadly psychological perspective over the past fifteen years remains very much at the dyadic level. While relationship research is no longer as individualised as it once was, the dominant framework is still relatively narrow and concerned mainly with the particular individuals who are the direct actors in the relationship in question (though see Duck, 1993; Duck, West, and Acitelli, 1997).

Of course, the individuals involved in a particular relationship are of crucial importance; no one would claim otherwise. The point, though, is that those individuals do not generate their relationships in a social or economic vacuum, any more than they do in a personal vacuum. Relationships have a broader basis than the dyad alone; they develop and endure within a wider complex of interacting influences which help to give each relationship its shape and structure. If we are to understand fully the nature of

friendships, or for that matter of other personal ties, these relationships need to be interpreted from a perspective which recognises the impact of this wider complex, rather than from one which treats the dyad in relative isolation. Yet most empirical research on friendship has focused only on the internal form and dynamics of friendship without much regard for variation in setting and without much thought given to contextual explanations of findings.

In other words, what is largely missing from the new field of personal relationships is a consideration of the broader *contexts* in which such relationships are embedded (Duck, 1993). In essence, it lacks a sociological framework which locates the relationships within their broader environment. This is the concern of the present volume. Its aim is to show that a sociological perspective can not only make a contribution to our knowledge of personal relationships, but furthermore that studying these apparently personal ties can also increase our understanding of social change and thus inform more general sociological discourse. To achieve this, the volume brings together some of the foremost researchers now investigating aspects of the sociology of friendship. By looking at the different ways in which friendships have been constructed in different social milieux and in different historical periods, the chapters in the book demonstrate both the importance of context in the development and organisation of these ties and the advantages which accrue from bringing a sociological viewpoint into play in analysing them.

In demonstrating how a sociological perspective can add to our understanding of friendship, the chapters in the book draw on a wide set of contextualising factors to examine the structuring of these relationships and to account for the different forms they take. By doing this they all illustrate a simple yet key theme in this volume, and in the sociology of friendship more widely: that friendships do not operate in some abstract, decontextualised world. Like all other types of personal relationship, they are constructed – developed, modified, sustained, and ended – by individuals acting in contextualised settings. As the chapters which follow demonstrate, these contexts impinge directly on the emergent construction of the relationships, shaping the behaviour and understandings of the friends in myriad ways, some obvious and some more subtle. Some scholars view contexts deterministically, as shaping the relationships embedded within them but not as being shaped by the behaviours of the actors participating in the relationships. Others see contexts as social constructions. A good example of this pertinent to friendship is provided by Hochschild (1973) in her description of the ‘unexpected community’ that emerged in an age-segregated apartment

building. Both types of scholars, however, think relationships need situating within a contextual framework if they are to be understood.

What do we mean by context? This is not as simple a question to answer as it seems, for, by its nature, the concept of 'context' is broad. Boundaries cannot easily be put around what is to be included within the term. Essentially, though, by 'context' we mean the conditions external to the development, maintenance, and dissolution of specific friendships. In other words, we are referring to those elements which *surround* friendships, but are not directly inherent in them, the extrinsic rather than the intrinsic. The difficulty is that the range of extrinsic elements which do 'surround' friendships are, in a literal sense, boundless. What counts as context, where boundaries are drawn around the extrinsic yet pertinent, is a question of interpretation and judgement rather than of fact. Researchers can contextualise a given phenomenon in quite different ways, each carrying its own assumptions, strengths, and limitations. In this sense there is no right or wrong; rather there are more or less informative ways of creating knowledge and understanding. What should be included as context is an open-ended question, the answer to which depends, at least in part, on the intention, perspective, and vision of the analyst.

It should be apparent that we would like to see a comparative sociology of friendship developing. As yet, we are some way from reaching this level of accomplishment. Even those studies which are germane to understanding the connection between context and friendship tend not to be comparative. Very few friendship researchers, for example, have used a longitudinal design that would allow for change in context to be studied. Instead, they have offered snapshots of contextual effects. So, too, few researchers have compared the friendships that form and flourish in different settings at the same point in time. Nor, in the main, are the papers in this volume explicitly comparative. None the less, we believe they do offer a starting point for such a comparative effort by identifying some of the key aspects of context which need to be considered in understanding friendship. We would hope that future studies will be able to build on the analyses they contain.

#### **Characteristics of context**

Contexts are not unidimensional. Many of their various aspects are of sociological importance. Certainly the structural and cultural qualities of context, as well as its spatial and temporal organisation, are relevant to understanding relationships embedded within them. It is important to

remember, though, that these broad characteristics of context do not act independently of each other. It is in their interaction that the complexity of context emerges. For example, distinguishing between what counts as cultural and what as social structural is often problematic, as the boundaries inevitably merge. Jerrome (1984), for example, has shown how middle-class lifestyles shape the friendship behaviour of older middle-aged women in Britain. Stack (1974) demonstrated a quite different pattern of ties in her analysis of friendships in a poor black community in the Midwestern United States. There the exchange of material resources was a key element to compensate for the economic uncertainties they faced. And, in a quite different setting, Oxley (1974) demonstrated how the culture of egalitarianism in small-town Australia influenced the patterns of 'mateship' which developed. Similarly, the distinction between the effects of temporal and spatial aspects of context is often blurred. Duneier's (1992) description of interaction among customers of a restaurant in an integrated neighbourhood in Chicago illustrates this point. The establishment's regular schedule made it possible for patrons to see one another without planning to do so and thus provided opportunities for them to forge ties with one another. The regularity of the temporal structure and of having a convenient place to meet was so important to these people that, when the restaurant closed temporarily for repairs, they replaced their routine visits to the restaurant with visits to other settings nearby.

It is also important to remember that dimensions of context are not static; they are constantly changing. The characteristics of a context during one period of time may vary considerably from its characteristics during another. One needs only to consider for a moment how neighbourhoods, schools, and the work-place have changed over the past several decades to realise the importance of this observation. On a broader scale, think how different relationships can be during times of war and times of peace, during affluent periods and in the midst of massive depressions, or in eras when men and women are not allowed to be alone with one another as against eras in which they are free to interact whenever they like. Over time, the social structural, cultural, spatial, and temporal situations surrounding individuals can all change, and so the constellation of the characteristics we are subsuming under 'context' changes as well.

### **Continuum of contextual analyses**

Friendship researchers have approached the study of contextual effects in different ways. In turn the methods they have used to study context are

related to the level of context they have studied. By 'level of context', we mean how near to the individual the boundaries of the context in question are. In the discussion that follows, we describe the traditions that examine the personal environment of individuals, the social network, communities or subcultures, and societies. (See Adams and Blieszner, 1993, for a discussion of contextual levels, and Praeger, 1995, for an elaboration of their treatment.) The discussion thus proceeds from the individual level of analysis to levels of analysis more remote from the individual. As we have already noted, these boundaries between levels of context are heuristic. By their nature, they are not delineated from each other in a discrete way.

### ***The personal environment level***

The first level represents the 'personal environment' of those who are friends. By this we mean the immediate features of a person's life which affect the character and pattern of the friendships which they develop and sustain. This will include, *inter alia*, their economic circumstances, their domestic responsibilities, their work commitments, their leisure preferences, and the like. It encompasses all those features of an individual's personal environment which either limit or create the opportunities they have for engaging sociably with others and servicing friendships. Researchers do not normally incorporate all these features into any given analysis of friendship patterns, but usually they do concern themselves with one or more in explaining why friendships take the forms they do.

Most studies which draw on context at the level of personal environment do so by specifying how social structural or cultural variables influence an individual's friendship behaviour. In this regard, aspects of this level of context are amenable to being treated as independent variables with a framework that examines the impact different variables have on friendship patterns. As a result, this perspective on context is highly compatible with survey methodology in which both friendships and the factors influencing them can be treated as attributes or properties of the individual. Thus, many studies have looked at how gender, for example, interacts with friendship development or with the interactional styles occurring in friendships (e.g., Fischer and Oliner, 1983; Wright, 1989; Rawlins, 1992; Kaplan and Keys, 1997). Other studies have examined the impact of characteristics such as age, ethnicity, ill-health, care giving, or economic circumstances on the organisation of friendship (e.g., Nahemow and Lawton, 1975; Weiss and Lowenthal, 1975; Fischer and Oliner, 1983; Jerrome, 1990; Lamme, *et al.*, 1996).

Not all research which incorporates context at the level of personal

environment depends upon survey data. Other methodologies are quite capable of producing data which provide information about the ways in which people's commitments and obligations structure their friendships. On the other hand, most survey-oriented studies of friendship are restricted to this level of contextualisation. Because of its individualistic character, it is harder for survey research to contribute to our understanding of other levels of context. This is not to say that context in the sense of personal environment is unimportant. It is difficult to see how an understanding of friendship patterns could emerge without this level of context being part of the analysis. Nevertheless, this is only one level. The range of contextual considerations which play a part in structuring friendship behaviour runs deeper than this type of feature alone. In some ways, the ease of doing survey research quickly and relatively inexpensively has seduced friendship researchers and so, by default, they have ignored the more labour-intensive and expensive methodologies required to reach an understanding of broader contextual effects.

#### ***The network level***

The second level of context is linked closely to the personal environment level. It concerns the network of personal relationships which each person maintains. There are two basic elements to the network perspective. The first is the more obvious: different people become involved in social networks with different properties through their distinct patterns of social participation. Some have larger networks than others; some have denser networks in the sense that those in it are likely also to know others involved. Similarly, some people's networks involve multiplex relationships, whereas others have less complicated ties. In explaining how networks with different constellations of relationships emerge, researchers typically draw on the type of factor discussed under personal environment. However, networks can also have an independent influence on people's behaviour. Here, the key question is not so much why different patterns of network develop, but rather what the results of these different patterns are for the opportunities open to people and the constraints they face. A feature of this second perspective is that it can be concerned with the network configurations of larger social collectivities, such as work groups or communities, in which no particular individual is seen as central. (For a review of the development of network studies, see Scott, 1991, or Wellman, 1988.)

Both these perspectives indicate that friendship behaviour can be influenced by the overall patterning of networks as well as by the specific

obligations embodied in particular personal relationships. The structural characteristics of the networks in which people are embedded become part of the context of their interactions. A simple way of recognising this with respect to friendship is to consider how patterns of kinship ties can influence a person's friendship behaviour. There is, for example, some evidence from Britain, admittedly now rather dated, that extensive involvement with kin living outside their household limits participation in (non-kin) friendship ties (Allan, 1979; Willmott, 1987). Similarly, people involved in relatively dense friendship networks are likely to develop fewer new friendships at any time than those whose friendship networks are more dispersed (Allan, 1989).

There have been relatively few studies which have tried to specify at all fully how the structure of people's networks influences friendship behaviour. There have been even fewer which focus on this from a perspective which considers networks wider than ego-centred ones (Milardo and Allan, 1997). In part this is because of the difficulties of researching such networks, especially using a social survey methodology. This is not the only approach used for generating data on networks, but it is undoubtedly the most common and the least time-consuming. Often such studies also ask only about a particular portion of an individual's network – those they see most frequently or those to whom they feel closest. (See Adams, 1989, for a discussion of the ways in which researchers have limited their operational definitions of friendship.) Given that different data collection instruments generate different depictions of network structure (Milardo, 1992), how useful more partial studies of personal networks are for providing contextual information relevant for understanding friendship patterns remains a moot question.

### ***Community level***

From the development of the Chicago School onwards, field researchers have provided many in-depth descriptions of the social lives of the inhabitants of specific places. The places and settings they have studied have varied widely, fostering a rich tradition in Europe in addition to the United States. (The classic American studies include Whyte, 1943; Gans, 1962; Liebow, 1967; and Stack, 1974. For a review of British studies, see Crow and Allan, 1994.) This body of research provides much insight into the friendships of those studied, though none of them focuses exclusively on these ties. What these studies illustrate exceptionally well is how the contexts in which sociability and friendship are embedded influence their inter-

nal organisation and dynamic. Woven into tapestries comprising threads about family, love, work, survival, and daily activities are narratives about the social lives and personal relationships of the participants. In this body of work the limitations of treating relationships solely as dyadic formations becomes most apparent.

A standard criticism of community studies is that only rarely are they cumulative. Each stands alone, difficult to generalise about or build upon. Researchers designed very few of them in a way that allows others to compare findings about friendship across them. Furthermore, few of the researchers used the results of previous community studies to inform their own research. In the main, they describe the complexities of friendship in one context, but do not evaluate how the different characteristics of contexts combine to affect friendship. None the less, one can begin to develop contextual hypotheses from some of these studies taken in combination.

For example, both Stack (1974) and Liebow (1967) described friendships among poor American blacks and emphasised the importance of friends for providing basic survival resources. This suggests that, in economies of scarcity, friendships become important as instrumental relationships. As the subjects in both Stack's and Liebow's work were American blacks, one might be tempted to offer a purely cultural explanation. The economic hypothesis gains strength when studies of unemployment elsewhere are considered (Binns and Mars, 1984; Wallace, 1987; Morris, 1990), or in the light of research like Hochschild's (1973) which examined the social lives of poor elderly white women living in an age-segregated housing complex. In these studies, too, respondents depended on material exchanges with one another, if not for survival, at least to improve their quality of life.

### ***Societal level***

The final level of context we want to discuss is the societal level. This is the level most removed from the individual, but it still frames patterns of friendship in a number of very important ways. In particular, the economic and social structures which dominate at any time have an impact on the forms which different personal relationships take (Silver, 1990). The best-known illustration of this concerns the ways in which industrialisation affected familial and domestic ties. Commonly, this is seen as entailing a move from a more collective past to a more individualised present, often expressed as a shift from an extended family system to a nuclear family one. The causes and time periods involved are frequently specified differently, but the consequences are usually seen as similar. In effect, industrialisation,

the spread of wage labour, increased geographical mobility, and the decline in importance of familial property resulted in marital selection being increasingly based around ideas of love and personal compatibility rather than parental influence, with a concomitant reduction in solidarity and authority between kin outside the immediate household.

Of course, the impact of social and economic change on personal relationships did not stop with the grand nineteenth- and early twentieth-century transformations we commonly subsume under the term 'industrialisation'. Indeed, as modernity developed further, so our understandings of how personal relationships should be organised also altered. Giddens (1992), for example, has developed an account of the ways in which romantic and sexual ties have been modified under what he terms 'late modernity'. While this account can be criticised, it does have the benefit of recognising just how much relationships of intimacy are tied to the economic and social formations within which they occur.

Just as the wider changes occurring in the society affect the patterning of sexual and familial relationships, so too they influence the character of friendship. Perhaps the most dominant theoretical perspective here is that of 'privatisation', though this term actually embraces quite a range of distinct arguments. Essentially the idea behind it is that, with industrialisation and the development of modernity, the more communal solidarities of the past have been replaced by a dominant concern for the private world of home and family. Whereas once the social and economic conditions of people's lives encouraged a wide co-operation and dependency between those living near to and working with one another, contemporary social organisation no longer generates the same needs. In particular, affluence in general and the development of mass communication and personal transport systems more specifically have reduced the salience of the local in people's lives and freed them from any great need to co-operate with others living nearby. There has, as a result, been a major change in the organisation of sociability, though again there are quite different versions of what precisely these changes have been.

Some have argued that this has resulted in nuclear families, or perhaps more accurately nuclear households, becoming increasingly isolated, with individuals leading lives which are firmly centred on their home and immediate family. Others disagree with this isolationist perspective, suggesting instead that what has altered is the salience of structured public settings in people's social lives. Whereas once social relationships tended to be based around ties of locality and employment and enacted communally, this is no longer so. Instead, people are now more able to sustain friend-

ships created in a variety of settings, but these ties tend to be 'privatised' in the sense that interaction is framed by domestic contexts rather than communal ones (Allan and Crow, 1991; Devine, 1992; Marks, 1994; Wellman, *et al.*, 1988). Such changes in friendship can be linked to other aspects of social change: for example, altered patterns of leisure, the greater 'compartmentalisation' of different aspects of people's lives, including the increased separation of domestic life and leisure from employment, and the development of greater conjugality within marriage.

Other scholars have adopted rather different perspectives, whilst still emphasising the ways in which historical change in socio-economic relationships pattern friendship ties. While Lopata (1991), for example, suggested that the development of commercial society led to a decline in the social significance and heterogeneity of friendship, Silver (1990) argued that commercial society actually encouraged friendship by ridding ties of the 'contamination' of instrumentality. 'Only with impersonal markets in products and services does a parallel system of personal relations emerge whose ethic excludes exchange and utility' (Silver, 1990, p. 1494). Litwak (1985, 1989) has also suggested that friendships become more significant with modernity because of the increased need for the flexibility which informal ties provide in societies dominated by bureaucratic organisations. Oliner (1989), too, was concerned with how friendships were patterned with the emergence of modernity, though she argued that the consequences were gender-specific. She particularly emphasised the historical importance of intimacy in women's friendships, whilst recognising that its mode of expression altered over time.

And, of course, change continues. Indeed, the arguments that have been made about the 'compartmentalisation' of sociable relationships can be seen as broadly compatible with arguments about the transformation of modernist society into post-modernity. Here the apparently secure base of knowledge and organisation which modernity represents is becoming more fragmented. One element in this is the greater freedom that people have to construct their own personal and intimate worlds. The rise of cohabitation, the developing recognition that marriage is not necessarily a lifelong commitment, the increased acceptance of gay identities and relationships, the growth of gender and ethnic politics, and so forth all point to the greater legitimacy of diversity in the construction of personal life. The friendships people form, the ties of solidarity which they generate, and the support (or otherwise) which they receive are likely to be important in these constructions.

But the issue here is not whether friendships are indeed becoming of

greater consequence in social life, nor whether society can accurately be defined as post-modern. The point is simply that patterns of friendship are framed within a societal context. Thus, for example, the form they take, their salience in people's lives, the extent to which they are permitted to be influential, and the legitimacy and support they provide are all shaped by the constraints and opportunities people experience as a consequence of their specific location within the social and economic formation, framed by the general character of that formation. The impact of these broader social and economic influences needs recognising. They, as much as anything, provide a contextual frame for understanding friendship now or in any time and place.

### **Plan of the book**

The chapters which follow all illustrate how the contexts within which friendships develop influence the forms which friendships take. The actual topics with which they are concerned vary quite considerably – from nineteenth-century women's friendships to the implications for friendship of recent developments in electronic communication. Some of the chapters contain detailed empirical examinations of the friendships maintained by specific individuals; others are more theoretical, drawing on a range of sources to develop arguments about the transformations that are occurring in sociability. All, however, focus on the ways in which the organisation of friendship and people's understandings of the boundaries and exchanges that the ties entail are influenced by factors which lie outside the relationships themselves. As such, they illustrate very clearly why context matters and why it is important in analysing friendship to locate the ties within their wider framework.

The first chapter by Stacey Oliner is concerned specifically with the ways in which the development of modernity within the nineteenth-century United States influenced the patterning of middle-class women's close friendships. As noted earlier, while much has been written about the impact of changing economic and industrial conditions on family relationships, far less research has been published on the impact of these changes for ties of friendship. Oliner's argument is that the growth of individualism as a dominant ideology had quite distinct consequences for men and women because of their discrete structural locations. For men, individualism was associated with autonomy, self-interest, and competition; intimacy was typically contained within the familial sphere. In contrast, among middle-class women the expression of intimacy was positively fostered, both inside

and outside the family. The institutional framework within which their lives were embedded encouraged an affectionate individualism to flourish and allowed for the development of intimate friendships in a fashion that would have been quite inappropriate for men.

Stephen Marks's essay is also concerned with understanding how the changing structural position of women – in his case working-class women from the industrial Midwestern United States – influenced the forms of solidarity generated between co-workers. In a fascinating analysis of the experiences of the women involved in the famous Relay Assembly Test Room experiments at the Hawthorne plant in Chicago in the 1920s and 1930s, Marks draws on archival material, as well as retrospective interviews with some of those involved, to reconstruct the pattern of solidaristic relationships which developed. He shows how the character of their friendships was patterned by the immediate circumstances of their domestic economies – and in particular the dominance of men's location within the household – as well as by the gendered realities of marriage and the local labour market. Interestingly, though, these friendships, starting circumstantially in their youth and lasting the women's lifetimes, did not involve particularly high levels of intimate self-disclosure. Rather, Marks characterises their solidarity as involving an 'inclusive' form of intimacy, which he contrasts with the 'exclusive intimacy' now so frequently taken as the hallmark of close friendship.

The next two chapters, by Graham Allan and Kaeren Harrison, follow the temporal theme by focusing on friendship patterns in the middle and later parts of this century. Allan is concerned with changes in dominant forms of male working-class friendship and sociability since the middle of the century in Britain. Building on the analyses contained in community and occupational studies in the immediate post-war period, he assesses the structural factors that influenced the ways in which sociable ties were then organised, and investigates how major changes in domestic, economic, and social relationships since then have modified how they are managed. The central theme of the chapter is that the boundaries constructed around sociable ties and the exchanges they involve are structured by the social and economic contexts within which they arise.

Like Oliker, Kaeren Harrison is concerned with middle-class women's friendship, though her focus is on married women in late twentieth-century Britain. Basing her analysis on a combination of interview and archival data, Harrison examines the integration of friendships within the broader contours of her respondents' lives. In particular, together with both Oliker and Marks, she is concerned with the expression of intimacy within friendships

and, in turn, how these ties relate to the women's experiences of marriage and motherhood. Her argument is that the patterning and content of these close friendships can be understood only within the context of the women's domestic lives and, specifically, the failure of their marriages to meet their expectations for conjugal expressivity. She emphasises how the close friendships the women maintained provided an alternative forum for intimate disclosure, offered a means of situating their experiences, and validated their sense of self.

Pat O'Connor also focuses on women's friendships and the ways in which they are patterned by the wider structures in which they are embedded. However, her concerns are more broadly based, examining how elements of patriarchy and capitalism shape female friendships in a post-modern context. Within societies where both men and heterosexuality remain privileged, she argues that dominant discourses often portray women's friendships as fragile and of limited social consequence. She explores how, even when their significance in the construction of identity is recognised, such cultural portrayals still disguise the part women's friendships play in sustaining the prevailing social order. In addressing these processes, she assesses the transformative potential such ties have in a post-modern era where old stabilities are increasingly questioned.

Scott Feld and William Carter take a quite different tack in examining how context influences friendship ties. Building on Feld's earlier work (Feld, 1981), they examine how friendships are patterned by the foci of activity in which they are embedded. Their argument is that most friendships arise from one or more foci of activity, and that usually foci of activity involve individuals in quite dense networks of others. These networks of relationships form the context within which particular dyadic forms of tie, including friendships, develop. Feld and Carter use the example of divorce to illustrate the importance of considering the extent to which friendships are embedded in foci of activity, and in particular how changes in this embeddedness impact on the organisation of the friendships in question. By doing so, they show how apparently personal ties of friendship are typically rooted in broader sets of connected relationships which influence their development and form.

In the final substantive chapter, Rebecca Adams explores how technological changes shape the character of friendship. She begins by illustrating how the emergence of mass forms of transport and communications over the past 200 years altered the parameters of social participation. Her main concern, though, is contemporary, and lies in distilling the impact that the growth of electronic communication – principally e-mail and the Internet – have had

on the social construction of informal relationships. Drawing on a conceptual framework developed in her earlier research (Adams and Blieszner, 1994), she examines how the special context of electronic communication raises important questions for our understanding and knowledge of friendship structure and processes. In probing these issues, she shows how a focus on electronic friendships helps explicate the limitations of some conventional approaches to analysing informal relationships, as well as highlighting the diversity of elements constituting 'context' in friendship analyses.

### References

- Adams, Rebecca G. (1989), 'Conceptual and methodological issues in studying friendships of older adults', in Adams and Blieszner (eds.).
- Adams, Rebecca G., and Blieszner, Rosemary (eds.) (1989), *Older Adult Friendship: Structure and Process*, Newbury Park: Sage.
- (1993), 'Resources for friendship intervention', *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 20: 159–75.
- (1994), 'An integrative conceptual framework for friendship research', *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 11: 163–84.
- Allan, Graham (1979), *A Sociology of Friendship and Kinship*, London: Allen & Unwin.
- (1989), *Friendship: Developing a Sociological Perspective*, Hemel Hempstead: Harvester-Wheatsheaf.
- Allan, Graham, and Crow, Graham (1991), 'Privatization, home-centredness and leisure', *Leisure Studies*, 10: 19–32.
- Binns, David, and Mars, Gerald (1984), 'Family, community and unemployment: a study in change', *Sociological Review*, 32: 662–95.
- Blieszner, Rosemary, and Adams, Rebecca G. (1992), *Adult Friendship*, Newbury Park: Sage.
- Crow, Graham, and Allan, Graham (1994), *Community Life: An Introduction to Local Social Relationships*, Hemel Hempstead: Harvester-Wheatsheaf.
- Devine, Fiona (1992), *Affluent Workers Revisited: Privatism and the Working Class*, Edinburgh University Press.
- Duck, Steve (1990), 'Relationships as unfinished business: out of the frying pan and into the 1990s', *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 7: 5–29.
- (ed.) (1993), *Social Context and Relationships*, Newbury Park: Sage.
- Duck, Steve, Dindia, Kathryn, Ickes, William, Milardo, Robert M., Mills, Rosemary, and Sarason, Barbara (eds.) (1997), *Handbook of Personal Relationships*, London: Wiley.
- Duck, Steve, West, Lee, and Acitelli, Linda (1997), 'Sewing the field: the tapestry of relationships in life and research', in Duck, Dindia, *et al.* (eds.).
- Duneier, Mark (1992), *Slim's Table*, University of Chicago Press.
- Feld, Scott L. (1981), 'The focused organization of social ties', *American Journal of Sociology*, 86: 1015–35.
- Fischer, Claude S., and Oliker, Stacey (1983), 'A research note on friendship, gender and the life-cycle', *Social Forces*, 62: 124–33.

- Gans, Herbert J. (1962), *The Urban Villagers*, New York: Free Press.
- Giddens, Anthony (1992), *The Transformation of Intimacy: Sexuality, Love, and Eroticism in Modern Societies*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Hochschild, Arlie R. (1973), *The Unexpected Community*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Jerrone, Dorothy (1984), 'Good company: the sociological implications of friendship', *Sociological Review*, 32: 696–718.
- (1990), 'Frailty and friendship', *Journal of Cross-Cultural Gerontology*, 5: 51–64.
- Kaplan, Daniel, and Keys, Christopher (1997), 'Sex and relationship variables as predictors of sexual attraction in cross-sex platonic friendships between young heterosexual adults', *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 14: 191–206.
- Lamme, Simone, Dykstra, Pearl, and Broese Van Groenou, Marjolein (1996), 'Rebuilding the network: new relationships in widowhood', *Personal Relationships*, 3: 337–49.
- Liebow, Elliott (1967), *Tally's Corner*, Boston: Little, Brown.
- Litwak, Eugene (1985), *Helping the Elderly: The Complementary Roles of Informal Networks and Formal Systems*, New York: Guilford.
- (1989), 'Forms of friendships among older people in industrial society', in Adams and Blieszner (eds.).
- Lopata, Helen (1991), 'Friendship: historical and theoretical introduction', in Helen Lopata and David Maines (eds.), *Friendship in Context*, Greenwich, CT: Jai Press.
- Marks, Stephen R. (1994), 'Intimacy in the public realm: the case of coworkers', *Social Forces*, 72: 843–58.
- Milardo, Robert M. (1992), 'Comparative methods for delineating social networks', *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 9: 447–61.
- Milardo, Robert M., and Allan, Graham (1997), 'Social networks and marital relationships', in Duck, Dindia, *et al.* (eds.).
- Morris, Lydia (1990), *The Workings of the Household*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Nahemow, L., and Lawton, M. P. (1975), 'Similarity and propinquity in friendship formation', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 32: 205–13.
- Oliker, Stacey J. (1989), *Best Friends and Marriage: Exchange Among Women*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Oxley, H. G. (1974), *Mateship and Local Organization*, Brisbane: University of Queensland Press.
- Praeger, Karen J. (1995), *The Psychology of Intimacy*, New York: Guilford.
- Rawlins, William (1992), *Friendship Matters: Communication, Dialectics and the Life Course*, New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Scott, John (1991), *Social Network Analysis*, London: Sage.
- Silver, Alan (1990), 'Friendship in commercial society: eighteenth-century social theory and modern sociology', *American Journal of Sociology*, 95: 1474–1504.
- Stack, Carol (1974), *All Our Kin*, New York: Harper and Row.
- Wallace, Claire (1987), *For Richer, For Poorer: Growing up in and out of Work*, London: Tavistock.

- Weiss, L., and Lowenthal, M. F. (1975), 'Life-course perspectives on friendship', in M. E. Lowenthal, M. Thurnher, D. Chiriboga, and associates (eds.), *Four Stages of Life*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wellman, Barry (1988), 'Structural analysis: from method and metaphor to theory and substance', in Wellman and Berkowitz (eds.).
- Wellman, Barry, and Berkowitz, S. D. (eds.) (1988), *Social Structures: A Network Approach*, Cambridge University Press.
- Wellman, Barry, Carrington, Peter J., and Hall, Alan (1988), 'Networks as personal communities', in Wellman and Berkowitz (eds.).
- Whyte, William F. (1943), *Street Corner Society: The Social Structure of an Italian Slum*, University of Chicago Press.
- Willmott, Peter (1987), *Friendship Networks and Social Support*, London: Policy Studies Institute.
- Wright, Paul (1989), 'Gender differences in adults' same- and cross-gender friendships', in Adams and Blieszner (eds.).