

The Cultural Variable in Friendship and Group Formation

DON BENNETT

University College, Dublin

Précis: Among the factors influencing social life, national cultural tendencies rarely appear in social research or analysis. In discussing the variables influencing comparative tendencies of populations to form primary groups and friendships, the national cultural variable is assessed for its potential importance. A variety of research findings on several North Atlantic nations is marshalled to provide data regarding comparative friendship and grouping tendencies; the same studies are assessed in terms of their success or failure in identifying a national cultural variable which may have been an influential part of the explanation of empirical findings. Salient forces which could be causally related to different friendship or group-forming patterns are discussed.

I INTRODUCTION

Group-formation has been studied for its general properties since the time of Simmel. However, there has been little interest expressed in the possibility that significant variations in group-forming exist in different cultural contexts. The same must be said about friendship. We lack a real history of friendship despite Simmel's (1908a) stimulating pointers; both anthropologists (as Paine, 1969, and Brain, 1976, have already lamented) and sociologists, like historians, have shown little interest in friendship, cross-culturally or otherwise.

Noteworthy among the fields of study in which attention has been given to either of these related topics is the sociological study of large organisations, especially work organisations. Earlier American organisational studies (e.g., Page, 1946; Roethlisberger and Dickson, 1939; and Merton, 1945) emphasised what was supposed to be a vital role of primary relations and informal groups in the large organisation. Informal groups as secret networks were portrayed as virtually the necessary social mechanism whereby formal organisations can effectively function. Data were soon available (Blau, 1954; Seashore, 1954) to show that strong primary groups in the workplace can

work against, as well as for, the interests, efficiency, and productivity of the organisation, and such is now the established generalisation (cf. Etzioni, 1975, Chapter 11 and *passim*). The existence of strong informal nets within American organisations has, nevertheless, not in itself been called into question. Is this an indicator of a higher general level of grouping in American than in other cultures? Whether all cultures have equal patterns of informal collusion and group formation is a question which has, amazingly, called forth little investigation (see, for example, the extensive review of the literature on "Small Groups and Large Organizations" by Golembiewski, 1965). This paper represents an attempt to partially fill this notable vacuum by studying group-forming and friendship patterns in France, America, England and Ireland.

II THE INFLUENCE OF CULTURE ON GROUP-FORMING AND FRIENDSHIP PATTERNS

Certainly there are other perspectives from which differential group-forming can be assessed. Class is one, relative mobility of population is another, location and occupation others, and the life cycle still another. These kinds of variables have received a great deal of attention, as indeed they ought. As early as 1786 Garve (cited in Michels, 1927, pp. 11-12) hypothesised that class differences are more important generally than national differences. Few, perhaps, have ever disagreed. Life cycle differentials in friendship formation and maintenance have received some attention (Hess, 1972, surveys much of the literature). And Gerstl (1961) has provided evidence that occupations can differ widely in relative tendency to have persons of the same occupation as friends (cf. the discussion of farm friendships below, especially Note 5). Nevertheless, the lack of attention to cultural differences may have rendered sterile much of the work on other differences. If we do not allow that a population being studied has general cultural characteristics, we are making the patently unsociological assumption that the given population represents universal mankind. Whether cultural influences are to be considered a constant in the case of a single population or an independent variable in comparative studies, they cannot be ignored when we come to our general explanations and our overall understanding. This flaw occurs, and occurs blatantly, even in studies which have cross-cultural data. Litwak and Szelenyi (1969) collected survey responses in similar areas in Detroit and two Hungarian cities to questions on the differential use in time of need of friends, family and relatives, and neighbours. Differences appeared. In their attempts to suggest explanatory variables (on none of which were data actually collected), the authors do not consider cultural differences; they fall back on comparing the communications systems

and level of technology of the two countries and on possible income differentials. Undoubtedly such variables can sometimes be potent factors. However, statements like the following by sociologists (Young and Willmott, 1973, p. 231) are possibly indicators both of the need for further dimensions in cross-cultural studies and of the importance of the culture:

We tried out many different comparisons between classes according to the amount of time that husbands spent with their wives and children when they were out of the home; according to the extent to which husbands had been out with and without their wives; and according to whether the wife accompanied them when they went out to engage in the leisure activity they enjoyed most. Although wives were somewhat less in evidence in the higher classes, the differences were always small.

Young and Willmott are speaking of a single-society study. Cross-cultural research has no greater guarantee of avoiding the *cul-de-sac*, if the variables being explored are unimaginative and inadequate, than one-society work. Irving (1977) and Verbrugge (1977) have each recently presented two-society data – Irving on Hull, England, and Orange County, California, Verbrugge on Detroit and a West German town. Irving ignores the cultural differences between England and California almost as completely as Litwak and Szelenyi ignore the possible contrast in their study; Verbrugge ignores it every bit as completely.

At another extreme in the handling of group formation and friendship we have been treated since the 19th century to a fair amount of evolutionary model-building concerning urban secondary relations, the modern family, and changing tendencies to group-formation. This is not a bad thing in itself, and there is no reason to doubt, for example, Simmel's contention that the character of friendship has changed over the last century or two (although one can hardly be certain that it will not change back again to what it was). We should perhaps be dubious about the confidence of Simmel (1908b, pp. 137, 193, and *passim*) and others that modern man primarily joins groups which are chosen on a basis of common intellectual interests, rather than on self-interest, emotion, religion, kinship, charity, or other factors. Dubin (1956) goes so far as to say that in industrial civilisation attachment to groups declines so low that "the basic problem is . . . one of enhancing the sense of attachment of participants to social organisations in which participation is necessary but not important to them". I cannot agree that this is, or could ever be, "the basic problem". Work, to continue with the same example, is socially necessary, yet it can be unimportant to the individual even in whole cultures. This does not mean, however, that

work is not done. The work is done, after some fashion, whether or not we have sociologists advocating “enhancing the sense of attachment”¹. There is, too, the reverse evolutionary theory – that industrialism is, socially, the advent of dense, rather than dying, grouping. Warner (1968) has stated this speculation in a well-known article: “In the simplest sense this transformation of the organization of work had the effect of creating a lattice of loyalties and social relationships in the city”, because “it seems fair to reason that in time the men and women of his work group must have become important members of a worker’s social life”. Here Warner has not simply woven an idle yarn; he has also stated something which is demonstrably untrue in many instances, as we shall see, and may be false in regard to whole cultures. Greater attention to cultural differences could perhaps help us to avoid blunders like Warner’s.

Evolutionary theorising on this topic has found an interesting ally of a sort in Wilson (1965). Generally, Wilson raises the matter in the comparative perspective for which I am calling. I think it can be seen, however, that much could be gained by separating the tradition/modernity variable from the comparative cultural one with which he here merges it:

The Americans have, necessarily, been concerned with the problem of social conformity and the agencies which weld together diverse and heterogeneous elements into some type of social consensus. Emphasis on the group . . . [has] been part of the American response to the circumstance of being the world’s most untraditional society, and the one compounded from the most diversified collection of immigrants. In such a society new groupings were necessary to discount the latent differences of background status and ethnicity With ‘the passing of traditional society’ the group has emerged to fulfil functions formerly realized by the stable stratification patterns of earlier social organisation.

[In Britain], a society with well accepted and understood status differences, in which associations have been formed on the basis of social similarities of class and culture . . . there is still a suspicion of groups, even if a waning suspicion, since the group has had less to offer the individual than in the American case. There has been less

1. Elsewhere (Bennett, 1974, 1975-76 and 1976) I have argued that social scientists have very often erroneously supposed that various social mechanisms of order, coherence, bonding, or grouping can be absent or problematic, mechanisms which are, quite the reverse, socially endemic. Dubin’s comment is an example of this mistake. Another from the literature on groups is Holmes’ (1970, p. 275) emphasis “that coherent, peaceable (group) relationships have to be accounted for, and cannot be taken for granted”. The sociological desideratum that they should be accounted for interferes in no way with the sociological fact that they may indeed be taken for granted.

need for the functions of reassurance and confirmation of identity which groups have fulfilled in America. The individual, in his relative isolation or his deliberately protected privacy, has had the support of a well articulated structure of relationships in which his position has been clearly defined. His security has stemmed from a fixed conception of a stable social order . . . He has had less need for the continued reiteration of approval by a group of associates. His status has been less fragile, less dependent on the specific self-conscious behaviour he has adopted towards his fellows. His values have been assured — the accepted values of his stratum in society, needing neither defence nor explicit formulation. It is where all these matters are in doubt that group formations need arise — groups then become an ego-prop for the individual whose identity is challenged by a society in which stratification is unclearly articulated and criteria of social differences fluid and volatile. . . .

Consequently British society has in the past not operated by groups

Holding so much explanatory resourcefulness, it is a pity that there is not some evidence calling for the explanation. Dubin says grouping wanes, Wilson says it waxes. What is its history? My purpose here is, of course, not to call into question all developmental, differentiation, Marxist, modernisation, and other general models of change. The degree of acceptability which they have won contrasts strongly, however, with the lack of such for the cultural variable. The historical dimension will be better served when research includes direct consideration of cultural characteristics.

III GROUP-FORMING AND FRIENDSHIP PATTERNS IN FRANCE

A rare strong argument that cultures are not identical in regard to group forming is Crozier's (1963) study of French organisations, *The Bureaucratic Phenomenon*. Crozier found group-formation in the French workplace to be absolutely minimal. The result is that French organisations run, in his view, by virtue of formal rules rather than by small group collusion. The difference from the American pattern is seen by Crozier to lie in the general French culture, rather than in the organisational structure itself. Such differences, if the findings are accurate, are of economic as well as personal and sociological importance. Managing and planning work organisations should be done, if possible, in consideration of apparent cultural tendencies. Questions of the degree of decentralisation or the size of work units — divisions, sections, or branches — will be raised where people operate

via fully effective primary groups. Optimum basic work group size is affected by obvious technological and environmental constraints; cultural patterns in interpersonal relations may be an equally real, if less obvious, factor. Those interested in worker control, too, will need to recognise potential cultural limitations to its implementation — different limitations from those which are a direct product of a social formation dominated by a particular mode of production. Economic life is only one social area, however, for which variations in group-forming have implications. Educational techniques should, perhaps, be informed by differing pupil group-forming patterns. Community organisation work is obviously enormously affected by such a variable.

Crozier's thesis concerning France is that primary group-forming is relatively rare outside the family — nuclear or extended. He looks at several institutional aspects of French society in addition to work organisations. Reviewing the literature and research findings bearing on the French educational system, the political administration, the community, the colonial system, and the labour movement and pattern of industrial relations, Crozier finds in all of these sectors the manifestations and results of a low global tendency to form groups outside the family. (Crozier gives most importance to Sharp, 1931, Bernot and Blancard, 1953, Pitts, 1957, and Wylie, 1957). One upshot in all aspects of life from schools to colonial administration is, and has long been, to fall back on impersonal rules and rigid strata-status boundaries — the bureaucratic phenomenon. A second general result is periodic revolts. General revolts with limited objectives are, according to this view, a feature of many aspects of French life. This mode of stating grievances and making change has become institutionalised in France, and, as Crozier would argue, not without reason. A cause is the void in primary group organisation. A network of primary groups in the society could permit alternative modes for change. The void in primary group organisation is further conjectured by these writers to be related to a paternalistic and authoritarian political administration reinforcing an exaggerated cultural strata-status consciousness and a culturally learned inability to tolerate either favouritism or relationships of personal dependence.

Crozier is impressed by the synthetic work of de Tocqueville, Goblot, and the American sociologist, Pitts, all of whom earlier recognised this failure of primary group-formation in France. De Tocqueville (1856) and Goblot (1925) pointed out, as Crozier and many others have been forced by their findings to re-emphasise, the rigid stratification of French society. Within each stratum, however, Goblot argued that a levelling process operates, providing an extraordinary degree of equality. Stratum or level may not be very precise terms for these categorical status-oriented social groupings. De Beauvoir (1949, p. 28) used a different word in referring to the sexual barriers in French schools: "In France in mixed schools, the boys' caste

deliberately oppresses and persecutes the girls' caste". Whatever the best term, Crozier's research and other research he cites have established the importance of what Crozier chooses to call the "abstract formal group" or "ranking category" in lieu of primary groups. Pitts (1957) has gone farthest in delineating this solidarity within social "ranks" and explaining how it acts as a working replacement for primary groups. My own participant observation study of a work situation in Provence in 1977 and 1978 (Bennett, unpublished) revealed the continuation of this cultural syndrome.

A most interesting aspect of the work of Pitts and Wylie is the correlation between strong families and weak societal primary groups. The people of the Provençal village whom Wylie studied are depicted as ones who "remain apart from each other" to a ritual extreme. Almost all kinds of groups "lead a precarious life, and usually they disintegrate entirely" (Wylie, 1957, p. 330). Life is simply centred around the family, to the exclusion, in so far as possible, of everything else. Family is the religion: "Formal religion is given formal recognition, but the deepest religious feelings relate directly to the family" (*ibid.*, p. 338). Exactly the same was reported by the many-faceted Columbia University study (Métraux and Mead, 1954) just prior to Wylie's. Using several research methods, a team of scholars focused on the family and French society. Documentary assessment of early Napoleonic governmental records (Hoyt and Métraux, 1954) were juxtaposed to content analyses of French films (Wolfenstein and Leites, 1954), to psychological assessment of Rorschach and other projective tests (Abel, Belo, and Wolfenstein, 1954), and to anthropological observation. Running through all of the findings is a fear of the strange and the stranger. This is a carefully inculcated estrangement from persons outside the kin, which begins with the socialisation of infants. Personal friendships are an ideal to which French culture pays, in effect, lip service, without providing anything much which will facilitate them. The actual cultural teaching is more like this: "Without initiation and without guidance, even relationships with a deep and permanent value, representing the individual's most personal choices — love and friendship — may become a danger to himself and others" (Métraux, 1954, p. 46). Métraux is able to cite several examples from French fiction of moral tales which make the point that it is disastrous for the individual to violate, or even to move outside of, conventional familism.

The historical origins and broad theoretical implications of this phenomenon have been developed by Ariès (1960). Strong families imply weak social bonds outside the family. The French family has sought to escape from society and its non-familial groups which they see as rivals to the family. The escape, according to Ariès, has been successful. Study upon study (Shorter, 1975, cites nine such, four of them reported in Jollivet and Mendras,

1971) pile up evidence that the French maintain the absolute minimum of contacts outside the family.

IV GROUP-FORMING AND FRIENDSHIP PATTERNS IN THE UNITED STATES

Ariès' argument has been applied to American culture by Sennett (1970a and 1970b). The modern American family, middle-class and urban in origin, is a terrifyingly destructive force, according to Sennett. An attempt to force all of life out of the community with its competing groups, friendships and enmities, and into the intense, often nuclear, family, is producing psychologically crippled individuals. More social relationships of all kinds are needed than are likely to exist in the intense, withdrawn, and overloaded familistic culture which Sennett finds in Chicago and in the United States generally.

Our interest in these cultural studies is, of course, that they relate to non-kinship primary relations. Kinship networks have received an unhealthy, lop-sided proportion of the attention (as Paine, 1969, and Irving, 1977, have already pointed out).

Several American studies support Sennett's thesis in one fashion or another. Babchuk and Bates (1963), interviewing Nebraskan couples aged twenty to forty, discovered that few friendships had been made by their respondents after marriage. Both these interviews and a questionnaire study of 799 people in North Carolina by Adams (1967) found that the respondents did not share "intimate communication" or intimate confidences with the "friends" they had. Other studies (Davis *et al.*, 1941, especially pp. 146-47; Dotson, 1951; Lazarsfeld and Merton, 1954; Komarovsky, 1964; and Babchuk, 1965) reveal low numbers of friends in working or middle-class American populations. Commenting on two of these studies, Bott (1971) writes: "Both Babchuk and Bates and Adams comment with surprise on the fact that exchange of intimate confidences was not considered by their informants to be a characteristic activity of close friends. I believe this finding occurred because all their informants were married, and their results would have been quite different if their respondents had been unmarried". "The 'intimate communication' aspect of friendship", she believes, "is likely to be sharply curtailed after marriage" because mating "is not fully compatible with" the continuation of close friendship. This is clear, if unintentional, support for Sennett's thesis.

Others (Shorter, 1975; Brain, 1976; Davis and Strong, 1977) have taken a position even stronger than Bott's in relating friendship and its absence to marriage. The position of the anthropologist, Brain, is a confirmed value-judgement against intense coupling: "Togetherness carried to extremes

devours the personality of both partners and they eventually become stranded in a dual solitude" (p. 263). Such analyses are rather less relevant than those of Ariès and Sennett for two reasons. First, Ariès and Sennett each refer primarily to single specific cultures. (Contrast the generalisation of the Ariès thesis, as it may perhaps be called, to all of capitalist society by Harris, 1977.) Secondly, the Ariès thesis identified family, rather than marriage or anti-social dyadic relationships, as the troublesome variable. It is couples *with children*, more so than isolated dyads, which they find problematic. The extended family, moreover, can apparently play the same omnivorous, isolating role as Brain's stranded couple or the nuclear family. Ariès pointed this out for France, and both Thrasher (1936) and Sennett (1970a, Chapter 11) have made interesting comments about a socially dominating, urban American extended family which may wither the individual's outside relationships. Thrasher (p. 242) believed he could easily see "the ultimate undoing of most [street] gangs"; they succumb to home and extended family upon marriage of the members.²

The variations along the spectrum from the isolated nuclear family through instrumental or time-of-crisis family ties, connected nuclear units, family brokerage and the stem family to the fullest extended family of common residential area constitute an important dimension in many areas of social analysis. Variation in familial type may or, on the other hand, may not be significant for the question of outside group participation and friendship for family members. Possibly family is a factor which affects this particular problem somewhat wholistically; perhaps, that is, family can have its given effect on outside relationships regardless of the point of the family on the spectrum just mentioned. Perhaps, therefore, it is the general role of family in the particular culture to which attention should be given.³

At different stages in the life cycle, family will have differing effects on the individual. In old age one hopes to become part of an extended family. During the early twenties or late teens friendships may tend to flower during a brief pre-coupling period. Yet these things may also be patterned by, among other factors, regional or national culture.

The evidence from American research is not unanimous concerning the correlation between strong family and weak extra-familial attachments. Gallagher (1961) noticed no such problem in Plainville. More importantly, Italian-American families in Boston in the middle of the twentieth century

2. In another American study Bell and Boat (1957) believed that they had found highly extended family involvement correlating inversely with group participation with workmates, neighbours, or other friends. My own reading of the data which they present, however, suggests no correlation either way.

3. One way of viewing the import of the debate over the significance of the high level of continuing relations between nuclear units and the rest of the family and kin (a debate begun by Sussman (1953 and 1954) which has not as yet reached its crest in the late 'seventies) is to see it as a de-emphasis of the significance of the difference between nuclear and extended family.

(Gans, 1962) clearly seemed to facilitate outside attachments. American evidence would not anyway be expected to be unanimous. There are multiple cultures in the United States. Each of these cultures or subcultures exerts its own social influence, just as does the general American culture. In some empirical instances these levels will coincide in their effect. In other instances they will exert differing influences, usually of unequal force. Gans' urban villagers did not, as seems to be widely recognised, reflect strong influences from American culture in many respects. A different cultural pattern — Italian-American or southern Italian and Sicilian — was probably the effective cultural variable. The same, of course, might have been said for France with its differing cultural regions. Findings on non-kin group-forming do not, however, seem to have turned up regional differences in France.

Outside the shop doors and at leisure, American workmates may more often be personal friends than is the case suggested by the evidence from France. In Dubin's (1956) study, only nine per cent of his 491 midwestern industrial workers carried friendships outside. Only a few years later, however, Wilensky (1961) and Tomeh (1964), in separate research in the same region, viz., Detroit, revealed a more respectable 29 and 19 per cent, respectively, of such relationships. Dubin had concluded from his study that "the workplace is not very congenial to the development of preferred human relationships". Given Wilensky's later information, we can see that Dubin's grand generalisation would not even have been safe had he qualified it "in the American midwest". The California workers interviewed by Berger (1960) named co-workers among their closest friends at what seems like a very high rate; 47.5 per cent of the two closest friends named were other Ford plant workers (p. 117).

Obviously the matter is complex when we are able to cite several studies seeming to show that blue-collar Americans have few friends and others showing, in effect, that they have many. Some of the problems arise out of research method, others out of conceptual dilemmas, still others out of the — sometimes unavoidable — attempt to compare units which are not exactly the same. When the definition of friendship in a social survey is left to the respondent, there must remain considerable doubt about what the resulting data represent. A measure, moreover, of relative tendency to make friends is not a measure of relative tendency to form informal groups. On the other hand, the similarity between the two is important and should not go unrecognised. It is indeed that which friendship-forming and group-forming have in common which is of most interest in the present discussion.

If we turn to political life, the multi-national survey undertaken by Almond and Verba (1963) stands as almost monumental testimony to enormous cultural differences in group-forming potential. Specifically it deals with reported likelihood to use informal groups to influence government.

Americans responded more often (56 per cent) that they would enlist the aid of an informal group to influence an unjust local regulation than British (34 per cent), Mexican (26 per cent), German (13 per cent), or Italian (7 per cent) respondents. A similar contrast appeared in regard to the reported behavioural predisposition to try to influence the State via informal groups. When the figures are confined to only persons who believe that individual actions have the potential to change the course of things ("subjective competents"), the national differences remain as striking and data are available for an additional nation, Ireland (Raven and Whelan, 1976). Seventy-four per cent of American subjective competents said they would attempt to use informal groups to change an unjust local law or regulation; only 13 per cent of Italian and 22 per cent of German subjective competents would use informal groups for the same purpose. British respondents again placed towards the centre, and Irish respondents (more than a decade later than the survey in the other countries) placed towards the lower end with 27 per cent stating an orientation to potentially enlist informal groups. These data may be far removed from actual group-forming performance. The extreme contrasts suggest, nevertheless, that there are significant cultural differences.

V GROUP-FORMING AND FRIENDSHIP PATTERNS IN IRELAND AND ENGLAND

The concept of an "exclusive and excluding" Irish family has been raised by Lynch (1975) in a study of alienation and community involvement in a part of Dublin, as well as by Gmelch (1977) in a study of travelling people. Even though the needs of individuals are only "being satisfied badly" within the Irish family, Lynch writes, "they are at least being fulfilled to some degree. The members of the family usually have no urgent need, therefore, to look for emotional support or social significance outside of it. They can thereby ignore those who remain apart from their familial unit . . ." (pp. 7, 19-20). Lynch's data, however, are essentially limited to community involvement and do not concern group-forming more generally. Irish rural society has received broader treatment from Hannan (1972) who distinguished clearly between neighbourhood groups and kin groups in Irish history. Neighbourhood groups have, in his view, however, largely disappeared as a feature of Irish social life. Nevertheless, the more recent study by Hannan and Katsiaouni (1977) reveals high rates of rural male friendship-formation, with neighbours or otherwise. Twenty-seven per cent of 408 farmers interviewed in this study listed no kin among the six persons to whom they were most attached (p. 80). This seems an extraordinarily high proportion, although the authors of the study do not seem to see it as such. Seventeen per cent of the farmer's wives answered similarly. In great

contrast, more than half of the sample of wives listed four or more kin among the six closest persons, as did 36 per cent of husbands. One phenomenon which seem to appear in this data is a strong dichotomy between kin-oriented and non-kin-oriented males. Only 11 per cent of the farmers lacked relatives living locally and only eight per cent had no contact with kin (p. 79); these factors do not, therefore, explain the large 27 per cent who list no kin. Indeed, the local presence of the kin highlights their total absence from the close persons lists of the 27 per cent. Equally interesting are the farmer's responses to questions of who is easiest and who is best to talk to when they are troubled, and to whom they most enjoy talking. Among men who did not name their wife as easiest to talk with in moments of upset, 43 per cent chose friends or neighbours rather than kinfolk of any kind, including wife's kin. The division regarding the "best" person to talk with is two-fifths non-kin neighbours and friends to three-fifths kinfolk (these percentages are based on Table 19, p. 83). The persons whom the farmer most enjoys talking to is his wife in 44 per cent of cases, a non-kin neighbour or friend in 32 per cent, and a kinsman in only 14 per cent. These may be indicators of the importance of friendship in Irish culture. Fifteen per cent of the same farmers would be "very upset" if forced by circumstances to move far away from their personal friends (p. 85). It is important to remember that only friends *who are not neighbours* are included in this figure and, of course, kin are not included. This 15 per cent stands very solidly on its own when compared against the 24 per cent of farmers who would be equally upset at not being able to see their close relatives regularly. Twenty-four per cent of these men would be very upset to find themselves living away from (non-kin) neighbours — as many, that is, as would miss their relatives greatly. We are not, regrettably, given a full breakdown of the data to establish how many farmers are included two or three times here, thereby indicating an aversion to the idea of leaving anyone. Using this measure, friends and non-kin neighbours are, nevertheless, obviously dearer to these traditional Irish farmers than their close relatives.

Hannan and Katsiaouni themselves draw quite the opposite conclusion from their findings. Their overall results, they state, "demonstrate very clearly the over-riding importance of kinship group bonds for family members, outside the ambit of the immediate nuclear family". This is indeed the direction in which much of their evidence points.⁴ Friendships, on the

4. I am well aware that Hannan and Katsiaouni (1977, pp. 34-37) discovered that the women in this study were more reliable respondents than men and that I, therefore, take a risk in pointing especially to the male responses. Conversely, however, it seems possible that Hannan and Katsiaouni may have over-compensated for this factor by paying disproportionate attention to female responses. Differences between male and female social networks are usual, and females usually have more friends (the voluminous literature on social network sex differentials is reviewed in Gluckman, 1971, and Bott, 1971, pp. 248-330).

other hand, appeared in the study at a much higher rate than the authors recognise in their overall interpretation of the data, especially given the constraints on friendship formation in agricultural settings which Hannan and Katsiaouni so clearly emphasise.⁵ Rapid social change resulting in a "disintegration of the neighbourhood" (Hannan, 1972) is also heavily emphasised by these authors. The combination of rural circumstantial constraints on friendship formation and the general decline in the importance of neighbours would lead us, in the standard interpretation, to expect much lower levels of personal friendship than were actually found among males in this Irish study.

Greater London is the setting for Young and Willmott's latest study, *The Symmetrical Family* (1973). These urban English perhaps achieved a historical low in involvement outside the workplace with work friends. Only two per cent have work friends as leisure-time friends (*ibid.*, p. 220). Zweig (1961, pp. 117-19), however, in interviews with English factory workers conducted in 1958-59, had found a contrastingly large nearly 40 per cent having such involvement: Agricultural workers in East Anglia reported to Newby (1977, pp. 298-99) that one-third of their friends are workmates; and, responding to another question, 47.7 per cent claimed that *all* of their workmates are "close friends"! These are high proportions by comparison with the other cultures which we have been discussing here; this is the case apart from any interpretation put on the data by any sociologist. As it happens, both Newby and Zweig opine that these are *low* proportions of friendships among workmates. This may be more than a mere interpretive curiosity or an indicator of the researchers' unfamiliarity with other literature regarding what is, after all, only one small part of their greater study. A cultural ideology may be at work here, either with the labourers, the sociologists, or both. Zweig seems to have been more impressed by certain strong reactions to the questions which he put, than by the comparative import of the answers which the factory workers actually made. Perhaps this is good research practice. In this instance, however, another interpretation of the whole scene is available, different from that which Zweig put on it. He writes that

The majority of workers would subscribe to the saying which I often heard that 'mates are not pals', or as one man said in a curious language of his own, 'Mating is not palling . . .'. As one man put it, 'in the environment of work we are friends but outside we are more choosy' (Zweig, 1961, p. 177).

5. "Compared to non-farmers", they write (p. 86), "the formation of friendships by farmers is, and presumably will continue to be, considerably limited by the occupational context. One cannot make friends in the work contexts since work is within the family." Another dimension of the same general limitation is that the pool of possible friends in a relatively stable population constantly diminishes as marriages convert them to kinfolk (cf. Moge, 1964, pp. 519ff.).

Yet, the proportions of males who did choose mates as pals in the four factories are 31, 33, 39 and 41 per cent (*ibid*). Perhaps the “more choosy” majority were expressing something that the English like to think about themselves, but which is not a pattern to which the English as a whole actually adhere as much as other cultures in which the denial of work-related friendships is less strenuous. If the English protest too much that they would not choose workmates as friends, perhaps they are trying to conceal (for some unknown, but probably cultural, reason) a tendency which they are afraid they empirically exhibit too much. The working women in Zweig’s interviews did not, however, make such protests. Their outside contacts with each other were correspondingly

. . . more frequent than among men. They go out shopping together, to cinemas, dance clubs and so on. They find great pleasure in companionship at work and they do not mind keeping it up outside. In Mullard about 50 per cent of women had regular contacts with each other’s outside work (Zweig, 1961, p. 118).

British commentators do not agree about whether “home-centredness” can be considered an English cultural characteristic. Lummis (1977) and Young and Willmott (1973), summarising and reinterpreting their previous and current work, found a “privatised”, home-centred family in East Anglia fishing towns and in London. Tunstall (1962) and Whitehead (1976) seem equally certain of the absence of any such home-centredness among similar fishermen in a rural research setting. The significant question here is whether home-centredness interferes with non-kin grouping and friendship. Young and Willmott and Lummis do not judge the privatised English family negatively — as observers of the French and American family have often done — partly for just this reason; English familism may allow adequate scope for non-kin social involvement. The results of the study of middle-class London families by Firth and others (1969) could be summarised that way. In the nineteenth century, write Young and Willmott (1973, pp. 96–97) to illustrate the historical process,

. . . almost the only luxury was provided in the tavern, and this was largely reserved for men The space that mattered most for the husband used to be the collective space of the alehouse. As the amount of private space has increased there has been more physical room for the husband at home, more comfort *and more room for receiving friends* (*italics added*).

Other evidence, as varied as Williams’ (1969) sociological study of a Lake County village is from Hobbs’ (1973) first-hand account of a Cockney

neighbourhood, also shows an English social life which is much denser than the French, and indeed possibly denser than the American.

All this perhaps flies in the face both of impressionistic commentary on the English and of what the English like to think of themselves. That simply makes it more interesting. Few generalisations are yet possible about national cultural differentials in group-forming. Original research is probably needed. A more comprehensive survey of the literature than I have been able to provide here is necessary. I have wanted to establish that such differences possibly exist and that this possibility has its own implications which should not go unrecognised.

VI EXPLAINING CULTURAL DIFFERENTIALS IN PRIMARY RELATIONS

Modest intentions perhaps do not free the writer, however, from the obligation to try to bring some explanatory order into the mass of data to which I have referred. Studies seem to reveal a dense English social life. Yet we saw earlier Wilson's argument that "British society has in the past not operated by groups . . .", and we saw that British respondents to Almond and Verba did not claim that they would enlist informal groups politically as often as Americans made such a claim. Perhaps there is a single theoretical explanation which will encompass much of the seeming diversity which has appeared. Perhaps in American culture groups are *used* more frequently, whilst English social life may be denser in other ways. Groups in English culture, moreover, when compared to *other* cultures than the American, may actually be relatively highly instrumental. This is one ground on which Emmett (1964) contrasts English with Welsh culture. It is conceivable that both English and American cultures make more instrumental use of informal groups than the Irish, for example, while, at the same time, Irish informal grouping and friendship formation could occur at a higher rate *generally*. Different explanatory possibilities involve cultural contrasts between what people believe to be true and what empirical observation reveals. The English and the French are perhaps unusual if they do not regard themselves as a "friendly" people. In some cultures many people may rather exaggerate their closeness to those whom they designate as friends. Sennett (1970b, Chapter 2) has marshalled some research evidence to indicate an American tendency to believe in the existence of a community involvement which has no basis in fact. Some of the American "friendships" turned up by questionnaire research may be similar phenomena. Sennett (1976) has also theorised that artificially concocted *Gemeinschaft* prevents actual group action.

We should pursue explanation via a more systematic look at the ensemble of cultural factors which could cause differences in primary relations. Some factors appear in the various kinds of evidence which have been reviewed

here. Many further variables suggest themselves. The pool of possible factors is, indeed, large enough that the space available here allows for neither an attempt at comprehensiveness in listing them nor for proper elaboration of even one or two factors. The chief of these may be the relative importance of friends and informal groups in the culture. It is not tautological to say this. The relatively direct cultural importance of friends and groups is one factor among many, cultural or otherwise, which together make up the relative tendency to form primary relations in the culture. Friendship and friendship groups may be more highly valued in Irish culture than in many others. Often a circle of friends may be found at the same Irish pub at the same time most nights of the week. The phenomenon of the regular congregation of a small group of friends may vary somewhat from one culture to another. The importance of the circle to the individual could also vary culturally.

High value on friendship is not itself a simple variable. Friendship can be quite a different relationship in different cultures. The classical Western European friendship pattern which seems to have reached its fullest flowering in the 18th and early 19th centuries probably differs widely from, say, present American understanding. Some of the findings reviewed above, as well as the comments of some of the sociologists themselves, would be incomprehensible to an individual holding the 18th century understanding of friendship. The historical record seems clear that friendship, then, at least for the middle and upper classes, constituted a profound personal knowledge of the other and a passionate devotedness alongside which almost everything else was subordinate. The "friends" studied by Babchuk and Bates (1963) and Adams (1967) who did not share intimate communication would seem to be a different social phenomenon. Berger (1960, pp. 67-68) comments that the relationship between some of his respondents and their designated closest friends was "hardly closeness". The very definition of friendship used by Bates and Babchuk (1961) allows for a weak relationship. They define a "primary friend" as "a person with whom one is disposed to enter into a wide range of activities (within limits imposed by such factors as interest, sex, age, financial resources, etc.), and with whom there would be a predominance of positive affect". These things, added to further comments by Babchuk, Davis and Strong, and a few current sociologists, could leave it in doubt from the 18th century point of view whether friendship still existed at all by the nineteen-sixties and-seventies. Babchuk (1965) states what he admits is an impression, that there are "qualitative differences in the primariness of relations between friends as compared with primariness between kin". Friendships, his impression is, have less primariness mainly because they lack "that constancy and 'inevitability' of interaction which distinguishes relations in the nuclear family". On one hand, this is self-evident, just as is the fact so emphasised by Davis and Strong (1977) that

marriage has a certain initial advantage over friendship in terms of longevity by virtue of the legal bonds which it entails. On the other hand, both from what I am calling the 18th century view and from the point of view of other contemporary scholars (Paine, 1969; Suttles, 1970), friendship is perhaps the stronger relationship, the inevitabilities and legal "permanency" of marriage and kinship to the contrary notwithstanding. Working with a premise that "friendships are especially valued in a population where social contacts have outgrown the bounds of kinship . . . and social classes" (p. 96), Suttles elaborates friendship as a relationship of powerful internal dynamics and great staying power. Litwak and Szelenyi (1969) have suggested that friendship rather than kin or neighbour is the relationship best suited to highly mobile technological society. Both Suttles and Paine emphasise friendship's "disregard", in Paine's words (1969, p. 511), "of the social costs it may incur". "Friendship is like a fishhook", concludes Suttles (1970, p. 134), in stark contrast to Davis and Strong and Babchuk, "the further it goes in the harder it is to pull out".

That the definition of friendship relations, as well as conclusions about their importance, differ from one sociological version to another may be related to the variation in friendship itself, not only from one era to another, but from one culture to another. Not all of the social scientists just cited had the same cultures in mind when making their generalisation.

Time and physical space affect friendships but the cultural variable has much influence here too. Do people, in a given culture, find their friends where they *are* or where they *have been*? Goethe (1824) advised that we should not see the friends of our past. In the future, in certain kinds of societies, LeGuin (1974) believes, we may indeed be uninterested in friends separated from us by time or space. At present, however, interesting studies in the United States by Hess (1971, 1972) reveal that intimates from earlier in their lives are dearer to the members of the population studied than are newer ones. The relative prevalence of friendships could be sharply affected by such differing possible temporal and spatial orientations.

The relative importance of friendship has been compared with that of romantic love. Simmel's (1908a) hypothesis is that when romantic love is of great significance in a culture, deep lasting friendships are not likely to prevail. A number of studies cited above offer evidence to support this idea and a few contradict it, even though the variable in question is more often called marriage or nuclear family than romantic love. The whole pattern of male/female relations is highly important to group-forming and friendship. Ireland is particularly interesting in this regard. Romantic love, for example, may have less power in Irish culture than in many other Western cultures (cf. Bennett, 1978). If so, this fact alone may have helped allow a greater social space for friends.

Many of the colourings affecting primary relations will, of course, emanate from the structural dimensions of the society. That fact alone does not necessarily magically spirit them far away from the realm of national culture. Systems of economic hegemony are not standard everywhere within the same mode of production. Neither is every capitalist state nor every instance of state capitalism nor every class struggle identical. One of the factors creating differences is national culture. Just as early traditional societies in which norms tend to be deeply internalised may, in their vacuum of variety, have somewhat different needs for the small group than complex societies, specific cultures can also be rigid by being highly formal, legalistic, or ritualistic. Possibly intimate groups are discouraged during the enculturation process in such formalistic cultures which rely on other modes of social control and goal attainment.

A complimentary perspective focuses directly on the sphere for personal activity which is available outside of conventional and legal norms. This charmingly existential free sphere is given serious consideration by Paine (1969) and Suttles (1970). "Friendship does not have rules of relevancy imposed upon it from outside", writes Paine (p. 510). The bounds and rules are determined contextually or created by the friends as a "private morality" (Suttles, 1970, p. 132). A great deal of space would be necessary to attempt to properly describe this extra-normative sphere. All that can be said here is that if it exists it is certainly not identical from one culture to another.

Social network theory has postulated a contrast between loose-knit and close-knit or dense networks. In the latter, one's acquaintances know one another; in the former they do not. No one, as far as I know, has related this to cultural differences. Maritain has mentioned his impression that Europeans attempt to keep their friends apart, whilst Americans introduce their friends to one another as a matter of course. Dense (American?) networks might promote group formation simply in that more people know other people, whilst loose (continental?) nets might discourage it (cf. Harris, 1969, pp. 173-74). British work (Klein, 1965, pp. 77-188 and Bott, 1971, pp. 287ff. are bibliographical) has established that the relative density of social networks does differ in otherwise comparable populations.

VII CONCLUSIONS

The study of national characteristics has never been acceptable in social science. The danger, however, of "national character" being construed as racial psychology is long behind us. National characteristics are cultural ones and they affect all levels of life, from economic hegemony and the State to friendship and mating. The snub to national culture by social science is a curious and unrealistic self-limitation in view of the manifest

real existence of certain national cultural characteristics. Everyone who travels beyond her or his national boundaries notices them easily, even social scientists — if travelling in a non-research capacity.

Our review of research findings demonstrates a clear possibility that group-forming in France is considerably weaker than in England or the United States. English friendship patterns exhibit some surprisingly strong characteristic features. Historically, friendship may, however, be a weaker relationship in the twentieth than in previous centuries.

Family as a variable has appeared repeatedly in our discussion. It is certainly unclear, however, whether nuclear or extended family should be expected to have the greater impact on group-forming. We have seen theoretical and empirical work asserting that both have a negative impact. Perhaps a clearer picture of the role of family would appear if attention moved to family as part of a national cultural complex or appropriate sub-cultural one. With regard to kinship in general, the matter may be simpler. If there are kin-oriented and comparatively non-kin-oriented cultures, with developmental and modernisation factors held constant, then non-kin primary relations may be different between them. A similar logic lies behind Loeb's (1973) attempt to argue that a tendency toward formal voluntary associations in a culture will provide a negative correlation with primary grouping. Perhaps both family and voluntary associations are competitors against informal groups and friends for the scarce time and energy of the individual. Cultural tendencies toward, or cultural repulsion from, formal voluntary associations is another feature which could be located as part of a national cultural variable.

My notion regarding Irish culture is that it lies toward the extreme of a high tendency to extra-familial group-forming — toward, that is, the opposite extreme from the French culture of the de Tocqueville—Goblot—Ariès—Crozier thesis. One could work on such an hypothesis despite suggestions by studies such as Brody's (1973) that group formation in singularly affected parts of Ireland may be at an unprecedented low.

The comparative study of non-kinship primary relations is a major research challenge, a topic of special interest to Irish society, and an opportunity to add a whole new dimension to our understanding of numerous facets of social life and of history. I would hope to see the general cultural variable taken seriously in other areas of research as well.

REFERENCES

- ABEL, THEODORA M., JANE BELO, and MARTHA WOLFENSTEIN, 1954. "An Analysis of French Projection Tests" in R. Métraux and M. Mead (eds.), *Themes in French Culture*, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, pp. 109-28.
- ADAMS, BERT N., 1967. "Interaction Theory and the Social Network", *Sociometry*, Vol. 30, pp. 64-73.
- ALMOND, GABRIEL A. and SYDNEY VERBA, 1963. *The Civic Culture*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- ARIÈS, PHILIPPE, 1960. *L'Enfant et la vie familiale sous l'ancien régime*, trans. as *Centuries of Childhood*, New York: Vintage, 1962.
- BABCHUK, NICHOLAS and ALAN P. BATES, 1963. "The Primary Relations of Middle Class Couples: A Study in Male Dominance", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 28, pp. 377-84.
- BABCHUK, NICHOLAS, 1965. "Primary Friends and Kin: A Study of the Associations of Middle Class Couples", *Social Forces*, Vol. 43, pp. 483-93.
- BATES, ALAN P. and NICHOLAS BABCHUK, 1961. "The Primary Group: A Reappraisal", *Sociological Quarterly*, Vol. 2, pp. 181-91.
- deBEAUVOIR, SIMONE, 1949. *The Second Sex*, London: New English Library, 1969.
- BELL, W. and M. D. BOAT, 1956-57. "Urban Neighbourhoods and Informal Social Relations", *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 60, pp. 391-98.
- BENNETT, DON, 1974. "Anarchy as Utopia", *Studies*, Vol. 63, pp. 323-35.
- BENNETT, DON, 1975-76. "Phenomenological Sociology", *Social Studies: Irish Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 4, pp. 315-57.
- BENNETT, DON, 1976. "Anomie: What Can It Be?", *Proceedings of the Sociological Association of Ireland Second Annual Conference*, Belfast: Sociological Association of Ireland, pp. 34-52.
- BENNETT, DON. 1978. "Acculturation and Irish-recorded Country and Western Music", *Proceedings of the Sociological Association of Ireland First and Fourth Annual Conferences*, Belfast: Sociological Association of Ireland, pp. 38-43.
- BENNETT, DON, Unpublished. "Strata Lines and Group Formation in a Wineharvest Work Setting".
- BERGER, BENNETT, 1960. *Working-Class Suburb: A Study of Auto Workers in Suburbia*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- BERNOT, LUCIEN and RENE BLANCARD, 1953. *Nouvelle, un village français*, Paris: Institut d'Ethnologie.
- BLAU, PETER, 1954. "Co-operation and Competition in a Bureaucracy", *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 59, pp. 530-35.
- BOTT, ELIZABETH, 1971. *Family and Social Network*, second edition, London: Tavistock.
- BRAIN, ROBERT, 1976. *Friends and Lovers*, London: Hart-Davis, MacGibbon.
- BRODY, HUGH, 1973. *Inishkillane: Change and Decline in the West of Ireland*, London: Allen Lane.
- CROZIER, MICHEL, 1963. *The Bureaucratic Phenomenon*, Chicago: University of Chicago, 1964.
- DAVIS, ALAN G. and PHILIP M. STRONG, 1977. "Working without a Net: the Bachelor as a Social Problem", *Sociological Review*, Vol. 25, pp. 109-29.
- DAVIS, ALLISON, BURLEIGH GARDNER and MARY GARDNER, 1941. *Deep South*, Chicago: University of Chicago.

- DOTSON, FLOYD, 1951. "Patterns of Voluntary Associations Among Urban Working-Class Families", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 16, pp. 687-93.
- DUBIN, ROBERT H., 1956. "Industrial Worker's Worlds: A Study of the 'Central Life Interests' of Industrial Workers", *Social Problems*, Vol. 3, pp. 131-41.
- EMMETT, ISABEL, 1964. *A North Wales Village*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- ETZIONI, AMITAI, 1975. *A Comparative Analysis of Complete Organisations*, second edition; New York: Free Press.
- FIRTH, RAYMOND, JANE HUBERT and ANTHONY FORGE, 1969. *Families and Their Relatives: Kinship in a Middle-Class Sector of London*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- GALLAGHER, ART, Jr., 1961. *Plainville, Fifteen Years Later*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- GANS, HERBERT, 1962. *The Urban Villagers*, New York: Free Press.
- GERSTL, JOEL E., 1961. "Determinants of Occupational Community in High Status Occupations", *Sociological Quarterly*, Vol. 2, pp. 37-49.
- GOBLOT, EDMOND, 1925. *La Barriere et le Niveau*, Paris: Alcan.
- GOLEMBIEWSKI, ROBERT T., 1965. "Small Groups and Large Organizations" in J. March (ed.), *Handbook of Organizations*, Chicago: Rand McNally, pp. 87-141.
- GLUCKMAN, MAX, 1971. Preface to Elizabeth Bott, *Family and Social Network*, second edition, London: Tavistock.
- GMELCH, GEORGE, 1977. *The Irish Tinkers: The Urbanization of an Itinerant People*, Menlo Park, California: Cummings.
- GOETHE, JOHANN WOLFGANG von, 1824. *Conversations and Encounters*, David Luke and Robert Pick (eds.), London: O. Wolff, 1966.
- HANNAN, DAMIAN, 1972. "Kinship, Neighbourhood and Social Change in Irish Rural Communities", *Economic and Social Review*, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 163-88.
- HANNAN, DAMIAN F. and LOUISE A. KATSIAOUNI, 1977. *Traditional Families? From Culturally Prescribed to Negotiated Roles in Farm Families*, Dublin: Paper No. 87, Economic and Social Research Institute.
- HARRIS, C. C., 1969. *The Family*, London: Allen and Unwin.
- HARRIS, C. C., 1977. "Changing Conceptions of the Relation between Family and Societal Form in Western Society" in R. Scase (ed.), *Industrial Society: Class, Cleavage and Control*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, pp. 74-89.
- HESS, BETH, 1971. "Amicability", Ph.D. dissertation, Rutgers University.
- HESS, BETH, 1972. "Friendship", in M. Riley et al. (eds.), *Aging and Society*, New York: Sage, Vol. III, pp. 357-93.
- HOBBS, MAY, 1973. *Born to Struggle*, London: Quartet.
- HOLMES, ROGER, 1970. "Marxism and the Nature of Groups", *British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 21, pp. 273-84.
- HOYT, NELLY SCHARGO and RHODA MÉTRAUX, 1954. "The Family in the French Civil Code: Adoption and the *Tutelle Officieuse*" in R. Métraux and M. Mead (eds.), *Themes in French Culture*, Stanford California: Stanford University Press, pp. 69-88.
- IRVING, HENRY W., 1977. "Social Networks in the Modern City", *Social Forces*, Vol. 55, pp. 867-80.
- JOLLIVET, M. and H. MENDRAS (eds.), 1971. *Les Collectivites Rurales Francaises*, Paris: Colin, Vol. 1.
- KLEIN, JOSEPHINE, 1965. *Samples from English Cultures*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

- KOMAROVSKY, MIRRA, 1964. *Blue-Collar Marriage*, New York: Vintage.
- LAZARFELD, PAUL and ROBERT MERTON, 1954. "Friendship as Social Process" in M. Berger *et al.* (eds.), *Freedom and Control in Modern Society*, New York: Van Nostrand, pp. 18-66.
- Le GUIN, URSULA, 1974. *The Dispossessed*, London: Gollancz.
- LITWAK, EUGENE and IVAN SZELENYI, 1969. "Primary Group Structures and Their Functions: Kin, Neighbours and Friends", *American Sociological Review*, Vol 34, pp. 456-82.
- LOEB, RITA, 1973. "Adolescent Groups", *Sociology and Social Research*, Vol. 58, pp. 13-22.
- LUMMIS, TREVOR, 1977. "The Occupational Community of East Anglia Fishermen", *British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 28, pp. 51-74.
- LYNCH, CATHERINE, 1975. "Alienation in an Urban Community" (M. Science thesis, University College, Dublin).
- MERTON, ROBERT K., 1945. "Role of the Intellectual in Public Bureaucracy", *Social Forces*, Vol. 23, pp. 405-15.
- MÉTRAUX, RHODA, 1954. "Themes in French Culture" in R. Métraux and M. Mead (eds.), *Themes in French Culture*, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, pp. 1-65.
- MÉTRAUX, RHODA and MARGARET MEAD, 1954. *Themes in French Culture: A Preface to a Study of French Community*, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- MICHELS, ROBERTO, 1927. *First Lectures in Political Sociology* in Alfred de Grazia (ed.), New York: Harper, 1965.
- MOGEY, JOHN, 1964. "Family and Community in Urban-Industrial Societies" in H. Christensen (ed.), *Handbook of Marriage and the Family*, Chicago: Rand McNally, pp. 501-34.
- NEWBY, HOWARD, 1977. *The Differential Worker: A Study of Farm Workers in East Anglia*, London: Allen Lane.
- PAINE, ROBERT, 1969. "In Search of Friendship: An Exploratory Analysis in 'Middle-Class Culture'", *Man*, Vol. 4, pp. 505-29.
- PAGE, CHARLES H., 1946. "Bureaucracy's Other Face", *Social Forces*, Vol. 25, pp. 88-94.
- PITTS, JESSE R., 1957. "The Bourgeois Family and French Economic Retardation" (Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University).
- RAVEN, JOHN and C. T. WHELAN, 1976. "Irish Adults' Perceptions of their Civic Institutions and Their Own Role in Relation to Them" in *Political Culture in Ireland*, Dublin: Institute of Public Administration, pp. 7-84.
- ROETHLISBERGER, F. J. and WILLIAM J. DICKSON, 1939. *Management and the Worker*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University.
- SEASHORE, S. E., 1954. *Group Cohesiveness in the Industrial Work Group*, Ann Arbor: Survey Research Centre.
- SENNETT, RICHARD, 1970a. *Families Against the City: Middle Class Homes of Industrial Chicago, 1872-1980*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University.
- SENNETT, RICHARD, 1970b. *The Uses of Disorder: Personal Identity and City Life*, New York: Knopf.
- SENNETT, RICHARD, 1976. *The Fall of Public Man*. New York: Knopf.
- SHARP, WALTER R., 1931. *The French Civil Service: Bureaucracy in Transition*, New York: Macmillan.
- SHORTER, EDWARD, 1975. *The Making of the Modern Family*, New York: Basic Books.

- SIMMEL, GEORG, 1908a. *Soziologie*, chapter translated as "The Secret and the Secret Society" by Kurt H. Wolff in *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*, New York: Free Press, 1950, pp. 125-76.
- SIMMEL, GEORG, 1908b. *Soziologie*, chapter translated as "The Web of Group-Affiliations" by R. Bendix in *Conflict and the Web of Group Affiliations*, New York: Free Press, 1955, pp. 125-95.
- SUSSMAN, MARVIN, 1953. "The Help Pattern in the Middle-Class Family", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 18, pp. 22-28.
- SUSSMAN, MARVIN, 1954. "Family Continuity: Selective Factors Which Affect Relationships between Families at Generation Levels", *Marriage and Family Living*, Vol. 16, pp. 112-20.
- SUTTLES, GERALD D., 1970. "Friendship as a Social Institution" in G. McCall *et al.* (eds.), *Social Relationships*, Chicago: Aldine, pp. 95-135.
- THRASHER, FREDERIC M., 1936. *The Gang*, second edition, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- deTOCQUEVILLE, ALEXIS, 1856. *The Ancien Regime and the French Revolution*, S. Gilbert (trans.), London: Fontana, 1966.
- TOMEH, AIDA K., 1964. "Informal Group Participation and Residential Patterns", *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 70, pp. 28-35.
- TUNSTALL, JEREMY, 1962. *The Fisherman*, London: MacGibbon & Kee.
- VERBRUGGE, LOIS M., 1977. "The Structure of Adult Friendship Choices", *Social Forces*, Vol. 56, pp. 576-97.
- WARNER, SAM BASS, Jr., 1968. "If All the World Were Philadelphia: A Scaffolding for Urban History, 1784-1930", *American Historical Review*, Vol. 74, pp. 26-43.
- WHITEHEAD, ANN, 1976. "Sexual antagonism in Hertfordshire" in D. Barker and S. Allen (eds.), *Dependence and Exploitation in Work and Marriage*, London: Longman, pp. 169-203.
- WILENSKY, HAROLD, 1961. "Orderly Careers and the Social Participation: The Impact of Work History on Social Integration in the Middle Class", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 26, pp. 521-39.
- WILLIAMS, W. M., 1969. *The Sociology of an English Village: Gosforth*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- WILSON, BRYAN, 1965. "A Sociologist's Footnote" in M. Phillips (ed.), *Small Social Groups in England*, London: Methuen, pp. 292-306.
- WOLFENSTEIN, MARTHA and NATHAN LEITES, 1954. "Plot and Character in Selected French Films: an Analysis of Fantasy" in R. Métraux and M. Mead (eds.) *Themes in French Culture*, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, pp. 89-108.
- WYLIE, LAWRENCE, 1957. *Village in the Vaucluse*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- YOUNG, MICHAEL and PETER WILLMOTT, 1973. *The Symmetrical Family: A Study of Work and Leisure in the London Region*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- ZWEIG, FERDYNAND, 1961. *The Worker in an Affluent Society*, London: Heinemann.