DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 248 080 RC 014 909

AUTHOR Leffler, Ann; And Others
TITLE When I'm Not With the Friend I Hate, I Hate the Friend I'm With: Contact, Support, and Hostility Networks in Community Life.
INSTITUTION Utah State Univ., Logan. Dept. of Sociology.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.; Utah State Univ., Logan. Agricultural Experiment Station.
PUB DATE Aug 84
GRANT 869
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rural Sociological Society (47th, College Station, TX, August 22-25, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Change; Community Study; *Conflict; Field Interviews; *Network Analysis; *Research Methodology; Rural Environment; *Rural Family; *Sex Differences; Sex Role; *Social Networks; Social Support Groups; Stereotypes
IDENTIFIERS *Amiability; Utah

ABSTRACT

A 1983 four-community survey of 220 rural Utah households had as its central analysis issue the extent to which conflict plays a modulating role in linking network positions. Not only do most network analysis approaches reflect an implicit assumption that network ties involving conflict are mutually exclusive from and incompatible with support ties, but there is a tendency to assume that networks channel only positive relations (the "amiability tilt"). Sites were selected to represent four major types of economic change currently being experienced in nonmetropolitan areas. A method was devised which measured conflict, support, and simple contact in such a way that none presupposed or eliminated another. Conflict definitely represented a common feature of important relationships and was a regular feature of network life. Conflict did not affect all community members in equal degree or form; indeed, male and female conflict patterns were so different that they actually appeared to inhabit socially different communities. Two common stereotypes depict American villages as tranquil and supportive, or riddled with hostility. Not only may both versions be right about the same relations, but the amiability tilt of network analysis needs correction. (BRR)

WHEN I'M NOT WITH THE FRIEND I HATE, I HATE THE FRIEND I'M WITH: CONTACT, SUPPORT AND HOSTILITY NETWORKS IN COMMUNITY LIFE

Ann Leffler*
Department of Sociology
Utah State University

Richard S. Krannich
Department of Sociology
Utah State University

Dair L. Gillespie
Department of Sociology
University of Utah

*Direct correspondence to Ann Leffler, Department of Sociology, UMC 07, Utah State University, Logan, UT 84322.

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rural Sociological Society (47th, College Station, TX, August 22-25, 1984).

WHEN I'M NOT WITH THE FRIEND I HATE, I HATE THE FRIEND I'M WITH: CONTACT, SUPPORT AND HOSTILITY NETWORKS IN COMMUNITY LIFE*

ABSTRACT

The networks literature has been bedevilled by an assumption that networks convey supportiveness to the exclusion of conflict. In this paper, we discuss a method for distinguishing conflict, support, and simple contact network linkages in surveys. We then describe the results of applying this procedure to a random sample of households in several rural areas. We find that conflict does permeate personal relations. We also find that ego's and alters' genders affect the extent and type of hostilities which engage them. We conclude by discussing implications of the findings for particular lines of research on stress and on community.

*Research supported by Grant No. 869 from the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Utah Agricultural Experiment Station.

Introduction

The networks literature has been bedevilled by an assumption that networks convey supportiveness exclusively. Thus, alters tend to be defined as members of ego's network only to the extent they exchange material or emotional resources, goods, and services with ego. It is further assumed that if support does characterize a network link, it is the main or sole relational mode there. On the other hand, in their review of the networks literature, Laumann, Marsden and Prensky (1983) note the surprising inattention paid to the delineation of inclusion rules which are used to operationalize network membership. They specify a number of ways in which network depictions depend upon the boundary specifications. distinguishing member from non-member elements, and trace analytic consequences of particular choices. McCallister and Fischer raise a similar point, arguing: "The findings of network research can be strongly influenced by the measures of 'relation' used to define the network" (1983:87).

In this paper, we want to extend these arguments by examining a particular mode of relation--conflict--which we will argue is generally omitted from network analyses. We will then discuss a method for including both supportive and conflictual network linkages within a context--survey research--considered somewhat intractable to network analysis. Finally, we will describe the results of applying this procedure to a random sample of households in four American rural villages in a "traditional" western state. Such sites, often believed unamenable to conflict, therefore comprise good testing grounds for investigations of conflict networks. We will argue that conflict does permeate personal relations in the study communities. We will also explore stratum effects on conflict

networks by examining the impact of ego's and alters' genders on the extent and type of hostilities which engage them. We will conclude by noting possible implications of these findings for particular lines of research on stress and on community.

The tendency to assume that networks channel only positive relations has been noted by a number of observers (Barrerra, 1981; Fischer, 1982; Pearlin et al., 1981; Wellman, 1981). This amiability tilt reveals itself on the theoretical level via definitions of networks as social support delivery systems (Cobb, 1982; Granovetter, 1973; Kessler and Essex, 1982; McCubbin et al., 1980; Phillips and Fischer, 1981). For instance, discussions of social stress routinely include network size as a mediating "buffer" between stress and health outcomes precisely because it is assumed coterminous with the availability of social support to ego. On the e rical level, as Barrerra (1981) notes, the confusion between network structure and positive network functions reveals itself via operationalizations of network membership, ego's network being determined by questions like, 'In an emergency, who would you be most likely to call on for help of the following sorts...?' When network membership and social support are conceptualized independently, this independence is often taken to indicate that the networks in question are functioning inefficiently or superficially (Pearlin et al., 1981). Thus, if networks successfully transport emotional freight, it is assumed the ties they bind must be positive. It is also assumed that if networks channel hostility, they must do so to the exclusion or at the expense of positive functions (Wellman, 1981). Thus, most approaches reflect an implicit assumption that network ties involving conflict are mutually exclusive from and incompatible with support ties.

Omitted in the emphasis on social support are multidimensionality and conflict. With respect to multidimensionality, relations between any two network elements can in principle include more than one mode. A particular link may thus be what is called "multiplex" (Burt, 1983; Minor, 1983) or "multistranded" (Fischer, 1982) with respect to he actual modes it freights. The actual number and type of modes included on any link are empirical issues. Consequently, it cannot be assumed in advance that a link concerns amiability and amiability alone. Specifically, in principle network links can transport antagonism instead of or in addition to support, and between any ego and any alter it is possible that both hostility and help characterize the relationship. The degree to which they overlap or the manner in which one predominates are researchable issues.

What follows is a description of measures and results from a 1982 four-community survey of rural households containing an adult male, an adult female, and at least one child. The central issue of analysis is the extent to which conflict plays a modulating role in linking network positions.

Approach

In order empirically to examine the role of conflict in network relations, it is necessary to measure conflict, support, and simple contact networks in such a way that none presupposes or eliminates another. Thus, to analyze conflict/support multiplexity, three separate network dimensions should be examined: contact networks (who R sees or passes time with), support networks (with whom R exchanges goods or services), and conflict networks (with whom R expresses tension, dislike, or annoyance). However, the logistics of collecting data even on one type of network are formidable; especially in survey research (Laumann et al.,

1983; McCallister and Fischer, 1983). Asked for the names of network alters, respondents may deluge the hapless interviewer with names, nicknames, descriptions ('the lady who lives two doors down'), and refusals to respond because names are being solicited. Furthermore, these nomenclatural alternatives may change as the interview proceeds, 'Mr. Robbins' becoming 'Hilda's husband' or 'George,' not be confused with 'George' the bachelor. The large N's and the lack of connection between respondents characteristic of survey research exacerbate these problems to the point where complex network issues such as multiplexity are underemphasized ther .

Nevertheless, in order to obtain data which permits inferences about the relations between contact, support, and conflict networks, it is necessary to explore all three within the context of surveys on randomly sampled populations. What is suggested below is a procedure for doing so. This method is amenable to surveys for several reasons. First, it is fairly brief, taking approximately thirty-five minutes to administer in an interview format. Second, untrained interviewers can learn to employ it in approximately four hours. Third, the response rate is high; ours, for instance, hovered around 90% across communities for the entire hour-long interview in which the network items were included. No doubt our policy of ten dollar compensations increased respondent cooperativeness, but at least the extensive array of network items did not deter it. And, finally, the procedure permits empirical examination of contact, support, and conflict networks separately, as well as of overlaps between them.

There are, of course, shortcomings to the method as well. These reflect our own time constraints rather than flaws, but they deserve mention nonetheless. The first problem is that respondents are

restricted to three alter names per question. The second is that respondents describe only their own relations with alters, not alters' relations with one another. The third shortcoming is that only a brief range of relational types is included: only certain forms of conflict, for instance; and no relational type outside the three focuses of contact, support and hostility. Thus, the procedure generates information on who ego's most important alters are, and particular ways in which ego is linked to them, not on the full extent of and links between the entire network structure But, by being restricted to a small set of questions which echo standard network concerns, while expanding the focus to include three distinct network types, data are generated which can be used for inferences about network multiplexity across these three types.

In order to ascertain ego's contact network, each respondent was asked four questions:

1a. Who do you see most often when taking a break at work or from housework?

1b. Who do you most often spend free time with at the end of the day or on weekends (not counting your spouse or children)?

1c. Who do you talk with most often before or after church activities or other voluntary groups you attend (not counting your spouse or children)?

2. Thinking back over the people you have mentioned so far, is there anyone else who you know and see or hear from regularly (not counting your spouse or kids)? Who would that be? Anyone else?

For each item, up to three names were accepted. Interviewers were trained to log these in the form of first and last initials, and to inform respondents of this procedure so as to assure them that alter identities remained private from us. In order to avoid confusions between alters with the same sets of initials, interviewers kept track of sets; whenever a

set was repeated, interviewers determined whether it did indeed denote the same alter mentioned previously. To distinguish alters with the same initials, middle initials were used as well. Respondents were repeatedly reminded not to include spouse or children as alters. They were also instructed that contacts could include disliked as well as liked alters, and that for each item they could name either people they had mentioned earlier, new people, or both. This procedure was surprisingly simple for both interviewers and respondents to learn. For instance, Table 1 presents data on antagonists' relations to respondents; only 6 of the 1021 antagonists named by respondents suffered from missing information.

Support network members were ascertained by two sets of questions, each containing ten items. The items were selected so as to cover standard conceptualizations of support in the literature. Barrera (1981), for instance, provides a set we found very useful and some items of which we also utilize. We expanded usual approaches, however, by including not only who supports ego but also whom ego supports. Thus, we administered two sets of support questions, delineating the direction of support flow: from alters to ego in the first set, and from ego to alters in the second. In the first set, to determine from whom ego might obtain support, respondents were asked:

3. Who would you be most likely to call on in a pinch (not counting your spouse or kids) if you needed someone to help:
   a. Look after your children?
   b. Watch your house or possessions when you're away from home?
   c. With house or yard chores or repairs?
   d. Talk with you about problems you might have with your spouse?
   e. Talk with you about problems you might have with your children?
   f. Talk with you about problems you might have with your relatives or in-laws?

g. Be right there with you (physically) in a stressful situation?
h. Loan you $250?
i. Help you understand a problem or confusing situation you faced?
j. If you have a paid job, who do you talk with about things that happen at work?

In the second set, to determine who might ask ego for support, respondents were asked:

4. Who would be most likely to call on you in a pinch if they needed someone to help?

This was followed by the same ten items listed above, with referents changed to the issues were the conditions under which ego would be called on rather than would do the calling for help. Again, up to three names were accepted per item, initials were used, and respondents were reminded not to include spouse or children.

The final type of network link examined was conflict. Concerned that positive response sets might discourage respondents from naming hostiles, we accompanied our standard prefacing instructions with an attempt to reassure our informants that antagonism is an acceptable aspect of interaction:

> So far we've talked about times when people could help you, or you could help them. Another important part of life is that sometimes some people who you see often let you down, bother you, or just plain rub you the wrong way. It is very natural to feel this way at times; in fact, it is good for people to express this kind of dissatisfaction sometimes instead of trying to ignore it. Whether we find ourselves on bad terms at times with our closest friends or on good and bad terms with different sets of people, nobody gets along perfectly all the time with all the people they regularly deal with. Considering not only people you have mentioned already but also anyone else you know and see regularly, we would like to know which of them (or any other people you know first-hand) are the persons you'd be most likely to have the following kinds of friction with? They may be people you also usually get along the best with, or they may not be. Please name up to 3 people per category, again just using first and last initials. Please tell us if you mention someone you haven't told us about before.

These remarks seemed effective: of the 2,151 times it was possible to name antagonists (239 respondents x 9 opportunities each), hostiles were actually named 68% of the time. That is, respondents took advantage of over two-thirds of the available opportunities to name antagonists. The actual questions we asked respondents were three:

> 6a. What three people (not counting spouse or kids) at times tend most to be overly demanding in asking you for help, your time, or the loan of things?
>
> 6b. Among the people who you see regularly, which three (not counting your spouse or kids) do you think would be most likely to let you down if you asked them for help, time, or the loan of something?
>
> 6c. What three people (not counting your spouse or kids) at times tend most to make you angry or upset?

Background items were used to obtain information about the characteristics of contact, support, and conflict alters.

The actual portrait of networks the instrument presents can be illustrated by reference to the four-community survey of rural households in which it was utilized. We will offer descriptive data on the issues of multiplexity and of the characteristics displayed by conflict network members. We will also examine the impact of ego's and alters' genders on these issues. Our reasons for selecting rural communities, and for examining gender effects within these communities, involve the frequent tendency for depictions of such communities explicitly or implicitly to assume that they feature positive and supportive relations over antagonistic ones, and that social relationships within them deliver support to and from members in equal degree across social differentiators like gender. These assumptions have been explained and critiqued in a number of reviews (Bell and Newby, 1972; Bender, 1978; Bescher-Donnelly and Smith, 1981; Coward and Jackson, 1983; Flora and Johnson, 1978; Haney, 1982; Hill,

1981; Joyce and Leadley, 1977; Moen, n.d.). Here, through examining network operations by gender in rural communities, it was possible to test the implications of such critiques empirically while simultaneously providing a deliberately restrictive setting for an investigation of the argument that conflict networks permeate interactional patterns.

The data were collected in June and July, 1983, and are based on standardized interviews with random samples of sixty respondents in each of four rural Utah villages. Sites were selected so as to represent four major types of economic change currently being experienced in nonmetropolitan areas: an energy boomtown, a recreational boomtown, a declining community, and a slowly growing one. Differences between communities are discussed elsewhere; in the present paper, the data have been aggregated across communities in order to present a portrait of conflict in rural life.

In the study sites, populations ranged from 1,000-2,000 in 1980. For each, the sampling frame included all residences with metered utility hook-ups, supplemented by on-site mapping surveys to include residences without individual hook-ups, mainly trailers in mobile home parks. From the list of residences, a random sample was contacted to ascertain whether the inhabitants included a man and woman married or cohabiting, and also at least one child. The study was restricted to this kind of "intact" family in order to examine relationships between male and female spouses, on the one hand, and parents and children, on the other. Within the sampling frame of each community 25 families were randomly designated for interviews with the female spouse only; 25 different families were randomly designated for interviews with the male spouse only; and 5 other families were randomly designated for separate interviews with both spouses.

Findings

Among these families, conflict indeed represents a common feature of important relationships. As Table 1 shows, respondents described a total of 1,015 hostiles, and named without describing an additional 6. Of the described hostiles, 343 were named more than once, appearing in the tab as multiple offenders. They represent an average 1.4 multiple offender per respondent, out of a possible maximum of four.[2] The difference between the number of times antagonists were named and the number of times was possible to name antagonists comprises the number recorded in the "blanks" column. Thus, on the average each respondent named antagonists six out of nine possible times.

Table 1 also describes a number of ways in which hostile egos and alters may be linked.[3] Respondents were asked if alters work at the same place as ego, are kin to ego, are neighbors to ego, go the same church as ego, or attend any voluntary clubs ego attends. Results indicate that antagonisms, far from being reserved for casual acquaintances, accompany tight social bonds. Across all respondents, the most common linkage was the kin tie: 37% of the hostiles were tied to the people who named them by blood or affine bonds. The next most common linkage is among respondents with paid jobs: one-third of their nemeses are co-workers. Neighborhood and church provide their shares of foes as well, 28% of named antagonists being neighbors, 30% being church co-members. Of course, the fact that foes are bonded to ego seems intuitively reasonable when the common experience of annoyance toward kin, coworkers, and so forth is recalled. But a sense that people to whom one is bonded are inappropriate targets of resentment is also common. This unease finds its theoretical formulation in underemphases on conflict in networks research

Table 1: Characteristics of Respondents and Antagonists

Antagonist (Alter) Relations to Respondent*

Ego Characteristics (1)	(2) # named	(3) # multiple offenders	(4) # blanks	(5) From Work	(6) Kin	(7) Neighbors	(8) From Church	(9) From voluntary clubs	(10) Same sex as respondent
Male (N=120)	506 4.2	174 1.5	362 3.0	NA	145 .29	135 .27	138 .27	100 .20	412 .81
Has paid job (N = 111)	469 4.2	158 1.4	338 3.0	166 .35	138 .29	126 .27	132 .28	96 .20	382 .81
Does not have paid job (N=9)	37 4.1	16 1.8	24 2.7	NA	7 .19	9 .24	6 .16	4 .11	30 .81
Female (N=119)	509 4.3	169 1.4	337 2.8	NA	230 .45	148 .29	180 .35	100 .20	356 .70
Has paid job (N=55)	249 4.5	85 1.5	126 2.3	70 .28	91 .37	49 .20	77 .31	54 .22	172 .69
Does not have paid job (N=64)	260 4.1	84 1.3	211 3.3	NA	139 .53	99 .38	103 .40	46 .18	184 .71
TOTAL (N=239)	1015** 4.2	343 1.4	699 2.9	236 .33	375 .37	283 .28	318 .31	200 .20	768 .76

*Characteristics overlap in all columns. The number in the upper left diagonal of cell represents frequency. In columns 2-4, the number in the lower right diagonal of cell represents the average per respondent, i.e. the frequency divided by the N of column 1. In columns 5-10, the number in the lower left diagonal represents the proportion of alters exhibitng that characteristic, i.e. the frequency divided by the column 2 frequency.

**Six names omitted because of missing information.

about social bonds, the implication being that conflict does not flow along standard bond channels. What we are arguing here, on the other hand, is that it does.

The bonds between ego and nemeses can also be seen by examining overlaps of conflict, contact, and support networks. These are shown in Table 2.

Most antagonists display multiplex relations with ego, appearing on more than one type of network. Less than half (415/1021) are uniplex members of conflict networks alone. Linkages between conflict networks and the set of people to whom ego provides support are somewhat more common than other linkages, 45% of nemeses also being possible targets of assistance. But the remaining linkages--39% for hostility-contact and also for hostility-support sources--both differ from the negligible overlap which would be expected did contact and support relations exclude animosity. The data thus underline the suggestion offered earlier that networks, support systems, and hostility systems be measured simultaneously but separately. Merely asking from whom respondents might seek support, as previous network studies have tended to do, neither taps the entirety of all regular contacts nor necessarily represents the entirety of each contact, which may include resentment as well as relief.

Conflict is thus a regular feature of network life. However, it does not affect all community members in equal degree or form. Rather, it follows a different channel for each gender. Indeed, male and female conflict patterns are sufficiently distinct that the community may be said to comprise "his" and "hers" features of network relations, as Bernard (1973) has suggested there are "his" and "hers" features of marriage.

Table 2. Multiplex Linkages Between Conflict and Other Networks*

(1)	(2) # hostiles named	(3) # uniplex hostiles	(4) Hostility/Contact linkages	(5) Hostility/Give ego support linkages	(6) Hostility/Ego gives support linkages
Ego Males (N=120)	512 4.3	219 1.8	183 .36	174 .34	212 .41
Females (N=119)	509 4.3	196 1.6	213 .42	226 .44	251 .49
Total (N=239)	1021 4.3	415 1.7	396 .39	400 .39	463 .45

*"Other" network memberships are: contact, alters who might give ego support, and alters ego might give support to. Membership in these three may overlap. In all columns, the number in the upper left diagonal of cell represents frequency. In columns 2-3, the numbers in the lower right diagonal of all represents the average per respondent, i.e., the frequency divided by the N of column 1. In columns 4-6, the number in the lower diagonal is a proportion suggested by Burt (1983) to measure multiplexity or "confusion." It represents the fraction of hostiles who are also in another type of network, i.e., the frequency divided by the column 2 frequency.

Specifically, each sex reserves its most ardent antipathies for its own. Thus, 76% of hostiles are ego's gender (Table 1). However, the enjoyment of opposite-sex contacts is less than this figure alone suggests. When asked who they see most often (Q's 1-2), respondents named same-sex contacts 85% of the time. Thus, respondents experience a disproportionate amount of aggravation from opposite-sex alters compared to the number of opposite-sex contacts they see regularly. This disproportionately annoying quality of opposite-sex contacts is especially noteworthy for female respondents: although 86% of their contacts are female, only 70% of their nemeses are.

Male and female conflict patterns also differ with respect to the ways antagonists are embedded in respondents' lives. Females tend to be more bound to hostiles, and they are bound in more multiplex ways. For instance, 45% of women's nemeses are also their relatives, while only 29% of men's are (Table 1). Similarly, 35% of the people who most annoy female respondents are people they see in church. For males, this figure is 27%. The greater pervasiveness of conflict in female relations can also be seen by comparing the gender multiplexities of Table 2. Although the size of male and female conflict networks is identical, the degree to which conflict penetrates other relations differs noticeably by sex. Every type of multiplexity is greater for women than for men. Thus, larger numbers of hostiles are also on female contact chains, receive support from ego, and give ego support than characterize male networks.

Network mechanisms seem more multivalent, more laced with conflict as well as accord, for females than for males. This overlap is not a function of the number of hostiles each sex named, for they are virtually identical. Nor is it a function of differential contact with annoying personality types,

for each sex reported similar proportions of multiple offenders. Rather, is a function of the degree to which each sex is "integrated," or perha "trapped," in multipurpose role relations. The women's networks may entangle them in relations which are simultaneously supportive, familial and antagonistic, for instance. The men's networks tend more to offe different channels for each of these functions. Thus, males are irrita mos by people they know well outside the structures of other networks. Females, on the other hand, experience their major sources of annoyance among people to whom they are locked as relatives, church-goers, support gives, support recipients, and contacts.

There is one way in which males are more tightly locked to antagonists than females are: work. Among respondents with paid jobs, males name coworkers as annoyances more than females do (35% vs. 28%). The issue of employment not only affects network patterns, but it modifies male and female links in different ways. Thus, work status affects men and women antithetically with respect to the number of multiple offenders each reported; the number of times each reported an absence of conflict; and the presence of kin, neighbors, and church co-members on conflict networks. In general, while among men the lack of a paid job reduced network entanglements, among the women the same lack increased them. For instance, the probability of a foe's being a relative was lower among unpaid than paid men (0.29 vs. 0.19). For women, on the other hand, unpaid status increased the likelihood of kin-targeted hostilities (0.37 for paid vs. 0.53 for unpaid women).

Conclusion

In sum, the analysis offered here suggests that the underemphasis on conflict in network analysis requires remediation. An effort was made to

examine the structure of hostility in communities often characterized as tranquil and supportive. Two general issues were raised concerning the significance of conflict for network relations. First, do ties between community members simply integrate all into a web of communal support, or do they also channel regular, patterned relations of hostility? Second, does the structure of associations differ by a stratifying criterion such as gender? It was concluded that hostility as well as accord is a regular aspect of community life, and that these relations overlap not only with each other but also with general relations of routine contact. At the same time, hostility, support, and regular contact are often separate. We may hang out with the same people who bug us, or we may not; the people who sometimes bug us may be the same people we call on for help, or they may not. Thus, all three kinds of relationships must be investigated simultaneously but separately.

With respect to gender differentiation, it was concluded that males and females do find themselves in variant structures of contact, support, and hostility. The institutions assumed to provide positive relations for men--family, contact networks, support chains--may operate thus to a greater degree than for women, since female grievance flow along channels which crosscut these central relations more than male grievances do. Indeed, earlier in this paper the question was raised as to whether men and women residing in the same town actually inhabit socially different communities. At least in the communities examined here, an argument can be made that they do. At the same time, for both males and females, annoyance, resentment, and anger are regular features of interactional life.

The permeability of relations to antagonism as well as accord has been discussed here as an issue for the descriptive characterization of network links. It is also an issue for causal analyses featuring these links. Thus, for instance, in the literature on stress, network size is often assumed to indicate social support in causal models which interpose support as a buffer between social stress and individual distress. Results of these models are mixed, sometimes suggesting that networks fail to buffer (Kessler and Essex, 1982; McFarlane et al., 1983). Given our argument that conflict, support, and contact networks overlap, at least two interpretations of such mixed results arise. First, ineffective support systems may be those in which conflict is also predominant. Alternatively, conflict relations may function as supplements or replacements for contact and support in buffering distress (Coser, 1956). Without disentangling relational modes, it is impossible to specify the effects of particular network dimensions on distress. Similarly, when relational modes are dependent rather than independent variables, their causes cannot be discerned until their contents are disentangled. For instance, the literature on community has noted and attempted to explain the strength of support ties in rural America. But as these ties may simultaneously include large doses of antipathy, an alternative depiction of rural life has arisen in which communities are depicted as riddled with hostility, and it is this feature which is considered in need of explanation. What we are suggesting here is that both versions may be correct about the same relations, and that in consequence an attempt to explain these relations in terms of their emotional valences requires disentangling these valences.

In sum, the amiability tilt of networks research needs correction. Far from characterizing only interactions between strangers, animosity

permeates bonds among people who are linked. Nor does hostility arise simply in the absence of other modes of network relations. Rather, it can accompany both contact and support relations. The extent to which it actually does so differs by gender, and no doubt by other social stratifiers as well. Thus, the particular conflict patterns which various study populations may display are issues which can and should be investigated empirically.

FOOTNOTES

1. In light of the fact that we plan to examine overlaps between conflict and support networks, it is worth noting that although conflict items include disgruntlement over support issues, they are neither empirically nor theoretically confounded with support. Empirically, the difference between the two network types appears in the form of hostile alters who are not also named as support alters. This form represents the most common pattern in the data when it is broken down by towns and gender. There, the highest hostility/support multiplexity coefficient is 0.55, indicating that 55% of female egos' hostiles in our recreational boom community were also people who might call on ego for help. Only three out of sixteen such coefficients (relating hostility with support flow to ego and support flow from ego for each gender in each community) exceeded 50%. Theoretically, the difference between support and conflict networks appears via an analogy to support questions on standard network measures. There, although respondents are asked from whom they obtain particular forms of support rather than whether they receive it, their willingness to provide names is taken to demonstrate that they do in fact receive support. Similarly, we are assuming that willingness to name the kinds of antagonists we specify shows respondents do have antagonistic relations.

2. Given that every respondent had 9 ways to name single offenders, the maximum number of multiple offenders for any respondent is 4.

3. Burt (1982) notes that "ego network" analysis like the sort we describe is in a preliminary stage of development. Consequently, it is unclear what are appropriate statistical techniques for illustrating and testing claims. We will report significance tests where possible, but we urge the reader to rely on the descriptive proportions we provide instead.

REFERENCES

Barrerra, M. Jr.
1981 "Social support in the adjustment of pregnant adolescents." Pp. 69-96 in B. Gottlieb (ed.), Social Networks and Social Support. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Bell, C. and H. Newby
1972 Community Studies. New York: Praeger.

Bender, T.
1978 Community and Social Change in America. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers.

Bernard, J.
1973 The Future of Marriage. New York: Bantam.

Bescher-Donnelly, L. and L. W. Smith
1981 "The changing roles and status of rural women," Pp. 167-185 in R. Coward and W. Smith Jr. (eds.), The Family in Rural Society. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Burt, R. S.
1983 Distinguishing relational contents. Pp. 35-74 in R. S. Burt and M. J. Minor (eds.), Applied Network Analysis: A Methodological Introduction. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Burt, R. S.
1982 Toward a Structural Theory of Action: Network Models of Social Structure, Perception, and Action. New York: Academic Press.

Cobb, S.
1982 Social support and health through the life course. Pp. 189-199 in H. I. McCubbin, A. E. Cauble, and J. M. Patterson (eds.), Family Stress, Coping, and Social Support. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.

Coser, L.
1956 The Functions of Social Conflict. New York: Free Press.

Coward, R. T. and R. W. Jackson
1983 Environmental stress: The rural family. Pp. 188-200 in H. I. McCubbin and C. R. Figley (eds.), Stress and the Family, vol. 1: Coping with Normative Transitions. New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Fischer, C. S.
1982 To Dwell Among Friends: Personal Networks in Town and City. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Flora, C. B. and S. Johnson
1978 "Discarding the distaff: New roles for rural women." Pp. 168-181 in T. Ford (ed.), Rural U.S.A.: Persistence and Change. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press.

Granovetter, M.
1973 The strength of weak ties. American Journal of Sociology 78 (May): 1360-80.

Haney, W. G.
1982 "Women." Pp. 124-135 in D. Dillman and D. Hobbs (eds.), Rural Society in the United States: Issues for the 1980s. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Hill, F.
1981 "Farm women: Challenge to scholarship." The Rural Sociologist 1(November):370-381.

Joyce, L. M. and S. M. Leadley
1977 An Assessment of Research Needs of Women in the Rural United States: Literature Review and Annotated Bibliography. University Park, PA: Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Agricultural Experiment Station, Pennsylvania State University.

Kessler, R. C. and M. Essex
1982 Marital status and depression: The importance of coping resources. Social Forces 61(December):484-507.

Laumann, E. O., P. V. Marsden, and D. Prensky
1983 The boundary specification problem in network analysis. Pp. 18-34 in R. S. Burt and M. J. Minor (eds.), Applied Network Analysis: A Methodological Introduction. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

McCallister, L. and C. S. Fischer
1983 A procedure for surveying personal networks. Pp. 75-88 in R. S. Burt and M. J. Minor (eds.), Applied Network Analysis: A Methodological Introduction. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

McCubbin, H. I., C. B. Joy, A. E. Cauble, J. K. Comeau, J. M. Patterson, and R. H. Needle
1980 Family stress and coping: A decade review. Journal of Marriage and the Family 42 (November):855-871.

McFarlane, A. H., G. R. Norman, D. L. Streiner, and R. G. Roy
1983 The process of social stress: Stable, reciprocal, and mediating relationships. Journal of Health and Social Behavior 24 (June): 160-173.

Minor, M. J.
1983 Panel data on ego networks: A longitudinal study of former heroin addicts. Pp. 89-99 in R. S. Burt and M. J. Minor (eds.), Applied Network Analysis: A Methodological Introduction. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Moen, Elizabeth
n.d. "Women and development in a developed nation." Boulder, CO: Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado.

Pearlin, L. I., M. A. Lieberman, E. G. Menaghan, and J. T. Mullan
1981 The stress process. Journal of Health and Social Behavior 22 (December):337-356.

Phillips, S. L. and C. S. Fischer
1981 Measuring social support networks in general populations. Pp. 223-233 in B. S. Dohrenwend and B. P. Dohrenwend (eds.), Stressful Life Events and Their Contexts. New York: Prodist.

Wellman, B.
1981 Applying network analysis to the study of support. Pp. 171-200 in B. Gottlieb (ed.), Social Networks and Social Support. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.