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ABSTRACT

Now that we know that kinship persists in the First World, what is the place of kinfolk in personal community networks? Kin are quite prominent in such networks, especially in networks of strongly active or intimate ties. Immediate kin—parents, adult children and siblings—are much more likely than other, extended kin to be network members and to have strong ties. Immediate kin are in a good deal of contact, even when they live far apart. Their densely-knit clusters of ties maintain relationships and foster the coordinated provision of support. Parents and adult children are especially supportive, usually giving each other emotional aid, financial aid, and domestic goods and services. They rarely are each other’s sociable companions. Siblings are somewhat less supportive, and are more similar to friends in their moderate levels of support and high levels of companionship. Extended kin are less prominent in networks. Even when present, they rarely provide support or companionship. In short, immediate kin occupy prominent and unique places in personal community networks. Their stable, coordinated aid crucially helps people to deal with everyday problems, acute stresses and chronic strains in domestic situations.
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COMMUNITIES AS NETWORKS

Family sociologists have usually treated kinship networks as discrete systems in Western (post)industrial societies. To be sure, separate treatment of kinship is useful with regard to inheritance, incest taboos, and ceremonial obligations. However, it leads analysts away from assessing the place of kinship ties in personal community networks: intimate and active ties with friends, neighbours, and workmates as well as with kin.

Social network analysis allows researchers to compare kin with kith. In the Bott (1957) tradition, network analysts look at how a person (or household) at the centre of a network deals with the members of her/his egocentric universe. They start with a set of all active or intimate relationships and only then ask if the members of such networks are kith or kin. They then ask about the personal characteristics of the members of their networks (e.g., gender, social class), the characteristics of the ties themselves (e.g., frequency of contact, kinship role), and ties among network members (Wellman 1982, 1988). Most analyses are concerned with:

- composition (e.g., the percent who are kin),
- structure (e.g., density of interconnections among network members),
- contents (e.g., the supportiveness of network members).

This approach treats a community as a set of relationships stretching beyond the household—without a priori limitation on where network members live and how they are related to the person at the centre of the network. It allows analysts to compare the characteristics of different kinds of community ties. It liberates analysts from looking only at communities which resemble traditional solidarities of neighbours and kinfolk. Thus the network approach provides a useful means for seeing how kin fit into personal community networks:

- How prominent are kin in personal community networks in terms of numbers and proportions?
• Do kin form separate clusters within personal community networks? Are their relations densely-knit and tightly-bounded? Or have kin become just a convenient recruiting area for friendships?

• Do kin differ from kith in the roles they play in such networks? Is kinship and friendship fungible in the economists' sense of substitutable resources? In particular, does the companionship and social support they provide differ in quality, quantity and reliability?

• How do kinship relations fit into the ways in which personal community networks help people and households deal with problems and opportunities of reproduction and production? Do they provide collective relations that support and control kinfolk, or do they provide resources upon which kin can draw selectively and voluntarily?

Rather than comparing subgroups (e.g., nationalities, social classes, genders), I concentrate on that mythical category: people in general. Where necessary, I use as a baseline the networks of white, northern-European ethnicity, employed, once-married, North American, 40-year old (sub)urban women and men with a child in primary school. Although such persons make up a smaller share of the population than conservative mythologists would have us believe (Berger and Berger 1983), nevertheless they remain the modal category. I focus on the size, connectivity, contact and supportiveness of network ties, acknowledging, but not emphasizing the ambivalence, stress and costs that most relationships experience. Fortunately, the studies of most scholars are comparable enough to permit me to interweave them into one integrated account. Nevertheless, I inevitably gloss over fascinating information about differences between subgroups (e.g., social classes, ethnicities, age strata women/men, married/not married). Where the published findings are thin, I supplement them with material prepared specially for this paper from the first and second Toronto (East York) studies (Wellman 1979, 1982; Wellman, Carrington and Hall 1988; Wellman and Wortley 1989a, 1989b).
ARE SISTERS AND COUSINS RECKONED BY THE DOZENS?

How Many Kin?

Fuzzy Sets: Personal community networks have even fuzzier boundaries than kinship networks. Because there are no gates (or gatekeepers) to divide members from non-members, analysts must develop a sharp picture from fuzzy reality. Personal communities contain the usual kinship dilemmas about including affines, relations continuing after divorces and deaths, and unrecognized kin. In addition, friends, neighbours and workmates come and go, their definition and importance varying by the hour, day and year. There is the "Bob and Carol and Ted and Alice problem" (Mazursky 1969): Ties to a married couple can function as one relation or two.

Indeed, there is no such thing as the network: analysts must specify inclusion criteria. For example, socially-close network members are often different persons from those network members who see each other frequently. Even specific role relations have inherently fuzzy characteristics. For example, our research group studies only those co-workers whose social relations spill over to the community.

Available and Actual Ties: The broadest possible personal community network of direct relations contains all those whom a person can currently deal with on an informal basis. Yet one rarely acquires relations through random encounters in cafes or on the streets. Rather, social and physical foci such as kinship groups or the neighbourhood streetcorner bring people together under auspices conducive to interaction (Feld 1982; Lofland 1973).

I estimate that about 2,700 adults are potentially available for interaction with married 40-year olds who have a child attending primary school (Wellman forthcoming). In addition to ties directly formed through foci (and a few random encounters), many relationships form through being friends (and kin) of existing friends (and kin). Analysts have estimated that most people have between 250 and 1,000 actual ties with adults, with my own estimate being an average of 400 (Boissevain 1974; Pool and Kochen 1978; Greenbaum 1982; Killworth, Bernard and McCarty 1984).
Weak ties of acquaintanceship far outnumber stronger ties of intimacy, support, companionship or routine contact. These weak ties integrate social systems and speed the diffusion of information (Frank 1971; Granovetter 1976; Erickson, Nosanchuk and Lee 1981; Rogers and Kincaid 1981; Rapoport 1957). Indeed, a person's many weak ties are more useful for this purpose than his/her smaller number of strong ties. Strong ties link people who travel in the same social circles and hence, learn similar things. Weak ties link people to networks whose members travel in different social circles and hence, hear new things (Granovetter 1973, 1974, 1982; Calzavara 1983).

What are the number and proportion of kin in such broadly-defined networks? Firth, Hubert and Forge (1969) report that on the average Londoners recognize the existence of 55 living, adult kin—a category similar to Table 1's potentially-available kin. Most of these kin tend to be actual—and not just potential—members of broadly-defined personal community networks. People usually are acquainted with an average of 35 - 45 kin (Adams 1968; Firth, Hubert and Forge 1969; Lüschen 1972). This number excludes household members but includes in-laws and spouses of consanguines. Most also have at least one parent (or adult child) and one sibling (Rosenthal 1987a).

Thus kin make up about 3% of all ties reasonably available for membership in a personal community network and less than 10% of all ties actually present in such a network. This introduces a Zen question of interpretation. Should we lament the irrelevance of kinship because kin make up only 10% of these networks? Or should we celebrate that kin make up as much as 10% of these networks? After all, the 90 or so available kin are such a tiny number when compared with the 2,000 potential network members directly available through foci and the 10,000 indirectly available? The second, more positive attitude is in better keeping with the increasing importance of kinship as definitions of network members tighten from all ties to intimate ties (Table 1).
TABLE 1: NUMBER & PERCENT OF KIN TIES IN AVERAGE NETWORKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF TIES</th>
<th># OF TIES</th>
<th>% OF ABOVE</th>
<th># OF KIN TIES</th>
<th>% OF ABOVE</th>
<th>% KIN OF ALL TIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Available</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directly Available</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(30-45)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(14-23)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(6-10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5-7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interacting</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3-15)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5-7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Active Ties: Just as most kinship studies consider only those kin who have more than trivial relations (Firth, Hubert and Forge 1969; Farber 1981), community network studies look only at small subsets of personal networks. Both expediency and experience suggest such concentration. As asking detailed questions about each network member takes much interview time, the easiest way to economize is to limit the number of network members about whom interviewers inquire. Researchers have identified a range of 14 - 23 persons who are significant in one's life because of repeated sociable contact, supportiveness, or feelings of connectedness (Table 1). This score of active ties provides people with most of their interpersonal support and companionship (Erickson, Radkewycz and Nosanchuk 1988).

Kin are substantially represented in most active networks, making up at least 30% of the active ties compared with less than 10% of all ties and 2% of all potentially-available ties (Table 1). Thus a much higher percentage of kin than kith are actively involved in network relations. However, preferences for active involvement are bimodal. Networks often contain few or many kin, rather than the average number (Verbrugge 1977; Reiss and Oliveri 1973; Wellman, Carrington and Hall 1988).

Not all types of kin are equally represented. Most active kin relations come from the small number of available immediate kin (parents, adult children, siblings, including in-laws). Indeed, the 3-4 immediate kin who are active network members are a majority of all available immediate kin. By contrast, only a small minority of available extended kin (aunts, cousins, grandparents, etc.) are active network members.

These data are consistent between studies. However, some studies suggest that certain social characteristics foster networks which contain a higher number and proportion of kin:


- Women actively involved in maintaining networks who bear a triple load of paid work, domestic work and community networking (Adams 1968; Firth, Hubert

- Residents of rural areas, perhaps lacking the opportunities of urbanites to make friendships based on shared interests (Mirande 1970; Fischer 1982b).

- Members of the working-class more reliant on kin for domestic support and less involved with workmates after hours (Adams 1968; Bell 1968; Fried 1973; Willmott 1987).

Interactors, Intimates and Confidants: Most network studies have looked at even smaller subsets of network members: either frequently-seen interactors or socially-close intimates. Only to some extent are the same persons both intimates and frequent interactors (Wellman, Carrington and Hall 1988; Milardo 1989). Many of the 10 or so frequent interactors are neighbours or workmates who rarely are intimates (Walker 1977; Kazak and Wilson 1984). However, the few immediate kin who frequently interact usually are intimate.

Most network studies identify about 25% of the active ties—4-7 ties—as distinctively close and supportive intimates. The importance and manageable size of these intimate personal community networks has attracted many researchers. Intimate networks tend to contain equal numbers of kin and non-kin. Most intimate non-kin are friends, and not neighbours or coworkers.

Most intimate kin—i.e., nearly half the membership of intimate networks—are immediate kin: usually equal numbers of parents (or adult children, depending on age) and siblings. There is conflicting evidence about whether immediate kin tend to be a person's closest intimate. Most studies report that an immediate kin is usually the socially-closest member of a network. However, Burt (1986) reports from national U.S. survey data that a best friend is usually the closest confidant after one's spouse. Oliver (1984) finds among Black Los Angeleos that intimates who are co-members of organizations—probably members of the same church group in most cases—are slightly closer than kin intimates (not distinguishing between immediate and extended kin).

Extended kin rarely are intimates. For example, they make up only 6% of all intimates in the second Toronto study (Wellman, Carrington and Hall 1988).
A few studies have looked only at the tiny set of socially-close confidants: the 1-3 network members to whom people pour out their hearts. While most intimate and active network members provide only specialized kinds of support, confidants help in many ways. The largest and most reliable study—the 1985 General Social Survey—found that less than one-half of all confidants outside of households are kin.\(^5\)

Summary

Most kin who are potentially available do become actual members of personal community networks. The stronger the relationship used to define a network, the higher the proportion of network members who are kin. Indeed, most immediate kin—and some extended kin—have strong ties in these networks as active and even intimate members. Immediate kin have much stronger ties in networks than do extended kin. Immediate kin tend to be intimates and even confidants. Extended kin tend to be (non-intimate) active network members or have even weaker ties.

KINSHIP CONNECTIONS

Structure: Densely-knit networks have paradoxical implications for the integration of social systems.

At the level of the individual, the system is highly connected, for he [sic] lies at the centre of a dense network of direct and indirect social relationships. At the level of the total system it is highly disconnected, for there are many pairs who have neither direct nor indirect relationships (Davis 1967, p. 186).

This type of local solidarity, often found among networks composed principally of kin, may well have been the principal structural reason that the Italian-American residents of Boston's West End were unable to form coalitions to defeat the massive "slum clearance" [sic] activities that destroyed their neighbourhood in the late 1950s (Gans 1962; Fried 1973; Granovetter 1973).

Networks of similar density may have different patterns of integration and fragmentation within them. It is likely that those network members who
participate in the same sociophysical focus (kinship, workplace, interest group, etc.) will have more ties among themselves than with other network members. Hence two structurally different networks may have the same density. But one of these networks might contain a *cluster* of densely-connected kin plus several disconnected *isolates*. By contrast, the connectivity of the other network might be evenly distributed with all members having one-third of all possible ties (Wellman and Berkowitz 1988).

In practice, the density of active and intimate networks ranges between 0.3 and 0.5. Only about one-third to one-half of the possible direct links between active or intimate network members actually exist. Thus most potential ties between network members have not actually become active ties (Wellman 1979; Wellman, Carrington and Hall 1988). These network members may be connected but at lower levels of intensity. For example, while most of a person's intimates are not intimate with each other, many have weaker ties with one another.

The density of interconnections among all of a person's actual ties is much lower because of the different sources of their (mostly weak) relationships with focal persons. For example, one study found a mean density of 0.05 for the neighbourhood acquaintance networks of non-Slavs (but 0.28 for the Slavs) living in a Slavic-American area of Kansas City (Greenbaum 1982).

*Kinship Clusters:* A set of kin form both a distinct social network and a part of a broader personal community network. The two networks overlap substantially, but they are not identical. To the extent that kinship is a system in its own right, then many latent members of community networks will be significant members of kinship networks. They are recognized as kin (even if their names are not known), and met at ritual events.

The nature of this kinship system affects the structure and operations of personal community networks. Because kinship is an inherently-connected system, then the kinfolk who are active or intimate members of personal community networks are usually linked with each other (Firth, Hubert and Forge 1969; Johnson and Bond 1974). At least one *kinkeeping* person -- usually a mother or daughter -- converts normative obligation into high centrality by taking upon herself the task of maintaining ties among kin. As Walker points out, "Family, like community, serves as a euphemism for women" (1986, p.7; see also Bahr 1976;
The result of this kinkeeping is that 62% of active kin in the Toronto study usually meet in group contexts, compared with only 26% of active non-kin.*7 By contrast to kinship, most friendship ties meet more privately as relations between individuals or couples.

The interconnections of kinship both constrain and promote interactions. The constraints come from the limited number of kin available to be network members. Yet normative feelings of obligations encourage people to interact with kin, especially with immediate kin (Farber 1981). At the same time, kinship connectivity fosters contact -- and even frequent contact -- with many persons whom they otherwise would not meet (Heiskanen 1969; McLanahan, Wedemeyer and Adelberg 1981; Johnson 1982; Gillespie, Krannich and Leffler). For example, the first Toronto study finds that while 59% of all possible intimate links between kin actually exist, only 19% of all possible links between friends actually exist (Wellman, et al. 1988). The upshot is that kin predominate in high-density networks while friends predominate in low-density networks (see also Shulman 1972; Kazak and Wilcox 1984; Oliver 1984; Wellman and Wortley 1989a).

It is not that most people dislike their active kin. The Torontonians report disliking only 8% of their active immediate kin and 4% of their active extended kin. It is just that active friends are much more likely to want to interact voluntarily (84%) than are active extended kin (13%) or immediate kin (44%).*

Marriage brings more kin into networks but lowers the density of connections in these networks (Lüschen 1972; Gordon and Downing 1978; Wellman, et al. 1988). Because marriage increases network size, the number of additional ties would have to increase geometrically to maintain an equivalent density. Yet except for parents-in-law, there is little contact between in-laws (Farber 1981). Similarly, although many of one spouse's friends become friends of the other spouse, only some of one spouse's friends become friends of the other spouse's friends (Kazak and Wilcox 1984; Willmott 1987). Furthermore, the number of friends may actually shrink after marriage, as spouses withdraw inwards to contemplate each other and their children (Johnson and Leslie 1982).

Thus kin (and in-laws) form one or two distinct clusters in personal community networks. One consequence is that those people who have networks heavily composed of kin—such as homemakers without paid work—may have
more densely-knit networks than other people (Hammer, Gutwirth and Phillips 1982; Wellman 1985). Kin rarely have direct ties with their kinfolk's friends. (They are indirectly connected through their mutual ties to the focal person at the centre of the network.) For example, only 7% of all possible intimate ties between Torontonians' kin and friends actually exist (Wellman, et al. 1988).

This connectivity means that kin have the densely-knit relations useful for coordinating and controlling action. For example, they are quicker to mobilize to care for sick relations. At the same time, high density often leads to inbreeding. Thus kin are less open than friends to getting new information about health care, and they are more reluctant to send sick persons to doctors and hospitals (Salloway and Dillon 1973).

**Summary**

Kin are usually the only densely-connected members of active and intimate networks. Thus they have a unique structural basis for coordinated action: be it supportive, sociable or controlling. The relative lack of ties between in-laws makes the networks of married persons more sparsely-knit than the networks of most unmarried persons. Kinship ties, while densely-knit, do not have tight boundaries. Their connectivity provides a more coordinated basis to connect network members to other social circles (see also Fried and Gleicher 1961; Greenbaum 1982).

**OVER THE RIVER AND THROUGH THE WOODS**

**Proximity**

A key message of post-World War II research has been that kinship ties endure over long distances. Densely-knit structures and normative obligations encourage active kinship ties to maintain contact despite separation. Moreover, kinship ties—even formerly latent ones—often help migrants to obtain jobs, houses, spouses and local lore. Community analysts have generalized this message from kinship relations to all community ties. They contend that phones, cars and planes enable relationships to be active and intimate over long distances (Webber 1964; Wellman and Leighton 1979).
Active and Intimate Ties: Active ties are dispersed ties. About three-quarters of active ties in Toronto (and San Francisco) extend beyond the neighbourhood, one-third extend beyond the metropolitan area, and one-fifth stretch over 100 miles (Wellman, Carrington and Hall 1988; see also Fischer 1982b).

Intimate ties are even less likely to be local. Thus about seven-eighths of the intimate ties of Torontonians extend beyond the neighbourhood, while one-quarter extend beyond the metropolitan area (Wellman 1979; Wellman, Carrington and Hall 1988). Thus North Americans must rely on cars, planes and phones to maintain active and intimate ties. Even poorer persons, with less access to cars and planes, have many long-distance ties. For example, about half of the intimates of Black Los Angeles live outside of their neighbourhoods and over 10% live outside of the metropolitan area (Oliver 1986).

Kinship Ties: Kinship relations reflect these broad tendencies. Most active and intimate kinship ties extend beyond the neighbourhood but remain in the same metropolitan area. However, kinship ties withstand separation better than friendship ties. The norms and structures that link kin—especially immediate kin—help them to be active and intimate network members even at a distance. For example, about one-half of the active kin of the residents of the San Francisco Bay area live more than one hour’s drive away while less than one-quarter of their active friends live that far apart (Fischer 1982b). Indeed, these Californians have more long-distance kinship ties (2.9) than friendship ties (2.5) in their active networks, even though kinfolk make up only 34% of these networks.

The second Toronto study shows similar findings, with 50% of immediate kin and 56% of extended kin living more than 30 miles [50 kilometres] away compared with only 32% of friends living so far apart. A lower percentage of intimates than active network members live so far apart. Both the first and second Toronto studies show that about 30%-40% of immediate kin, extended kin and friends live outside of the metropolitan area. This is because residential moves weaken once-intimate relationships. The ties remain active but they no longer intimate (Tindall and Wellman 1989).

To be sure, distance reduces contact. Few kin now live near enough to make daily visits. For example, Torontonians have frequent contact (3 times
weekly or more) with only one kin by telephone or in person. The biggest decline in contact occurs when the tie extends beyond the metropolitan area, more than about one hour's drive, or 30 miles (Wellman 1979; Wellman, Carrington and Hall 1988). However, relations with kin are less sensitive to long distances than are relations with friends.\textsuperscript{10}

For example, the second Toronto study reports that 26\% of active friends living more than 30 miles away are seen at least monthly, compared with 55\% of active immediate kin and 46\% of active extended kin. The telephone compensates for distance, especially for immediate kin. Seventy-two percent of the intimate immediate kin living outside of metropolitan Toronto talk on the telephone at least monthly, compared with 56\% of extended kin and 50\% of friends.*

In sum, despite the dispersion of kin, most people have an important minority of active and intimate kin living nearby. About one-quarter of active kin—including one or two intimate relatives—tend to live in the same neighbourhood. As these are usually immediate kin, they are often quite supportive.\textsuperscript{11} However, most local ties are with neighbours and not kin, and it is neighbours and friends who provide most support and companionship.

The other pattern is one in which many kin—extended as well as immediate—live nearby, visit often, and rely heavily on each other for support. Such clusters of kin occur among those who have poor linguistic or financial resources for dealing with bureaucratic institutions.\textsuperscript{12} Willmott (1986) suggests that this pattern is more apt to occur in neighbourhoods with a stable population, room for kin to settle nearby, and jobs available locally. It is especially likely to occur in neighbourhoods with many poor residents who speak a different language or who are less-mobile manual workers.

Contact

Kinship scholars have been more interested in documenting the abundance of contact with kin than in comparing contact with kin to contact with friends. They have shown that most people have at least weekly contact with 20-40\% of their active kin (i.e., 1 or 2 persons) either in person or by telephone. Almost all have weekly contact with at least one (intimate) immediate kin. At the other
extreme, about one-third of all actual kin ties are in touch less than once month. Such contact is usually only for ritual occasions arranged by kinkeepers, such as birthdays, Christmas, and family get-togethers.\footnote{13}

Frequency of contact with kin is a function of \textit{kinship closeness} (immediate vs. extended kin), \textit{social closeness} (intimate, active, latent), and \textit{spatial closeness} (same neighbourhood, metropolitan area). Immediate kin have more contact than extended kin. In part, this is because immediate kin are more apt to have active or intimate relations. However, at each level of intimacy, immediate kin are in more contact than extended kin (Pitrou 1977; Fischer 1982b; Leigh 1982; Wellman and Wortley 1989a). The same normative and structural factors which help most ties with immediate kin to be active despite distance fosters frequent contact among kin. Thus contact with immediate kin diminishes less with increasing distance than does contact with extended kin (Adams 1968; Klatzky 1971; Leigh 1982; Gaunt 1988).

Many geographically distant ties are latent. They become briefly active during rare visits, but they only become really active when migration brings proximity and transient dependency. Hence migrants are likely to activate a few of their many weaker ties with extended kin, but they do not otherwise retain such people in their active networks.

An active kinship tie is apt to be in more frequent contact than an active friendship tie. For example, Americans have "recently" contacted 36\% of their active kin but only 26\% of their active friends (Tsai and Sigelman 1982; see also Shulman’s Canadian data 1972). Contact patterns are different for immediate and extended kin. The second Toronto study reports in-person contact at least once per week with 24\% of active friends and 26\% of active immediate kin but with only 4\% of active extended kin. Intimate immediate kin also are more apt to have more weekly in-person contact: 37\% compared with 20\% for intimate extended kin and 26\% for intimate friends.\footnote{14}

Despite the frequency of contact with immediate kin, most people have more friendship ties than kinship ties. Hence, they routinely see more friends than kin. For example, south Londoners meet a mean of 3.1 friends socially but only 2.6 kin. Moreover, three-quarters of the active relations whom Torontonians contact at least three times per week are neither kin nor friends—but neighbours
and co-workers (Wellman, Carrington and Hall 1988). The Toronto women who stay home to do childcare deal with similarly-occupied neighbours as if they were coworkers with whom they have been thrown together on the job (Wellman 1985).

Summary

Few kin or friends live in the same neighbourhood, but many live elsewhere in the same metropolitan area. Kinship ties are better able to remain active and intimate over greater distances than friendship ties. One result is that a higher proportion of kin than friends do not live in the same metropolitan area. Although network members who live far apart usually have lower rates of contact, contact with kin diminishes less over distance than does contact with friends.

There is much more contact with immediate kin than with extended kin at the same levels of activity or intimacy. Although immediate kin usually are in contact more than friends, extended kin usually have the least contact. Contact between immediate kin is the least affected by distance. Kinship structures keep kin in contact even at a distance, but only immediate kin usually maintain frequent contact.

To be sure, some people—usually from ethnic minorities or low socioeconomic circumstances—have large clusters of kin near at hand for companionship and support. Yet the more common pattern is to maintain intensive relations with a small set of immediate kin: densely-connected, but residentially-dispersed. Together with approximately equal numbers of friends—also residentially dispersed but less densely-connected than immediate kin—these ties make up the core of personal community networks. More latent relations with extended kin remain in place, to be activated for specialized needs, family get-togethers, or on migration.

BROTHERS' KEEPERS

Different network members provide different kinds of supportive resources. Just as general stores have given way to specialized boutiques, people must search
their assortment of ties to find specific kinds of support. For example, the second Toronto study found that different active network members often supply emotional aid, small services, large services, financial aid, companionship, and job/housing information. Most network members provide 0-2 of these 6 kinds of support. About 60% of the members provide some kind of emotional aid, small service or companionship. However, only 10-16% provide some kind of large service, financial aid or information. Less than half of the network members provide both emotional aid and small services (Wellman and Wortley 1989b; see also Fischer 1982b).

Density and Amity

As is the situation for contact, the densely-knit relations of immediate kin facilitate their mutual supportiveness. Interconnected ties aid the communication of needs and desires, and foster awareness of the material and immaterial resources that kin may have available to satisfy them. Densely-knit structures help kin to coordinate their supportive efforts to be more effective and to minimize individual burdens. For example, adult children often take turns giving care to ailing parents (Connidis 1989). At the same time, densely-knit ties help kin to persuade shirkers to be supportive.

Cultural norms of amity encourage the provision of support to kin without an expectation of strict reciprocity. Such norms idealize family welfare, encourage kin to share resources, urge them to give other kin privileged access to these resources, and cherish long term reciprocity. As Schneider argues, "The bond of kinship...is not contingent or conditional, and [supportive] performance is presumed to follow automatically if the bond 'exists'" (1984, pp. 165-66).

This view of kinship contrasts with contemporary depiction of friendship ties as sparsely-knit, voluntary relations requiring constant maintenance and reciprocal aid. Pitt-Rivers argues that friendship "is but the exploitation of an implicit right to reciprocity. The paradox of friendship lies in this: though the favours of friends must be free, they must still be reciprocated if the moral status quo is to be maintained" (1973, p.97).
Yet some active kinship ties are not supportive. Is support from kin as dependent on intimacy as is support from friends? Analysts have suggested that the mutual concern of parents and adult children and the mutual interest of siblings may lead to different kinds of supportive relations (Adams 1968; Fischer 1982b). They have lesser expectations for supportive relations with extended kin: grandparents, uncles, aunts, and cousins (Farber 1981; Coombs 1980; Cheal 1988). Are immediate kin more apt to be supportive than extended kin just as immediate kin are more apt to be in frequent contact?

Unfortunately, there have been few comparisons of support from different types of kith and kin. However, several studies have argued the continuing importance of kinship by showing that most (immediate) kin are supportive. Although such studies do not present detailed comparisons of kin and kith, they do suggest that kin and kith differ in the quality and quantity of support they provide.18

**Kin are Distinct From Friends**

Our research group used hierarchical cluster analysis to see if kin enact distinct supportive roles in personal community networks (Wellman and Wortley 1989a). We compared the tendency of 20 different kinship and non-kinship roles to provide emotional aid, services, companionship, financial aid, and job/housing information. In all cases, we started with separate categories for men and women (e.g., father, mother) and for consanguines and affines (e.g., mother, mother-in-law).

The cluster analysis shows that kin differ from kith in practice as well as in theory. The patterns of support they give are quite distinct. The cluster analysis also shows three distinct types of kinship roles: parent-adult child, sibling and extended kin. In addition, there are distinct differences in the support profiles of friends, neighbours and ties based on common membership in the workplace or other formal organizations.

Some similarities are also noteworthy. The cluster analysis shows that women and men behave similarly within kin and kith roles. For example, mothers are similar to fathers, except more emotionally supportive. Affines
behave like consanguines despite some theorists' expectations that blood relations should be more supportive than in-laws. Because much support effectively goes to the household rather than to the focal person, kin often feel they are supporting their own blood relatives.19

Parents and Adult Children

Relationships between parents and adult children have been celebrated for their combined supportiveness and destructiveness from Abraham (c1500 BCE) to Woody Allen (1989). While noting the strains in these ties, my interest is in the extraordinary high level of supportive resources they convey. The bond between parent and adult child is the most supportive of all intimate and active ties, providing high levels of both material and emotional support. Such ties are so broadly supportive that weaker, but still active, relations are usually almost as supportive as intimate relations (Hoyt and Babchuk 1983; Cheal 1988; Wellman and Wortley 1989a). Mother-daughter ties are especially supportive, building upon shared concerns about (grand)children and domestic tranquillity. The coming of grandchildren may well transform lifetime mother-daughter conflicts to cooperative efforts by domestic co-workers (Wood, Traupmann and Hay 1984; Binns and Mars 1984; Fischer 1985; Willmott 1987; Wellman and Wortley 1989a). Indeed, these strong bonds are the foundation of informal care for the elderly.20

Parents and adult children are each others' pre-eminent sources of informal financial aid to buy a house, take a trip, or provide care for illness and infirmity (Sussman and Burchinal 1962; Fischer 1982b; Wellman and Wortley 1989a). They are the most likely of all ties to give each other gifts, emotional support, child care, care for family illness, and help with major home maintenance (Table 2).21 For example, 84% of the active parent/child relationships in the second Toronto study provide some kind of emotional aid and 39% provide some major services. By contrast, the percentages for all active ties are 62% and 16% respectively (Wellman and Wortley 1989b). Moreover, parents do not reduce their support when many adult children compete for their attention (Aldous and Klein 1983).

Parents and adult children usually support each other but do not enjoy each other. They rarely choose each other as sociable companions (Wellman and Wortley 1989a). Mothers and daughters often expect much support from each
TABLE 2: PERCENTAGE OF ACTIVE NETWORK MEMBERS PROVIDING SPECIFIC KINDS OF SUPPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE:</th>
<th>PARENT/CHILD</th>
<th>SIBLING</th>
<th>EXTENDED KIN</th>
<th>FRIEND</th>
<th>NEIGHBOUR</th>
<th>ORGANIZATIONAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Emotional Aid</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Problems Advice</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Emotional Aid</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Emotional Aid</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Small Services</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Services</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lending Items</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Household Services</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Aid</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Large Services</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Household Service</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Services</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Financial Aid</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Loans</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Loans</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Loans</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Companionship</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing Things Together</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing Ideas</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Participation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Information</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Information</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Contact</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Information</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Second Toronto Study (Wellman 1982)
other, take its provision for granted, but complain when it is not given. Fathers and sons, who expect less, have fewer strains in their relationships.  

Siblings  

Sisters and brothers give each other much support, but not as much as do parents and adult children. Unlike parent/child relations, there is much variation in the supportiveness of siblings: Intimate siblings exchange much more support than siblings with weaker ties. When there are more than two brothers and sisters, only some may form supportive bonds (Johnson 1982; Cheal 1988; Wellman and Wortley 1989a).  

Siblings, tending to be of similar ages, have shared similar histories and have similar concerns. Their similar current situations resemble those of friends, but their ties are overlain by longer histories, commitment to norms of amity, and common kinship structures. Indeed, the sibling role was more similar to friendship in our cluster analysis than it was to the parent, adult child or extended kin roles. The sociable relations of siblings are more similar to friendship than to relations between other kin. Siblings are as likely as friends to do things together and to provide emotional support, more likely to provide large services and help around the household, but less likely to discuss ideas or help each other outside of their households (Table 2).  

Siblings (and siblings in-law) make up about 20% of the active network members who provide emotional aid, financial aid, services, or companionship (Wellman and Wortley 1989a). Because the Torontonians have more siblings than parents (or adult children), siblings provide them with more emotional and material aid even though each sibling is less likely to be supportive than each parent.  

Extended Kin  

Extended kin have roles that are distinct from other kin and from friends. Even those few extended kin who have active relationships are less likely than other active network members to exchange social support. They are about one-half as likely as active immediate kin to provide each kind of support (Table 2). For example, 29% of these extended kin provide minor emotional aid as compared with about 60% of the immediate kin (Wellman and Wortley 1989a).
combination of low numbers of active ties, weaker relations, and low likelihood of support means that extended kin are a negligible source of aid for most routine, chronic or acute problems.

The exceptions are in those situations such as migration or finding jobs where weak ties have a comparative advantage because of social and spatial dispersion (Johnson 1985; Anderson and Calzavara 1986; Grieco 1987). Although extended kin rarely are active or supportive, their ties are strong enough and connected enough to convey news. They are useful conduits of information, although the small number of kinship ties provides less news than do the larger number of acquaintances (Lin and Dumin 1986).

Kith

Most of the active and intimate network members with whom people socialize are friends and not kin. "We typically have a good time with friends but turn to relatives in a crisis" (Fischer 1982b, p. 132). Friends make up nearly half of most active and intimate networks and usually form nearly half of the ties providing each kind of (non-financial) support. Although most friends provide somewhat less variety and quantity of support than do parents and adult children, they are as likely as siblings to provide support and much more likely to do so than extended kin (see Table 2). Moreover, many of those people who do not have active kinship ties have one or two intimate friends who act like immediate kin by reliably providing a wide range of social support.*

Many friendship ties are discrete, voluntary relationships that function outside of groups. Hence when friends are not helpful, the relationship often ends for lack of group support. Knowing this, many Torontonians report that they carefully limit the claims they make on friends (and some kin) for aid. It is not that friends are unsupportive when asked, but that people often do not feel confident that they can ask their friends for aid.*

By contrast, neighbouring ties are often less voluntary, especially when they are between women staying home to do domestic care (Wellman 1985). Proximity makes active neighbours a principal source of routine companionship and aid for children, homes and spouses (Table 2; see also Warren 1981; Willmott 1987;
Wellman and Wortley 1989b). However, quick access by car and phone means that the metropolitan area, and not the neighbourhood, is often the effective limit on supplying goods and services.

Summary

To say that kin are supportive and friends are sociable is as much an oversimplification as to say that there is no difference in the content of relations between kin and friends. Kinship significantly affects the nature of ties, but it does so interactively with the strength of a tie, the shared interests of the network members, and their physical access to each other.

At one extreme, parents and children reliably exchange a broad range of support. Their relationship transcends intimacy, different stages in the life course, and physical access. At the other extreme, extended kin are rarely supportive, even if active or living nearby. In between are siblings whose conditionally companionate and supportive relations more closely resemble friends in their dependency on shared intimacy and in their life situations.

W(H)ITHER KIN IN NETWORKS?

The Prominence of Kin: Contemporary Westerners wander freeways and shopping malls surrounded by strangers. The few known faces they encounter hardly ever are kin. The people whose company they keep rarely are kin—in the neighbourhood, at work, or at play.

No wonder that scholars have had to work so hard to assert the persistence and importance of kinship. Yet the closer one looks at personal community networks, the more prominent are kin. Out of their hundreds of relations, people form active ties with almost all of their immediate kin and some of their extended kin. These ties—often dispersed and invisible make up a large minority of active ties and about half of intimate ties. They loom even larger as reliable, flexible, longterm sources of support.

The prominence of kin in these networks is greater than current size and contact figures suggest. Because kin usually have known each other at least twice
as long as friends, they have had many more person-years of contact. Because kin are densely-connected with each other, conversations between two kin often refer to other kin. By contrast, friends usually engage in separate duets.

*The Uniqueness of Kin:* The importance of kinship suggests its uniqueness. Why would active and intimate networks have so many kin if they were just like friends? Imagine that we had a structural map of a typical personal community network, but none of its labels of *Immediate Kin, Friend,* etc. The densely-knit cluster of relations among kin would be apparent along with the lack of links from this cluster to other network members. In effect, the structure reveals the existence of the active kinship system. Moreover, the maintenance of these relations over long distances and rare contact suggests the ability of structures (and norms) to hold kin together.

To be sure, quasi-legal norms maintain kinship as systems. Rules and customs emphasize kinship relations for inheritance, incest taboos, and rights to share housing, sponsor immigrants and receive confidential information from bureaucracies. Yet the differences separating kin from kith are neither neat nor simple. Not only do kin differ from friends and neighbours in structure and deed, different types of kin differ from each other. There are no inclusive rules of amity requiring all kin to be supportive, and there are many friends whose ties transcend marketplace reciprocity. *Parents and adult children* are remarkably supportive but often do not enjoy each other's company. *Extended kin* have little content to their relations even when active; they are bound together only by structure. *Sibling ties* are almost as supportive as parent/child relations and almost as sociable as friendships. *Friendship* ties are the most variable—the term is a residual grab-bag for relations which are *non-kin, non-neighbour,* and *non-workmate*—yet intimate friends often provide the broad, reliable support characteristic of immediate kin.

Underlying this diversity is the structural connectivity and normative amity of the kinship system. It is what keeps extended kin in personal communities, and it is what keeps parents and children supportive even when they do not enjoy each other's company. Friends must reaffirm their ties continually, while neighbours are apt to move away or break relations over petty disputes. By contrast, kinship ties are relatively reliable without needing direct, one-on-one reciprocity. Immediate kin are reliably there for support, and extended
kin are reliably available for acquaintanceship, news and adaptive life-changes. Kin are not necessarily expected to reciprocate directly as long as they remain members in good standing of the kinship network. In their distinctive ways, both immediate and extended kin help people and households to reduce interpersonal uncertainties in making their way through stressful, problematic worlds. As Lyn Lofland has pointed out (1973), we live in "a world of strangers". Yet it is just such circumstances that makes so outstanding the contact, connectivity and supportive reliability of immediate kin.

**Community Saved or Liberated?** For a time, community analysts thought that all communities were densely-knit, broadly-supportive, local solidarities helping people to endure the ravages of the (post)industrial Revolution. Such a Community Saved model—epitomized by Young and Willmott (1957) and Gans (1962) celebrated the vitality of kinship (and neighbouring). As a counterpoise, network analysts have emphasized the diverse, ramified, sparsely-knit nature of most personal communities (e.g., Wellman and Leighton 1979; Fischer 1982b). In their view, communities are not merely havens from large-scale social forces but active arrangements by which people and households reproduce. Their Community Liberated model has had the virtues of emphasizing the social (and not spatial) basis of community and of showing how networks actively help people to engage with the outside world.

Yet communities are more apt to have mixed compositions and structures than to be purely Saved or Liberated. Within them, kin form a key core cluster efficiently structured for communicating needs and coordinating support. This Saved cluster provides a haven from the demands of the outside world and many of the interpersonal bandages for domestic sores. Complementing this involuted group are strong and weak ties with friends, stretching outwards to connect a focal person to the diverse resources of other groups. These Liberated ties provide companionship in many arenas as well as entry points to new arenas. To the extent to which both types of ties and structures are useful and complementary, then both are integral parts of a single personal community network.
Towards a Political Economy of Personal Community Networks

This paper has reviewed supportive relations with kin and kith as one of three basic ways by which most people obtain resources. The other two are market exchanges and access to institutional resources as citizenship rights, organizational benefits or charitable acts.

The uses of these three mechanisms differ substantially between social systems. In the Third World, personal community networks structure important relations of production as there are neither the structures nor the capital to support extensive market economies. In those Third World countries where employment is unstable and there are no retirement funds, secure survival is an urgent need. The socially-controlled reliability of kinship relations become crucial in such situations of competition for scarce survival resources. People develop broadly-based ties, expanding them from purely social relationships to key sources of material resources. Marginal groups rely on these ties as a basic survival strategy. Middle-class groups develop informal networks and formal relationships to support upward mobility. In all classes, such networks strongly channel access to such reproductive resources distributed by Third World institutions as schools, hospitals, and make-work jobs (Lomnitz 1977; Roberts 1978; Bandyopadhyay and van Eschen 1981).

In the Second World, personal community networks help people manoeuvre through bureaucratic obstacles to institutional benefits and provide informal arrangements for production. For example, they provide the ties necessary to obtain the resources for getting a job done (Burawoy 1985; Walder 1986). Such networks are even more crucial for reproduction in such bureaucracy-laden societies by providing informal alternatives to rigid institutional procedures (Grossman 1989). For example, groups of Hungarian kith and kin take turns building houses for each other (Sik 1988). The only way to obtain a telephone in many such countries is to use informal connections; official queues remain dormant window-dressing.

By contrast, personal community networks in more comfortable western, First World milieus are principally relations of reproduction. The low importance of the economic and political aspects of social support distinguishes the networks of most First Worlders from those social systems which are less economically or
politically secure. The people we have studied rarely face acute or problems of employment, shortages of consumer goods, or extensive bureaucratic control of their routine affairs. They rely on market exchanges for almost all of their production and much of their consumption. Despite some variation, their institutional benefits such as schooling and medical care are available as citizenship rights. Hence they do not pay as much attention as do Second World residents to having network members with skills for fixing things and bureaucracies. Nor do they have the survival needs of Third World residents to blend domestic with employment relations in both the informal and formal sectors.

Because almost all westerners have assured resources for survival, they can manage their lives with less apprehension than the Third Worlders who live on the margins and the Second Worlders who must constantly manipulate bureaucracies. Their work lives are largely separate from their community lives. Hence their personal community networks are built around companionship, soothing domestic stresses, and reliable, flexible, low-cost domestic services. These are not trivial pursuits as few people want to place themselves at the mercy of markets and institutions to deal with such needs. Although analysts are just starting to calculate the costs and benefits of community network relations (Humphries 1977; Pahl 1984), these networks clearly contribute important and central resources that enable people to go about their daily lives, handle chronic stresses, and cope with acute crises.

I suspect that First Worlders prefer to use personal community networks to meet many needs because they have more control over the workings of network relationships than they do over purchases or beneficences obtained from bureaucracies. Yet their dispersed, fragmented networks require constant maintenance. The study of personal community networks should recognize the how different types of relationships divide the labour of providing supportive resources. Reliable relations with immediate kin provide secure stocks of services, emotional aid, and financial aid within these networks. At the same time, friends provide sociable pleasure, diverse resources, and access to social circles beyond the existing community.
NOTES

1. Among other works focusing explicitly on kinship/friendship comparisons are Allen (1979), Fischer (1982b) and Willmott (1986). The first two are more qualitative in their approach, while the latter two analyze data from specific surveys.

2. Laslett's (1988) estimate of 9.13 kin for British 44 year-olds is less discrepant than it seems: it excludes in-laws and relatives more distant than first cousins. On the other hand, Cumming and Schneider's counts seem anomalously high: 151 potential kin (and excluding in-laws!), about one-half of whose names are known.

3. Studies include: Fischer (reported in 1982a, 1982b); Reilly and Cochran (1985); Willmott (1986; 1987); Wellman, Carrington and Hall (1988); Wellman and Wortley (1989a, 1989b); Milardo (1989).

4. Shulman (1972); Wellman (1979); Johnson and Leslie (1982); Hoyt and Babchuk (1983); Wellman, Carrington and Hall (1988).

5. The 1965-1966 Detroit Area Study found that only 7% of the confidants were kin. However, the survey's stimulus question emphasized friendship and not kinship, and the sample consisted only of white males. See Laumann (1973), Fischer, et al. (1977), Verbrugge (1977).

6. Confidants: 0.41 (calculated from Laumann 1973, Table 6.1). Intimates: 0.33 (Wellman 1979) and 0.44 (Fischer 1982b); active network members: 0.33 (Wellman, Carrington and Hall 1988). Those studies that report higher densities appear to include in their calculations the always-present ties between respondents and network members (Shulman 1972; Kazak and Wilcox 1984), or to include household members as network members (Oliver 1984 analyzing Blacks in Los Angelos; Marsden 1987 analyzing national U.S. data).

7. Data calculated expressly for this paper are indicated with an asterisk: *.


9. Adams (1968); Firth, Hubert and Forge (1969); Klatzky (1971); Ball, et al. (1972); Fischer (1982a, 1982b); Johnson (1982); Oliver (1986).

10. Adams (1968); Klatzky (1971); Ball, et al. (1972); Clark and Gordon (1979); Fischer (1982a); Leigh (1982); Willmott (1986); Oliver (1986); Gaunt (1988).

12. American Blacks (Oliver 1986); poor white Londoners (Young and Willmott 1957; Willmott 1986); Italian-Americans (Whyte 1943; Gans 1962; Fried 1973; Johnson 1982); Italian-Canadians (Calzavera 1983), and Portuguese-Canadians (Anderson 1974).

13. Adams (1968); Heiskanen (1969); Lüschen (1972); Shanas (1973); Ball, et al. (1976); Pitrou (1977); Johnson (1982); Shulman (1982); Palisi (1985); Willmott (1987). For infrequent contact at rituals, see also Rosenblatt, Johnson and Anderson (1981); Caplow (1982); Lüschen, et al. (1972).

14. At the other extreme, 31% of active immediate kin are seen less than once per month, as compared with 48% of active extended kin and 40% of friends. Telephone contact shows patterns similar to those reported here for face-to-face contact. None of the data reported here include active or intimate ties with neighbours and workmates (not considered to be friends): they, of course, are in quite frequent contact with the respondents.

15. Wellman with Hiscott (1985); Wellman, et al. (1987); Wellman and Wortley (1989a, 1989b); see also Fischer (1982b); Barrera and Ainlay (1983); Litwak (1985); Tardy (1985); Gottlieb (1985); Lin, Dean and Ensel (1986); Pilisuk and Parks (1986); Israel and Rounds (1987); House, Umberson and Landis (1988).

16. Farber (1981); Fortes (1969); Pitt-Rivers (1973); Bahr (1976); Nye (1976); Mogey (1977); Grieco (1987); Willmott (1987); Cheal (1988).

17. Litwak and Szelenyi (1969); Allan (1979); Perlman and Fehr (1987); Duck (1983); Argyle and Henderson (1984); Waring (1985); Willmott (1987); Blumstein and Kellock (1988); Berscheid, Snyder and Omoto (1989).


19. Because most community network studies assume the person is the unit of analysis, support to households often gets misanalyzed.

20. The extensive literature on the subject deserves a review in its own right. See, for example, Bachrach (1980); Johnson (1981-1982); Longino and Lipman (1982); Steuwe (1982); Keith (1983); Anderson (1984); Morgan (1984); Steuwe and O'Donnell (1984); Broady (1985); Kivett (1985); Rempel (1985); Fischer (1986); Soldo, Wolf and Agree (1986); Jutras and Renaud (1987); Rosenthal (1987a, 1987b); Wenger (1987); Bassoff (1988); Coward (1988); Marcil-Gratton and Légaré (1988); Steinmetz (1988); Stone (1988); Wilkinson (1988); Wolf (1988); Connidis (1989).

21. Johnson (1977); Mogey (1977); Pitrou (1977); Horwitz (1978); Unger and Powell (1980); Riley and Cochran (1985); Willmott (1987); Cheal (1988); Radoeva (1988); Wellman and Wortley (1989a); Mogey (forthcoming).

23. Wellman and Wortley (1989a, 1989b); see also Adams (1968); McLanahan, Wedemeyer and Adelberg (1981); Johnson (1982); Farber and Smith (1985).


25. Similar ideas are found in Wolf's (1966) comparison of kinship and friendship organization in rural areas, Merton's (1957) distinction between "locals" and "cosmopolitans", Litwak and Szelenyi's (1969) contention that kin handle long-term commitments while friends provide heterogeneity, and Heller, et al.'s (1981) distinction between "extended-kin orientation" and "primary-kin familism"—all of which are somewhat reminiscent of Parson's (1951) identification of the integrative and adaptive functions of social systems.
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