TEAM HAMILTON: MORAL ORDER AND CONFLICT

by

ERIN LEAH WINTER

(Under the direction of Mark Cooney)

ABSTRACT

This study explores how members of a cycling team (Team Hamilton) manage conflict in the context of a team. Team Hamilton is a distinct type of team because it lacks rigid formal organizational mechanisms, members compete with each other, members depend on one another in various ways, and they have single stranded yet deep relationship ties. These features structure the morally moderate, interpersonal conflict among team members, which they manage by using strategies such as toleration, gossip, mockery, sabotage, and avoidance. To explain the variation in conflict management team members use, I draw on Donald Black's (1993) theory of conflict management. Black seeks to explain conflict in terms of its social structure or social geometry – its location and direction in a multidimensional social space. This strategy assumes that social life obeys principles of its own that are independent of the characteristics of the individuals involved. Guided by this theory, this work offers an explanation of conflict, of why, how, where it occurs, as well as the form it takes.

INDEX WORDS: Conflict management, Social Control, Moral Moderation, Donald Black, Team, Organizations, Cycling, Mountain Biking

TEAM HAMILTON: MORAL ORDER AND CONFLICT

by

ERIN LEAH WINTER

B.A. The University of Georgia, 1999

M.A., The University of Georgia, 2003

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2009

TEAM HAMILTON: MORAL ORDER AND CONFLICT

by

ERIN LEAH WINTER

Major Professor: Mark Cooney

Committee: David Smilde
                  William Finlay

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

Page

FIGURES

CHAPTER 1

IT'S NOT ABOUT THE BIKE: MORAL ORDER AND CONFLICT

The seminal questions of social theory, though in particular the Hobbesian question, ask: "How is order possible?" In answering this question, Hobbes argued human action stems from specific desires and appetites that humans, as biological animals, experience as pleasure and pain. He asserted that human action thus arises from a biological urge propelling humans to overcome these pains. Therefore, according to Hobbes, all humans are motivated to act in ways designed to relieve discomfort and further wellbeing ([1651] 1909). This suggests that human action is determined by the strongest present desire. Left unchecked, these actions lead to a state of war (Hobbes [1651] 1909). However, Hobbes further argued that human striving for self-preservation induced humans to enter contracts with each other, surrendering individual interests in favor of long-term security. Through this process, Hobbes asserted, society arises.

Hobbes's theorizing, particularly that found in Leviathan, served as a building block for many scholars working in the sociological tradition who shared his focus on explaining human action and moral order – sometimes scholars agreed with Hobbes and other times his work served as a point of departure for their arguments. Hobbes's legacy influenced classical scholars of much renown, including John Locke, Jeremy Bentham, Adam Smith, James Mill, Alfred Marshall, and Herbert Spencer, to name a few. However, despite the contributions of their theorizing, other equally important scholars took a different tack to explain what was a central focus for sociologists – moral order.

In contrast to the fundamental assumptions that informed scholars who worked within Hobbes's legacy, classical thinkers such as Baron de Montesquieu (1716), Jean-Jacques Rousseau ([1762] 1987), Auguste Comte ([1855] 1974), Alexis de Tocqueville ([1863] 1984), and Emile Durkheim ([1892] 1960) assumed that moral order that pervades society arises out of society itself, specifically fashioned from the conditions that permeate the (social and physical) environment in which society arises. In other words, for these scholars, society itself produces moral order, an assumption that stands in opposition to that which assumes morality is a biological entity guided by the seeking of pleasure and the avoidance of pain. Articulating this point, Durkheim writes that society is "a moral entity having specific qualities distinct from those of the individual beings which compose it" (Durkheim [1892] 1960, 82).

Rejecting both these schools of thought on moral order – that it arose from propensities inherent in humans or that it emerged through society – Emanuel Kant ([1785] 1964) and those that followed in his footsteps – Johann Gottfried Herder ([1784-91] 1968), G.W. F Hegel ([1821] 1991), Wilhelm Dilthey ([1883] 1976), Georg Simmel ([1903] 1971), and Max Weber [1913] 1968) – argued that moral order resulted from rational human choice, that is, from agency. These theorists argued for the existence of a categorical imperative based on the assumption that humans uniquely have the ability to reason and express themselves. Moral order develops from these individual and/or collective processes.

Despite their different explanations, these scholars all theorize moral order – where it originates and how it is shaped. The preoccupation with this topic arose out of observations of war, genocide, and violence, which catalyzed subsequent attempts to understand these conflicts and their converse, peace. Hobbes's scholarship queried how humans lived in peace with each other, avoiding the war against all. Kant, like Hobbes, theorized in the face of a human history in

which violence and struggle prevailed. Reacting to this, Kant theorized that conflict is natural and functional in that it serves as to bring about a future in which individuals are free and goodness prevails. In addition to these influential thinkers, echoing Kant's and Hobbes's attentions, Karl Marx ([1845] 1965) and Antonio Gramsci (1971) also centrally focused on conflict. In doing so, they, along with Durkheim and Weber, emphasized the role of social control in producing moral order.

These classical scholars and their ideas continue to inform contemporary sociological theorists and their work. Attempts to understand both moral order and conflict remain central concerns of the discipline. Contemporary society adds complexity to these issues for sociologists studying them: Thanks to the ease of travel and communication, the variation in moral order is widely apparent and must be accounted for by any scientific explanation. Conflict, too, is changed. While war, genocide, and violence still occur, from a purely statistical point of view they are, however, a relative rarity in comparison to the generally high level of peace throughout the world. This lack of violence is thus important to understand.

This study takes up these topics – moral order and conflict – and sociologically explores them. On a theoretical level, this study: 1) focuses on explaining conflict using a pure sociology perspective, which emphasizes social structure or social geometry – its location and direction in a multidimensional social space – and; 2) examines the effect of structure on the production of moral order. At the empirical level, this study ethnographically investigates a particular social setting that is but one example of a more general and widespread organization – the team – in order to: 1) expand sociological information on conflict and its management among team members and; 2) observe how conflict among team members shapes the moral community of the particular team under study. In pursuit of these goals, this study focuses on conflict at the case

level, assuming that each case is shaped by the organization in which it is embedded and that the cases themselves generate the moral order that characterizes the interactions among the members of the team under study – Team Hamilton.

Team Hamilton

Team Hamilton was comprised of people who lived in the midsize town of Hamilton and share an interest in cycling. Throughout the year, members of this team voluntarily raced and casually rode their bicycles together, interacted socially during bicycle related events, and cooperated in order to meet collective, cycling specific goals. This constant contact contrasts to other sports teams that restrict meetings to a "season," teams on which members do not compete against one another, groups with forced participation, organizations in which members are independent, and groups with members who come together solely to pursue their own agenda and have no common purpose (Harvey and Drolet 1994).

This particular form of social organization – the team – is extremely common in modern societies, despite the tasks and roles undertaken on Team Hamilton being specific to cycling. Sports, businesses, and educational settings are but a few of the numerous social worlds in which teams are found. In fact, as a social grouping, teams are becoming more numerous in an array of settings (Jones & George 1988; Lawler, Mohrman, & Ledford 1995; Furst, Blackburn, & Rosen 1999). For example, in sports, a setting in which teams are traditional, a "world systems" of modern sports has developed as the global expansion of modern sport teams displace traditional indigenous leisure activities (Guttmann 1996). In the world of commerce, businesses increasingly relying on teams for product innovation due to the increase in business competition resulting from the global and technological nature of emerging markets (Hollenbeck et al 2001).

In education settings, teams are increasingly commonplace in the wake of scholars effectively arguing that learning in teams – as opposed to an isolated learner – have strong positive effects on almost every conceivable learning outcome (Oakley et al 2004).

As this discussion shows, then, Team Hamilton is a model of a more general organization – the team. As such, it shares features of all teams, most specifically that members work together to achieve common goals. However, as a particular team, certain features distinguished Team Hamilton. Most notably, features that defined Team Hamilton included: internal competition, minimal organization, interdependency, voluntary membership, and narrow yet deep intimacy.

Internal competition among Team Members occurred over primacy in cycling skill and fitness. Proving one's self as better than another cyclist earned social status. Every ride provided a forum for testing one's mettle against others; consequently, the ranked order of cyclists by their cycling prowess was in constant flux. In comparison to other teams, Team Hamilton was not highly organized. Few formal positions, procedures, or rules existed to guide team members. Instead, team organization tended to be informal and/or imposed from the outside. However, despite lacking rigid organization, Team Hamilton members were considerably interdependent; cyclists relied upon one another for ride execution and knowledge, trail work, and safety. This independency was somewhat tenuous given that the voluntary membership meant that riders could exit the team at any time. At the same time, the intimate experiences riders shared through cycling created deep ties that discouraged members from curtailing participation that would have extinguished the team's existence. Still, in primarily limiting their interactions to cycling activities, the deep ties among riders tended to be single stranded, limiting the social knowledge riders had about one another.

These features influenced team members' behaviors and interactions, including how they managed conflict. In turn, the cases of conflict management reflected and produced a moral order that was palpable yet not overly aggressive in character – moral moderation.

Table 1.1: Characteristics Producing Moral Moderation

- Low levels of organization
- interdependency
- unsettled rank (internal competition)
- narrow but deep relationships
- voluntary participation

Moral Moderation, Moral Minimalism, and Moral Extremism: Variation in Moral Orders

Moral moderation contrasts to patterns of conflict management that prevail in other settings in which social structural features differ from those on Team Hamilton. For example, in hunting and gathering societies, members moved constantly, creating high levels of independence and little internal social cohesion. As a correlate to these weak ties, researchers found that hunter and gatherers placed a premium on avoiding conflict (Turnbull 1965; Lee & DeVore 1968; Lee 1979; Woodburn 1979; Robson 1980). Baumgartner's (1989) research on suburbia finds something similar: communities characterized by fluid and transient relationships experience low-level and infrequent conflict. In suburbia, residents rarely interacted with each other, were typically highly mobile, tended to relate to others vis-à-vis their occupational roles as opposed to their less-formal neighborly roles, were very individualist, and had little to no interdependency. These social conditions generated "little internal moral pressure" or moral

minimalism (Baumgartner 1989). Thus, instead of violent or even moderate confrontation, community members tolerated grievances or avoided those with whom they had conflict.

A strong community, as conceptualized by Baumgartner (1989) stand in contrast to these settings, like suburbia, in which moral minimalism prevails. In strong communities members are highly interdependent, tightly bound together through multiple strands of overlapping networks that produce high levels of intimacy. In such communities, instead of toleration and avoidance, more confrontational methods of conflict management arise, such as gossip, criticism, and even violence (Merry 1990). For example, Furer-Haimendorf (1967) found that violence among the Chenchu of India increased dramatically when, under British containment, their nomadic lifestyle was curtailed and avoidance became impossible. Similarly, violent conflict is often frequent and intense in horticultural societies, such as the Yanomamo, characterized by autonomous, residentially stable, clan-based villages (Chagnon 1996).

The obverse characteristics of the social structures and of the tenor of conflict among the Semai and the Waorani illustrate this point well (Cooney 1998). These two societies have different social structures: the Semai have a dense web of cross-cutting ties, while the Waorani tend to be divided up into independent, kin-based factions (Cooney 1998). They also have dissimilar patterns of conflict: the Semai are extremely peaceable, rarely engaging in physical violence (Robarchek and Robarchek 1992). In contrast, the Waorani are extremely violent; approximately one half of all adult deaths result from within group violence (Yost 1981). Cooney (1998) argues that the difference in levels of violence between these communities stems from their social structure: the Semai relied on third party intervention – that of the headmen – to negotiate disputes, but the Waorani, who all shared equal status within their community, lacked any social superiors that acted as settlement agents.

Calvin Morrill's (1995) work expands the point that social structure influences moral order or, put differently, that variation in organizational structure equates to variation in moral order. In an ethnographic study of executive work in 13 firms, Morrill found that culture and organizational structure within each company influenced conflict management among company executives. He distilled three distinct organizational contexts – atomistic, mechanistic, and matrix corporations – and found that executives' conflict management was similar across organizations with equivalent organizational structure and culture. Morrill theorized that these three distinct couplings of organizational context and conflict management created three types of moral orders.

In atomistic organizations, employees worked within weak but highly stable hierarchies; rank had little influence over conflict management. Executives within such organizations worked autonomously, their attentions focused specifically on their spheres of expertise. As a result, little collaboration and communication occurred between executives. In the face of these structures in which relationships were very loosely tied, principals engaged in conflict most often avoided each other. Traditional, professional firms, including law, accounting, engineering, architectural, and medicine firms, are those most likely structured as atomistic organizations.

In mechanistic bureaucracies, employees were stratified by a formal hierarchy; rank played a central role in how conflict was handled. This strong hierarchy structured communication among executives, limiting their interaction to those immediately close to them in the chain of authority. This hierarchy was highly stable, with little turnover or movement once a position is gained. Executives handled their grievances against those of lower rank through direct commands, while employees handled grievances with their superiors through gossip and avoidance. On occasion, mechanistic bureaucracies engendered harsh, punitive conflict,

sabotage, and vicious acts of subversion. In this context, very little negotiation occurred and, though formal grievance procedures exist, employees rarely use them. As the most common organizational form, mechanistic bureaucracies populate diverse fields from banking institutions to giant utility corporations.

Like atomistic organizations, matrix organizations operated with loosely formed formal hierarchies. Differing from both mechanistic and atomistic bureaucracies, executives in matrix organizations communicate frequently as a result of the fact that project teams overlay functional business units. When disputes arose within project teams, functional units often acted as coalitions. This undermined formal organizational hierarchies and challenged authority. As a result, matrix organizations had ambiguous lines of authority, weak formal hierarchies, and very little interdependence. The pattern of conflict within matrix organizations was one of negotiation and, often, negative reciprocity – vengeance. Originally utilized in the aerospace industry, as a new relatively new form of bureaucracy, matrix organizations typically structure high-tech work places and leading-edge companies.

To wit, Team Hamilton's pattern of conflict, and resulting moral order, could have resembled any one of the communities discussed above. For example, Team Hamilton's conflict pattern could have been very restrained, following the pattern of suburbanites. Alternatively, Team Hamilton's conflict could have taken a more aggressive tack, like conflict in mechanistic bureaucracies. Team Hamilton riders did not engage in fist fights, like the low-income African American youth studied by Elijah Anderson (1999;1989); they refrained from challenging each other to– and engaging in – duels, like that of twentieth century military officers and large landowners (Williams 1980; McAleer 1994); they did not kill those with whom they had a conflict, or seek out another to kill in their stead, like is commonplace among the Jivaro of

Ecuador and Peru (Harner 1972); and they never sought community-wide discussions when faced with grievances, like the Kpelle of Liberia (Gibbs 1963). Instead, though conflict in this team was pervasive, conflict management was typically subtle and non-aggressive. Overt instances of conflict management, such as violence, were rare. Disapproving of public conflict, members of this team frowned upon forthright discussion of cases of conflict.

This finding, that middle-class Team Hamilton members did not respond to grievances with violence and murder, is not overly surprising of high status people in contemporary U.S. society. However, historically, high status people often resorted to violence in response to tensions. For example, high status men in medieval Europe often responded to affronts with violence, as did men in middle to upper-middle class North American Families (Bloch 1961; Zillman 1990). Thus, the lack of violence between Team Hamilton members is not explained by their high status per say, but by the structure of their social relations.

Variation in Team Hamilton Conflict

Conflict management among Team Hamilton members varied, even in instances in which the issue ostensibly at the core of the conflict remained the same. The issues over which conflict arose were both interpersonal and riding specific. In practice, cyclists engaged in conflict over seemingly trivial issues, including but not limited to: passing each other on the trail, late arrivals, bike handling skills, the order in which riders entered singletrack trail, and sharing food.

However, what conflicts are about does not explain how they are handled. Marvin Wolfgang (1958) found this to be true in his research on homicide. He observed that trivial issues often provoked homicide, including issues such as "a jostle" or "a slight derogatory remark" (1958, p 189). The cases of conflict among Team Hamilton members that involved these

issues forged the moral order on Team Hamilton – moral moderation. Conflict management techniques ranged from avoidance, to sabotage, to gossip, to mockery, to toleration.

Avoidance, the curtailment of interaction, directly impacted interdependence. As an act that directly challenged this team's continued existence, in this setting avoidance – measured by time spent not attending team events or instances in which a rider was left out of team activities – was more conflict than sabotage, gossip, mocking, or toleration. When riders avoided particular others and curtailed interaction, the person being avoided was unable to safely ride, did not know trails to ride, and risked not being included in future team benefits, such as sponsorship. In consequence, over time, riders avoided by team members typically did not merely ride alone; avoided riders often ceased riding all together. Avoidance invoked by a single individual towards others or the team was often bilateral in form. Cases involving avoidance were common, often sparked by tensions over prior or on-going conflict. For example, after Krista angered Mac, she avoided him temporarily. In another case, Mike ignored Stan's (a repeat offender) prodding for trail food. In a different instance, Tony stopped attending group rides after not delivering on a promise he made to team members. In his case, and others like it, avoidance, essentially, meant expulsion from the team.

In addition, Team Hamilton members also sabotaged – a form of self help – each other. Sabotage was a more intense and malicious method for dealing with conflict than gossip, mocking, or toleration. Sabotage was an intentional act performed while riding and manifestly intended to inconvenience a cyclist who was riding, while performing the latent function of condemning deviant behavior. Sabotage included aggressively merging into another rider's physical space, forcing that rider to yield in order to make room, passing a rider aggressively, increasing the pace on a friendly ride to intentionally drop a rider, and purposefully slowing

11

down when in front of a rider. Sabotage was more negative as the detrimental effects to the targeted rider incurred increased. An example of a case of sabotage occurred when Greg deliberately forced Jeff off the road during a sprint and thus disabled his bid for the win on a competitive group ride after Jeff refused to stop at a store for Greg to refill his water. In another case involving sabotage, after Don started down the trail ahead of Mike, Mike passed Don aggressively at a perilous spot in the trail, sending Don to the ground in a crash. These cases and others involving sabotage, often sprung from on-going grievances, clashes over irresponsible bike handling, and tensions over team organizational/role details.

Gossip– a trial in absentia – was less conflict than avoidance and sabotage but more than mocking or toleration. Critical, attacking, riding-relevant gossip was more conflict than informational gossip. For example, gossip criticizing one's riding skills was more conflict than gossip sharing information about a rider's supposed sexual exploits. Further, conflict became more intense with an increase in the number of riders privy to the gossip. Conversely, the more exclusive the audience privy to gossip, the less confrontational the conflict. Riders gossiped amongst each other continuously. For example, Ellie asked Stan if he noticed how fat Rick looked. In another case, Chris disdainfully recounted to Jeff and Krista comments Mark made about Doc and Robert's daily rides with each other. In yet another incident, Nick gossiped about how Don always started down the trail before any one else, much to Nick's dismay.

Mocking, or making fun of someone to his/her face, was also a form of self-help, and was less conflict than avoidance, sabotage, or gossip. Similar to gossip in that it is verbal and often mimics storytelling, mocking was less conflict than gossip because it is not covert – the person who mocks did so openly. This afforded the person who was mocked the opportunity to defend him/herself and to respond immediately, features that potentially decrease social damage.

Mocking varied in intensity based on how closely or distorted it was from reality and how critically it attacked others. Mocking that touched on strong norms within this community was more conflict than mocking that spoke to general, society-wide topics. Issues that sparked mockery – but were not necessarily the topic of the mocking –included overly aggressive cycling behavior (increasing the speed of the ride for no apparent reason), a marked decrease in level of team participation, and repeated concern for any issue (i.e. being overly concerned with keeping your bicycle clean, with matching your cycling outfit, or for being home at a particular time). For example, distributing an email of a ride report that exaggerated a rider's actions while sprinting for the finish line as behavior that "nearly took [Bill] into the ditch" was more conflict than a report of how a rider "wore stupid yellow shorts we could see through" because the former case of mocking pertained to a cycling-specific act while the latter did not.

Toleration, the handling a grievance by doing nothing, prevailed as the behavior most cyclists employed when reacting to normative violations in this social community. In some cases, toleration was accompanied by another style of conflict management, such as gossip or mocking and in other cases it was the sole form of conflict management. Objectionable behavior that was tolerated ranged widely; most behaviors were tolerated unless continually repeated, including getting others lost during rides, forgetting functionally necessary clothing and equipment and thus needing to borrow from others, and arriving late to scheduled events. For example, Bill tolerated when Dave emailed a story mocking his marriage as the reason Bill missed group rides for two consecutive weeks. In a different case, Robert tolerated when Dan mocked his car as "the choice of homosexuals every where." In another instance, Maggie tolerated Alex's habitual lateness.

<u>Conflict Management and Team Structure</u>

The conflict management techniques (the social processes by which people pursue their grievances against one another) of toleration, gossip, self-help, and avoidance represent the dominant pattern of how riders on Team Hamilton responded in the face of tensions (Black 1976). Though they are presented as analytically distinct, in reality, they occurred on a continuum, as represented in Figure 1.

LESS: toleration——gossip——self-help (mockery and sabotage)——total exit (avoidance): MORE

<u>Figure 1. Continuum of Conflict Management Techniques.</u>

In order to glimpse the pattern of how Team Hamilton's social structure affected riders' reactions to grievances, consider the following cases that highlight particularly salient aspects of Team Hamilton:

Case 1.1:

In an interaction that highlighted the high degree of interdependency among them, Greg, Scott, Max, and Justin hashed out their strategy for winning the 24-hour team-relay race at hand, a discussion that include deciding who would race the first lap. With two additional features – a run en masse by competitors to their bikes and an extra distance added from the bikes to the start of the actual racecourse, the first lap covered more distance than any other lap and consequently took longer to complete. The strenuous run and the added distance that

14

only first lap racers competed put them at a disadvantage for winning the

race with in the race for the "fastest lap of the day." This individual

competition pitted all racers, even teammates, against each other for a high

status distinction.

Faced with this issue, despite knowing that a good performance on

the first lap was crucial to the overall outcome of the race for the team,[1]no

one volunteered to race the first lap: Greg looked at his shoes. Scott started

into the distance. Max and Justin shifted from one leg to the other. Greg

broke the silence and argued that he should not race the first lap because

he wanted to try to win the fastest lap prize, a goal he felt was reasonable

because he won this distinction the last two races. No one replied and they

lapsed into silence again. After more time passed, Scott stood up and said

he would do the lap on the condition that they all agreed he would not do

it again the next race and that he did not have to do any middle-of-the-

night laps. Max, Justin, and Greg readily concurred and began bustling

about to aid Scott in getting ready for the start of the race.

Case 1.2:

Jacob, Hank, and Will agreed that Craig inappropriately and

repeatedly cut them off during rides. They felt strongly about their

complaint against him and personalized their reaction by calling him

"CDC," which stood for "Craig on Crack," when they gossiped about his

---

[1] The more racers a competitor is in front of, the fewer obstacles in their way that might slow them down. For example, if a racer in front of you crashes, you lose time avoiding them. Or, if a racer in front of you is going slower than you would like to go, you lose time passing them. Therefore, the fewer people in front of you, the better your chances of winning.

behavior. After a while, they stopped attempting to keep Craig's nickname covert and instead called him CDC to his face, with no noticeable reaction from Craig, but never confrontationally redressed Craig for his behavior.

As summer turned to fall, these riders attended the Fall Tour mountain bike stage race. During the first stage, Jacob, Hank, and Will discussed how they needed to ensure they were in front of Craig at the start of the race sections so he could not cut them off. Jacob and Hank executed this plan without a hitch but Craig jumped in front of Will, who yielded and then passed him as the trail sloped uphill. However, on the next day's stage, when Craig made movement as if to again get in front of Will, Will emphatically reprimanded Craig, telling him not to. Craig complied and paused while Will surged in front. A similar situation played out on the next stage but instead of Will, Hank yelled loudly at Craig not to get in front of him. In his tirade against Craig, Hank rhetorically asked him if he, Craig, was on crack and accused him of always being in the way.

Case 1.3:

Nick and his wife, Casey, decided to refinance their house. To sign the paperwork needed to complete the transaction, they drove to a real estate lawyer in town chosen by the bank. After a few minutes in the waiting area, the firm's secretary escorted them to a room and introduced them to the closing attorney. To both Nick's and the attorney's surprise, they knew each other – they rode bikes together at 3:30 p.m. almost every

day. Nick took the opportunity to introduce his wife Casey to his riding

buddy, Frank. After they left, Nick and Casey discussed with their

intimate friend Susan how they felt awkward that Frank now knew some

of their financial business. Nick regretted this, noting that he wished a

different attorney had presided over the closing.

At 3:30 p.m. that same day, Frank and Nick met each other and

two others for their daily ride together. Frank and Nick told the story of

their morning and the group marveled over the coincidence. During the

next few hours, Frank and the other two riders rehashed their experiences

together over the years. They spoke of the time they were lost for over six

hours in a storm, of the year when Frank won the TBL with Nick's help,

and of how Nick's quick temper put him into perilous situations with other

riders from which Frank helped extract him, among other events.

Uncharacteristically silent, Nick added little to the conversation. Back at

their cars, the riders packed their gear while confirming with each other

that they would again ride at the same time and from the same place

tomorrow. Without agreeing that he would be there, Nick jumped into his

car and drove away.

Case 1.4:

As Jenny declined a second glass of wine, she complained that she wished

tomorrow's ride would start later. She argued that 8 a.m. was torture,

noted that no one she spoke with wanted to leave so early, and vowed to

advocate for a later start time on rides for the rest of the year. Chris

listened to Jenny's tirade without interrupting. When she finished, Chris

reminded her that she voluntarily attended the 8 a.m. rides. Jenny

responded that she obviously knew she chose to ride at that hour but noted

that these rides were the only avenue by which she would get a quality and

safe workout. Chris poured Jenny another glass of wine. She took a sip

and mentioned that she would ride next Saturday and skip tomorrow.

Greg, who had been quite up to this point, spoke up and suggested to

Jenny that she had to go to the ride tomorrow because she promised him

they would car-pool to the out-of-town meeting point. Jenny sat up from

her reclined position and asked him why he was not able to go alone,

without her. Greg shook his head and walked out of the room without a

word. Jenny, who had sat up in attention when Greg spoke, lay back down

on the couch silently. Shortly after, despite her full wine glass, Jenny

stood and said good-bye for the evening, noting that she had to wake early

to ride.

Each of these cases highlights the influence a particular feature of Team Hamilton's

social matrix had on conflict among team members. The distinctive methods by which each of

the principals in these cases reacted to a grievance are notable and illustrate the moral

moderation of Team Hamilton. Much of the conflict was managed through low-level methods

such as toleration and avoidance, but other conflict was handled more forcefully and included

yelling, gossip, and mocking.

Case 1.1 shows an instance in which internal competition clashed with the

interdependency among riders on the same team. All four racers wanted to compete for the

fastest lap of the day, a goal that interfered with the interdependency needed to achieve their goal of winning the overall race. This team is not alone in experiencing this paradox. It also characterizes a number of other teams found within capitalist industry, the military, and sports in general. Work place team members need to work together in order to successfully fulfill company and business goals. These same team members also compete with each other for promotions, awards, and rewards. The military operates in a similar manner: Soldiers rely on each other to succeed in their missions and, in combat situations, for their lives. However, soldiers compete within their units for privilege in duty and recognition. So, too, in sports such as swimming, gymnastics, and cycling, team members compete against each other while simultaneously working together so that their team might win.

Case 1.2 captures how conflict was shaped by the organization of social life that dominated particular moments in time. In other words, organization on Team Hamilton varied by activity and affected conflict accordingly. In this case, Jacob, Hank, and Will tolerated and poked-fun at Craig's violation of the informal rules when low-level organization that was typical for Team Hamilton prevailed. However, when organization increased during a race, Jacob, Hank, and Will handled their conflict differently. Instead of tolerating and mocking Craig's behavior, they used more aggressive conflict management techniques that included yelling and personal attacks.

This temporal and activity-based variation in organization is a frequent occurrence within organizations. For example, political parties are less organized during the times between elections than they are during elections. Likewise, schools are more organized during the hours in which school is in session and less organized after the children go home for the day. In each of these examples, conflict varies as the organization of the setting increases and decreases. For

example, children who are forbidden to run in the halls in the morning may not elicit harsh reprimand if they did the same behavior while waiting for a PTA meeting their parents are attending to conclude.

Case 1.3 focuses on the intimacy between cyclists on the team. On the one hand, a high degree of intimacy existed between riders. Many members of this team knew each other for many years, spent a great deal of time in each other's company, and shared many experiences. On the other hand, despite a high degree of intimacy among riders, team member relationships were generally single-stranded. Riders came together regularly to participate in events that often consumed a great deal of time (some times hours, other events may unfold over days), but they typically spent more of their day engaged in activities besides cycling. This created a typical rider whose relationship with other riders was very deep but also very narrow, with little to no overlapping networks.

The case detailed here illustrates the relationships commonly found between team members. Frank and Nick were highly intimate in a very particular context – while riding. In this setting they experienced many events that created intimacy and deepened their relationship. However, the fact that Nick and Frank were surprised to find themselves doing business together shows that despite their on-the-bike intimacy, they shared little in their lives outside of cycling. Further, as illustrated by Nick's discomfort with Frank's knowledge of his finances and Nick's subsequent avoidance of Frank, narrow ties engender particular grievances and affect conflict. This single-strand style of relationship among an organization's members pervades modern life and includes work, school, and leisure teams such as the local adult softball league, church teams, and political teams. Deep and narrow networks are distinct elements of modern life. As globalization decentralizes power, people in all societies are involved in multiple groups and

networks. This echoes the findings of Marx, Weber, Durkheim, and Simmel, who all noted that as the division of labor becomes increasingly more complex in modernity, social life becomes multifaceted and the number of social worlds in which people participate expands.

Case 1.4 shows the influence of voluntarily participation on conflict. This is sociologically interesting because as traditional authority continues to decline, people are free to join organizations of their own choosing. In doing so, they self-submit to rules and regulations that they might otherwise avoid as influences on their behavior.

In this case, Jenny initially chose riding over drinking wine but then changed her mind, choosing to have a drink instead of riding. The freedom to change her mind – to choose whether or not to participate – is a powerful influence on Team Hamilton members. Likewise, in this case, the element of voluntary participation influenced the pattern of conflict, seen here when Greg avoids the conflict by exiting, instead of pursuing, the grievance to resolution. Notable voluntary teams include voter registration teams, volunteer firefighters and rescue-squad teams, as well as teams internal to organizations such as the Elks, Shriners, and Masons, and recreational or club team sports.

Why Study Team Hamilton

This research shows that community, or organizational, structure is linked to moral order and how community members manage conflict. Therefore, research that sheds light on these patterned elements of any community informs general knowledge about our contemporary social world, as well as situations in which conflict is likely to arise and the severity it will take. Thus, though extreme instances of conflict demand attention, every day conflict is some times no less disruptive, perhaps just less dramatic. In fact, from a pure sociology perspective – which is

discussed in detail in chapter two, these two levels of conflict are very much alike in that they can both be predicted and explained through generic aspects of social structure, only the location of the conflict with in this social structure varying and producing the differences in conflict type. Therefore, though large-scale and violent conflict typically demands explanation more so than family, office, or team conflict, scientifically understanding one informs an understanding of the other. Thus, to the end of understanding conflict in general, that of war, terrorism, or homicide, as well as less dramatic instances such as criticism, sabotage, or gossip, I study conflict through ethnography of a commonplace organization: Team Hamilton.

As discussed previously, teams are a common type of modern social organization. In particular, teams in which members are functionally interdependent but compete with one another, are narrowly intimate, and join voluntarily pervades our contemporary social landscape. As a result, so too does the moral order that is characteristic of these organizations color modern life. As such, these teams' distinctive patterns of social relationships, and the conflict associated with this pattern, are significant for sociological understandings of our contemporary social world in general, research on organizations, and scholarship on conflict. Mapping the social conditions that prevail within a given social world provides insight into conflicts that will arise, and subsequently, when peace or conflict will prevail. As the global economy continues to strengthen, transnational travel is accomplished with increasing ease, multicultural spaces increase in number, and natural resources become scarcer, the potential for conflict increases. Thus, knowledge about peace and conflict, including when each will arise, as well as the severity and form of peace or conflict will take, will be invaluable to understanding the behavior of present day social life.

CHAPTER 2

"MANAGING CONFLICT IS LIKE RIDING A BICYCLE, ALL YOU NEED IS BALANCE

AND PRACTICE, PRACTICE, PRACTICE." – ANGELA JACKSON

Explaining conflict has been a central concern for scholars throughout the history of the

social sciences. Colleges and universities have even developed specialized departments to pursue

this topic, and specific journals, such as the Journal of Conflict Resolution and the Journal of

Peace Research, dedicate their pages to academic conversation on the subject. Conflict, as a

social phenomenon, spans settings and times. It occurs between nation-states, within

communities, among family members, between strangers, and within organizations, among other

settings. The settings in which conflict occurs are diverse, the issues over which conflict arise are

equally numerous, and the way in which conflict is dealt with varies dramatically. As a result,

attempts to explain conflict have resulted in much speculation, many hypotheses, and multiple

theories.

For example, Robert Jackall (1988) argues that conflict occurs as a result of particular

organizational structuring in which factions with cross-purposes compete for such things as

organizational resources. Likewise, Jassawalla and Sashittal (1999) argue that high levels of

conflict result from organizations with high levels of complexity and differentiation. Noting this,

they suggest that organizational members coordinate planning and reduce bureaucracy in order to

decrease conflict. In addition, Molnar and Rogers (1979) find that conflict results from rules,

policies, and procedures. According to Lovelace et al (2001), the method by which team members communicate incurs more or less conflict.

Arguing that psychological propensities explain conflict, Pelled (1996), suggests that group-members' attitudes create conflict. Similarly, Jehn and Mannix (2001) argue that the level of respect among group members is linked to conflict. Specifically, these authors posit that high levels of respect, open-discussion norms, and a supportive team environment reduces conflict. Nemeth and Staw (1989) take a similar tack, contending that groups in which members have similar attitudes or values towards their task have low conflict. They suggest that mutually held norms promote harmony and decrease interpersonal tensions (Nemeth and Staw 1989; Schneider 1983). Echoing these findings, Bar-Tal (1989) and Schein (1986) argue that conflict, in the form of friction and emotional upset, occurs when group-members differ on core values and beliefs about the task in which they are engaged. Likewise, Blake and Mouton (1964, 1970) contend that conflict management styles vary with a person's level of concern for others and for the task at hand.

These diverse and numerous explanations indicate the lack of agreement within the social sciences about how to theorize conflict, which, as a state of affairs, reflects the multidimensionality of conflict itself. This leads some scholars to conclude that conflict should be explained by particularistic theories. For instance, Hager et al (1956) argue that religious and ethnic and racial conflicts are fundamentally different and specific theories are needed to explain each one. Likewise, Janowitz (1957) argues that because of the unique characteristics of the nation-states involved in war, particular explanations are needed for each instance of such conflict. In other words, advocates of particular theories argue that understanding the unique features of each case of conflict yields more explanation than any general theory could provide.

However, general patterns that characterize conflict exist and have been discerned through the efforts of scientists across disciplines, including law, psychology, economics, political science, and sociology. These patterns suggest that a general approach to explaining conflict is not only possible, but is desirable in that it would provide a great deal of analytical purchase for an entire class of phenomena (Fink 1968).

A central goal of this study is to demonstrate the systematic connections between conflict and its social environment, as well as query the relationship between behavior and moral order. In light of these concerns, a general theory rather than a particularistic one is more fitting. Three general theories in particular offer highly compelling explanations: rational choice theory, new institutionalism, and pure sociology.

Rational Choice Theory

Incorporating elements from the works of classical thinkers such as Jeremy Bentham and Adam Smith, rational choice theory fundamentally queries how order and cooperation are possible. In doing so, rational choice theory explains the effect of the interdependent action of individuals on the behavior of the social system as a whole. The rational choice paradigm rests on the basic assumption that human behavior results from purposive, rational action designed to achieve particular ends. In considering action, rational choice theorizes that individuals weigh the costs of actions against the benefits and follow the course that is most rational of all possible alternative courses of action given their calculation. The logical derivative of these assumptions is that all human action – including conflict – is rational action committed for a specific and agreeable gain.

In attributing a fundamental psychological process to all – a process in which individuals weigh costs and benefits, always seeking to maximize the latter – rational choice theory is highly generalizable and avoids the entanglement of individuals' psychologies. For example, take conflict, homicide. Instead of pondering motivations for committing homicide, rational choice explains homicide as an action someone undertakes that offers the greatest benefit to cost ratio of any behavior. The same explanation holds for all individuals, groups, and organizations across time and space. For example, a drug-dealer who kills a competitor with whom s/he has conflict does so because s/he gains more from the act than the act costs her/him whether the action took place in an alleyway in the year 1955 or in front of the post office in 2005. Likewise, a corporation bribes officials in the face of conflict because it perceives the risks as less than the benefits accrued from doing so.

As these elements show, the rational choice paradigm is notable on many dimensions: the premises are straight forward, the argument clear and simple, and the model is explicit. James Coleman (1986) notes these appealing elements of rational choice, arguing that, "If an institution or a social process can be accounted for in terms of the rational actions of individuals, then and only then can we say that it has been 'explained'."

New Institutionalism

New institutional theory developed to explicitly acknowledge – and theorize –the role of institutions in society. New institutionalism, like rational choice theory, rests on the basic assumption that action results from rationality. However, while both paradigms stem from the choice-theoretic tradition, they define rationality differently. As discussed above, classic rational choice theory, like that theorized by Coleman (1990), reduces rationality to that which is

instrumental. In contrast, in new institutionalism, instrumental rationality is but one aspect of rationality that also includes cognitive rationality (Brinton & Nee 1998). In addition, while rational choice theorists assert that individuals create institutions to further their preferences, new institutionalists suggest the opposite: institutions determine individuals.

Central to new institutionalism is the assumption that institutions matter because they determine action by setting limits through cultural and social factors (Koelble 1995). In other words, the social environment in which an institution is situated, including the state, other institutions, conventions, and customs constrains and enables action. From this point of view, then, action is not simply the result of economic or technological factors. In addition, foregrounding the institutionally molded individual, new institutionalism also assumes that individuals shape and reinforce their institutional environment from within through interaction (Brinton & Nee 1998). In other words, new institutionalism emphasizes the institutionally molded, cognitive role of individuals within organizations in explaining patterns and processes across and within organizations. Thus, of interest to new institutionalists are the processes through which individuals reinforce and further shape the institutions in which they are embedded. Put differently, organizations establish normative 'ways of doing' that constrain actors' behaviors by making alternative actions inconceivable. In turn, actors create and enforce the organizational structures in which they are embedded.

By arguing that cognition and culture play dominating roles in organizations' behavior, new institutionalism theorizes that action results from the likes of norms, values, ideas, cultural objects, rules, rituals, scripts, and other elements of culture, in addition to instrumental calculuses of costs and benefits. This emphasis undergirds the assumption within new institutionalism that behavior is explained with attention to the particular situations in which actors are embedded. In

other words, new institutionalism assumes that variables in specific cultural sites influence action in particular ways and, as such, must be considered in any analysis. This suggests that every organization has the potential to behave uniquely. However, new institutionalists, most notably Paul DiMaggio and Walter Powell (1983), find that like-organizations behave similarly. They explain that this isomorphism across organizational fields is, in part, the result of formal rules organizations must follow as dictated by state and industry regulations and the rational decisions organizations make that are structured by these external forces. In addition, new institutionalists also assert that isomorphism arises from the behaviors of an organization's internal actors that are molded by an organizational culture that strives, as its primary objective, to reduce uncertainty and to gain and maintain legitimacy (DiMaggio & Powell 1983).

In attempting to gain and maintain legitimacy, organizations model each other, including elements such as workforces, what criteria CEOs must meet, when and what products to launch, the salary each employee earns, and how to deal with conflict. These borrowed processes then structure interaction among members and create an internal organizational culture that reinforces these same behaviors. These processes create a cognitive platform for action in the form of norms, beliefs, rituals, and so on. With regards to conflict, a new institutionalist analysis would attribute patterns of conflict within a single organization to an organization's internal culture that is structured by its embeddedness within a field of other, similar organizations. For example, an incident in which a boss sexually harasses a secretary who then tolerates the act is, in a new institutionalist analysis, explained as the result of cultural notions regarding how to behave in the work place. In other words, conflict, here, is a taken-for-granted practice delimited by an overarching organizational culture.

Pure Sociology

Based on the premise that social life behaves, pure sociology focuses on the social

element of action. As such, pure sociology can be applied to any type of social behavior. Donald

Black (1976) invented pure sociology in the course of explaining the behavior of law. In his

book entitled the same (The Behavior of Law), Black (1976) provided a testable theory that

synthesized previous work in legal sociology. This theory combined theoretical traditions,

building on the work of Karl Marx (1890), Emile Durkheim (1893; 1897), Max Weber (1922a;

1922b), Talcott Parsons (1951; 1962; 1966) and William Graham Sumner (1906). Since this

original publication, pure sociology has been gaining adherents who have applied the theory to a

diverse range of subjects. To date, it has been used to explain aspects of art, science, and

medicine, though it has been applied most extensively to conflict management. With regards to

conflict, pure sociology focuses on reactions to deviance, conceptualizing these reactions as

social control or, as the terminology used in this study, conflict management. Thus

conceptualized, conflict management is a dependent variable that can be readily studied by

observers. The body of work drawing on pure sociology to explain conflict includes: genocide

(Campbell 2009), conflicts between immigrants and natives in Ireland (Cooney 2009), how

conflict is managed in daycare centers (Baumgartner 1992), between nations (Borg 1992), by the

state (Cooney 1997), among the mentally ill (Horwitz 1982), between domestic partners

(Michalski 2005), in medical malpractice litigation (Mullis 1995), as collective action (Senchal

de la Roche 1996, 2001), and in employee-owned organizations (Tucker 1999), among others.

Pure sociology explains the behavior of social life by its location and direction in social

space (Black 2000). This social geometry – the social structure of relationships among the people

involved – patterns the responses to and management of any social behavior. In other words,

pure sociology treats behavior as a dependent variable explained by its location and direction in social space – by structure. As such, pure sociology does not query psychology or personal characteristics, but holds these factors constant.

Social Geometry

Social Space Dimensions

Analytically, pure sociology breaks social space into five distinct dimensions: vertical, horizontal, symbolic, corporate, and normative. The vertical dimension of social space captures stratification, specifically the unequal distribution of material resources. Horizontal space encapsulates people's relations to each other in terms of intimacy, integration, participation, and embeddedness in the social world around them, and their relation to the center of social life, or their radial location. Symbolic space refers to the distribution of culture, including similarities and differences in norms, customs, ideas, values, languages, and religions. The corporate dimension of social space represents the degree of organization characterizing a group. Lastly, normative space measures reputation with reference to any conflict management someone might be or has been subject to.

Status

The location of a person or persons within this matrix relative to the location of others is status (Black 1998). Though we may speak of an overarching, average status, a person's status may, and in fact often does, vary within social space dimension. For example, a waste management person may have high vertical status but low symbolic status. Similarly, a cyclist who rarely attends rides has less horizontal status than riders who often participate in team

events. The distance between people refers to the degree to which their statuses coincide. Thus, a sponsored rider and a non-sponsored rider are separated by greater corporate distance than two sponsored riders; in other words, sponsored riders have more corporate status than non-sponsored.

Direction

In specifying social geometry, direction is also important. In other words, taking conflict management as the dependent variable, conflict can move vis-à-vis status, upward, downward, laterally, or in a radial direction. An employee criticizing his boss is an example of conflict management moving upward in corporate space, while a judge convicting a felon is an example of punishment moving downward in vertical space. Two professional category cyclists of equal organizational and vertical status fighting after a race is an example of conflict management moving laterally in direction. Social control moving from the center of social life, where social control is highest, towards the margins, where people are less integrated, has an outward radial direction.

Forms of Conflict Management

In addition to styles, Black (1978) also theorizes five forms of social control. Self-help as a conflict management technique is the handling of a grievance through unilateral aggression, such as between a parent and a child, or bilateral aggression, as in the case of a feud. Like self-help, the conflict management form of avoidance – the curtailment of interaction – may also be unilateral; however, if both parties curtail interaction simultaneously, avoidance may also be bilateral. The negotiation form of conflict management – joint decision-making leading to a solution – is bilateral. In contrast to these forms, settlement – a trilateral form of conflict

management – involves a third party facilitating resolution. Lastly, toleration – inaction, as a form of conflict management, may be initiated by one party, adopted by two parties, or urged by a third party.

Social Control as a Quantitative Variable

As illustrated above, responses to grievances take various forms and styles. The differences in degree, in terms of force and violence, between these responses define the severity of conflict management. These differences may be measured as quantitative variables: the more forceful and violent a behavior, the greater the quantity (Black 1993). For example, punching some one for passing aggressively on their bike is more self-help than gossiping about the pass. In turn, gossiping about the passing move is more self-help than tolerating the behavior and acting as if it never occurred

Thus conceptualized, conflict can be measured and compared across time and space, even in the face of changing, relativistic, and biased evaluations of deviance, because of this focus on reactions to deviance at the case level. This highlights a central feature of pure sociology: it explains behavior across time and space and is thus highly generalizable.

Propositions

Pure sociology states explicit, general propositions that explain patterns of conflict. Black formulates a number of propositions about the relationship between conflict and social status (vertical, horizontal, organizational, cultural, and normative) and social distance (relational and cultural). The propositions relevant for this study can be condensed to: 1) downward conflict is more intense than upward conflict; 2) in a downward direction, conflict intensity increases with

vertical distance, and in an upward direction, conflict intensity decreases with vertical distance; and 3) conflict intensity increases with relational distance (Black 1993).

The first proposition asserts that a higher status person will exercise harsher methods of conflict management against a lower status person than a lower status person will exert against a higher status person. For example, a high status cyclist is likely to yell at a low status cyclist who caused a wreck while attempting to pass, but a low status cyclist is more likely to tolerate a high status cyclist that caused a wreck while attempting to pass. The second proposition suggests that conflict becomes more or less intense as the vertical distance between those involved in a conflict varies. For example, a professional (high status) cyclist with a grievance against another professional but less accomplished cyclist is likely to gossip about this lower status professional in the face of tensions. However, instead of gossiping, this same professional (high status) cyclist is more likely to yell at a much lower status, beginning cyclist, instead of merely gossip about him/her. Likewise, a beginner rider is more likely to tolerate tensions if the person involved in the conflict is a professional cyclist than if the person involved is a fellow amateur cyclist, in which case the beginner is apt to yell or employ some other discordant conflict management. The third proposition states that, for example, cyclists who race on the same team are more likely to tolerate questionable behaviors from each other than they are from cyclists on other teams.

The propositions outlined here that make predictions about definite relationships between variables, and the pure sociology approach itself, are testable. As such, some facts are inconsistent with it. For example, if upward conflict was consistently more intense than downward conflict, pure sociology as it is currently formulated would be falsified.

Analytical Purchase: Explaining Conflict on Team Hamilton

All three of the theories discussed above offer compelling explanations of conflict. However, in the discussion that follows, pure sociology proves the most effective explanation for the data of this particular study in light of the research's goals. Take, for example, the case in which Dave hit Chris with a 2x4. New institutionalism explains this case with attention to the issue over which the conflict interaction arose. New institutionalism maintains that in the face of this issue that catalyzed the conflict – Chris forcing Dave over the while line of the road onto the shoulder – Dave responded isomorphically, his behavior structured by the rituals, norms, and other elements of organizational culture that constrain and enable behavior on Team Hamilton. So, Dave hitting Chris with the 2x4 is explained as a function of organization culture carried out by an organizationally molded individual in the face of an issue for which a blueprint exits on how to respond to said issue.

Stopping the analysis here, such a new institutionalist explanation is informative and sound. However, negative cases contradict this explanation, showing it insufficiently explains other cases with like issues. In other words, on Team Hamilton, many cases occurred over the issue of one cyclist pushing another off the road while riding. Yet, the same degree of violent conflict as response to this behavior was rare. For example, Max ran Ben off the road during a sprint finish and Ben tolerated him doing so. In another case, Mark pushed Alex off the road and Alex responded by yelling at Mark. In yet another instance, Doug merged into Alex, forcing him off the road. In this case, Stan, a third party, mocked Doug for his action but no instance of violence arose. Further, Alex did not yell in response in this case, though he did so in another case over the same behavior that involved a different principal, Mark. In all three of these cases the issue of one rider forcing another off the road and into the shoulder was the same. Again, in

all these cases the institutional setting stayed constant. Yet, the reaction to these issues varied across cases. Thus, while issues are relevant to instances of conflict, they are insufficient for fully explaining it. Therefore, the conceptual system of new institutionalism does not explain the variation in reactions to similar issues across cases in this study of Team Hamilton.

Analyzing these same cases, rational choice theory explains these instances of conflict with recourse to the preferences of each principal involved in the conflict. Take, again, the case in which, Dave hit Chris with the 2x4. Rational choice theory explains Dave's actions as the rational outcome arrived at through Dave's personal cost/benefit analysis. Similarly, rational choice theory explains that Ben tolerated Max's action because Ben found it the most rational course of action of all those available to him. Likewise, Alex yelled at Mark for forcing him off the road, instead of hitting him with a 2x4 or tolerating the behavior, because Alex's calculated costs and benefits for doing so positioned yelling as the most rational response. So, too, did Alex tolerate Doug – but not Mark – when run off the road, because in both cases Alex benefited the most from his differing responses. As this analysis shows, rational choice theory accounts well for the variation across all these cases of conflict. Thus, when applied to the same set of cases rational choice does a better job than new institutionalism in explaining the variation and the conflict itself, and it does so in a much less complex way. In contrast to new institutionalism, then, rational choice can account for these cases where there is a great deal of variation in response to a same issue.

Pure sociology, too, explains the variation in these cases of conflict, but does so with a drastically different approach: it looks to the social geometry of each instance of conflict and explains the responses as a function of relational positions of each principal involved in the conflict. This method, unlike that of rational choice theory and new institutionalism, does not

pay attention to the issue over which the conflict ostensibly occurred. As a result, pure sociology unproblematically explains variation across cases in which conflict erupts over similar issues but with very different outcomes. Pure sociology explains the conflict between Dave and Chris, that between Max and Ben, between Alex and Mark, and between Alex, Doug, and Stan with reference to the positions of each of these principals in relation to each other in five dimensions of social space. In the case involving Dave and Chris, their equivalent vertical status explains the conflict (social status). Ben tolerated Max because they were intimates (social distance). In the case in which Alex yelled at Mark, the conflict is explained by the fact that Mark was lower in vertical status than Alex (social status). In contrast, Alex had less vertical status than Doug, which explains why he tolerated Doug's behavior (social status). As this analysis shows, these pure sociological explanations emphasize the social geometry of each case, which allows for the theory to account for the great variation across cases.

Irrational Conflict

Despite the straightforward, explicit model rational choice theory offers for explaining the variation in conflict across cases in which riders pushed others off the road, it does not as clearly explain other classes of cases. Consider, for instance, the following cases: In one case Krista capitulated to Iona's request that Krista allow Iona to win instead of sprinting her for the finish, a sprint Krista felt assured that she would have won. In another case, during a race, Mark repeatedly sped up and ignored Ellie, after she caught him, whenever Ellie requested permission to pass Mark on the trail. When Mark did this, he gained a few feet as Ellie kept her pace constant instead of matching Mark's momentary bursts of speed. After the third time of speeding up, Mark could no longer hold Ellie off and she passed him. However, the physical effect of

these successive spurts of energy designed to stop Ellie from passing him ultimately drastically slowed the pace Mark could sustain. Too weak to comfortably finish racing, Mark ultimately dropped out of the race. In another case, Ben, Sam, Mark, Krista, Will, Doc, Robert, and Greg gave Mac money to buy jerseys for them. Mac never did so and never explained what he did with the money. All those who gave Mac money tolerated this though it meant the lost of $185 per person.

Each of these cases represents an instance in which a principal responded to an issue in a way that appears detrimental to their self-interests. In the case involving Krista, she gave up what, in her words, was an almost guaranteed victory to instead follow Iona's dictates. In Mark's case, he paid the consequences for exceeding the physical limits of his body by ultimately dropping out of a race he paid to enter instead of letting Ellie pass on the trail. And in the last case, multiple riders tolerated the loss of money for no clear gain and without compensation.

From a rational choice perspective, these cases are all explained as outcomes of each principal involved in the cases' personal calculus of costs and benefits. However, this explanation is not wholly satisfying because these behaviors do not seem rational, and in fact may be characterized as irrational in that the principals incurred costs with little perceivable benefit. This paradox brings to light two disadvantages of the explanation of these cases made by rational choice theory: First, this apparently irrational behavior cannot be accounted for, except to say that it is rational for some reason to the principals involved, a lackluster explanation to be sure. This issue further begs the question: How, as a researcher, can we know the costs and benefits of each actor? In addition, if we were to somehow access these costs and benefits – that exist within the black box of the mind – than how do we measure them? Knowing the costs and benefits – how an individual ranks his or her preferences – is an essential component to

understanding the moral order on Team Hamilton. Thus, these features of rational choice theory are unfavorable to achieving the goals of this research.

In contrast to rational choice, new institutionalism offers a different tack for explaining these same cases in that it analyzes the conflict as the outcome of cultural processes structured by the organization in which the principals involved in the cases are embedded and the overarching institutional field in which the organization itself acts. With this focus, new institutionalism views each Team Hamilton member's behavior as constrained by "how things are done" and/or explicit rules and rituals that pervades and structures Team Hamilton. For example, in the case involving Krista and Iona, rules govern behavior. In particular, organizational rules detail criteria for disqualifying riders that have bike problems – such as Krista did prior to the case of conflict with Iona. Thus, by taking a broader lens to the case, Krista's behavior to not sprint Iona is explained as structured by the general rules regulating competition in cycling. For the case involving Mark and Ellie, a new institutionalism explanation of Mark's actions is that his actions were consistent with the general rituals and habits structuring interaction between men and women that rest on the belief that men are superior to women and, as such, are stronger, faster, and better riders. Viewed as a part of an institutional belief system, this case is consistent with other, like cases that occurred among Team Hamilton members in which men acted against their apparent self-interests in the face of a woman challenging the patriarchal order. For example, Greg picked up and carried Valerie's bike without asking her if she needed the assistance during a ride in the high altitude in which Greg had a hard time breathing. Carrying Valerie's bike physically taxed Greg in environmental conditions already challenging him. In another instance, Sam gave his remaining water to Krista during a very hot ride on a route with no opportunity to refill water. Sam's sacrifice contributed to the heat exhaustion that ultimately forced him to walk

several miles of trail to cool down. However, though apparently irrational, Mark's self-defeating actions are in keeping with the institutional belief of gender that structure behavior on Team Hamilton and in cycling in general. Lastly, a new institutionalist explanation of the case involving Mac and the money others gave him is that Team Hamilton riders, like many members of small groups, do not discus money at all. In fact, in American culture in general, discussions of money are considered taboo (Trachtman 1999). Other cases that arose on Team Hamilton support this explanation, including Valerie not asking Stan for money that Stan borrowed from Valerie to pay for his restaurant meal, Jake not asking Chris for money that Chris owed Jake in compensation for breaking Chris's ladder, and Nick not asking Derrick for prize money that Derrick owed Nick for Nick winning a race Derrick organized.

However, as discussed with the preceding set of cases, these new institutionalist explanations do not account for the variation in behavior across the same issues on Team Hamilton. In other words, while these new institutionalist explanations coherently explained numerous cases, many cases also arose that conflicted with these same explanations. For example, as counter point to the new institutionalist explanation of Krista's behavior as that which was structured by organizational rules, though the rules of mountain bike racing prohibit riders from receiving any help from others and many racers adhered to this rule, many racers flagrantly violated rules. For example, on many occasions, racers both aided others with bike problems while racing and accepted help during races. In contrast to the case in which Mark refused to let Ellie pass him, many instances arose in which men tolerated women passing them. Further, many other like-instances occurred that were inconsistent with this new institutionalism explanation of sharing water. For example, in one case, Maggie asked if any one had water to spare and no one aided her despite the many riders with still full water bottles. In another

instance, Bill tolerated when Tina pushed him up a hill so that he could stay with the peloton[2], a behavior that squarely challenges gendered notions of strength. Finally, with regard to the new institutionalist explanation of why no rider demanded Mac account for the money the gave him, many cases arose in which Team Hamilton members did ask for repayment of loans and payment for goods and services. For example, in one instance, Oliver asked Howard, Lance, and Sam for gas money in return for riding in his car. In another instance, Brian refused to give Charlie money for a drink on the basis that Charlie still owed Brian money for the last time Brian lent him money. In light of these counter-point cases, new institutionalism does not adequately account for the variation in response to issues that arise at the case level.

Applying pure sociology to these same "irrational" cases yields yet a third explanation. As with the first set of cases, pure sociology explains these instances of conflict by analyzing the social space associated with the case. The case in which Krista capitulates to Iona is explained by Iona's superior social status. The case in which Mark attempts to thwart Ellie from passing is likewise explained by the organizational dimension in which these riders are acting that hierarchically positions Ellie as inferior to Mark (social status). And, the case in which riders tolerate Mac stealing money from them is explained by the social distance between riders, specifically in terms of intimacy and interdependency (social distance). Moreover, this approach also coherently explains cases that appear to be in distinct contradiction to these examples, again, by focusing on the social geometry of the cases and not the issues over which the conflict emerged or the preferences of the principals involved in the case.

As this comparison of theories shows, pure sociology is the best fit for explaining the cases in this study of Team Hamilton, as well as for achieving the goals of this study. The

---

[2] The main group of riders formed during a cycling race.

primary reason pure sociology is a best fit for this data and the social behavior of interest –

conflict - is that it does not look to the particular characteristics of the actors – the principals

themselves or the organizations – for explanation. Instead, pure sociology analyzes the social

geometry of the case and explains the outcome of the case through dimensions of social space. In

other words, even when faced with the same issue, a single individual's behavior often fluctuates

dramatically, and individuals even, at times, behave in contradictory ways. This phenomenon

poses a problem for theories that base their analyses on actors' characteristics. The difficulty for

these theories lies in the fact that an individual's characteristics are robustly constant in that

actors take them with them into a great variety of settings. Yet, despite the consistency of these

characteristics, actors do not engage in conflict all of the time. In fact, relative to other behaviors,

instances of conflict are rare. Pure sociology overcomes this paradox by analyzing the social

geometry of actors involved in cases of conflict. By accounting for the social space in which

behavior occurs – the geometry of the case – instead of focusing on individuals' characteristics,

pure sociology overcomes the problem associated with the great variation in behavior actors'

exhibit.

Another strength of pure sociology for explaining this data is that it avoids subjective

data insofar as the theory focuses on the external behaviors of individuals and not their internal

logics, motives, meanings, cost/benefit analyses, or psychologies. This latter feature decreases

the subjectivity of the data that is inherent in any scientific study. This highlights more general,

central advantage of pure sociology: it explains behavior across time and space, is thus highly

generalizable, and makes explicit propositions that make no assumptions that the individual or

society is rational, functional, and so on.

For example, consider the phenomenon of arrest, as Donald Black (1976) does in his book The Behavior of Law. Black suggests arrest is often explained as the outcome of a psychological event – a decision of a policeman – that takes into account variables such as "the policeman's attitudes and perceptions, his background and training, the expectations of his supervisors and colleagues, and the actions and reactions of citizens, including those subject to his authority." Black (1976) goes on to argue that in opposition to such explanations it is also possible to understand arrest as a social phenomenon and explain it by the proposition that law varies inversely with other social control. Black (1976) asserts that the latter explanation "does not explain the behavior of the policeman as an individual. It explains the behavior of law." Such an explanation, Black states, "says nothing about social life that is beyond a test of the facts. It does not assume or imply, for instance, that everything in social life has a function, or that a social system tends toward harmony or stability….it does not assume or imply that conflict or coercion or change inheres in social life…it does not imply that social life has the social control it needs, that law appears when other social control is ineffective…or that it equilibrates social life…it does not assume or imply that society ultimately benefits from law…it does not assume or imply anything about the purpose, value, or impact of law."

******

Rational choice theory, new institutionalism, and pure sociology all contain advantages and disadvantages for explaining the conflict on Team Hamilton. Each provides analytical purchase in some regard, while sacrificing it in others. Ultimately, then, the usefulness of one or the other of these paradigms resides in the research question itself and the goals of the study. Therefore, in light of the study at hand, pure sociology proved a better fit for explaining conflict, and the moral order that arose from the cases of conflict, than either rational choice or new

institutionalism. As this discussion illustrates, then, for this ethnographic study in which conflict management is the social behavior under investigation, the dependent variable to be explained, pure sociology is more useful than either rational choice theory or new institutionalism.

CHAPTER 3

BUILDING THE TRAIL: ETHNOGRAPHIC METHODS

At one point towards the end of conducting my fieldwork, I asked my husband and fellow

Team Hamilton member to tell me any particularities he could think of about the behavior of our

friends on Team Hamilton. He thought for a while, and then replied, "Well, it's hard to motivate

people to do trail work." I pushed him further, asking if he could detail to me specifics about our

teammates and their interactions. Again, he pondered for a moment before responding that,

"Dave's a funny guy – dry wit. And Bill, well, he whines. He's a lot like Sarah."

The next day, I met Dave, Frank, and Bill for a ride and asked them a similar question to

the one I posed to my husband. In response, Frank instantly asked me why I wanted to know. I

told him I was just curious about how observant we were of each other, a curiosity spurned by

my dissertation work. Bill then humorously interjected "watch what you say…you'll end up in

her paper." Dave said, "In that case, I've got plenty to tell you. Let me see…Bill's an asshole,

Frank's mind is in the gutter, and I am super fast."

Bill responded, "Fuck you. You're two biscuits away from 200 lbs."

While my prodding of husband and teammates yielded little in the way of a direct answer

to the questions I asked, the responses did suggest that I know many details of Team Hamilton

that members themselves did not know or could not articulate. For example, I know that during

rides Dave usually pulled at the front of the group 30 minutes on the dot and hated when his time

there was interrupted; that Bill always attempted to ride behind Frank until the final sprint, at

which time he often moved to ride behind Dave (Bill rode behind Frank consistently despite the fact that he once shared with me a "lesson" he learned – as he put it – not to ever position himself behind Frank); that Frank, and others, constantly remarked on his (Frank's) weight despite the fact that he appeared fit and trim; that Robert pointed out every stick, rock, and piece of litter that we passed while riding so that those behind him avoided hitting these obstacles. When Dave was the person who rode directly behind Robert, Dave made fun of Robert doing this by silently, but dramatically, mimicking Robert's movements, but no one else made fun of Robert when riding behind him; and that Rebecca rarely pulled but always sprinted at the end of rides.

Besides being intrinsically interesting to me, knowing these patterns is an essential component to understanding conflict management on Team Hamilton. While surveys, experiments, or the exclusive use of formal interviews may have generated useful and interesting data, ethnographic methods – especially observations – are particularly well suited for gathering detailed, nuanced, and setting-specific information like that contained in these examples. In general, ethnographic research is a well-established method for researching social life that offers distinct advantages for the study of conflict (Koch 1974; Nader and Todd 1978; Merry 1979; Buckle and Thomas-Buckle 1983). Further, ethnography is highly fitting for studying conflict using a pure sociology approach (Baumgartner 1988; Morrill 1995).

A primary benefit of ethnography for this study is that it allowed for a focused-gaze on specific cases of conflict. In other words, instead of simply generating information about the acts of conflict themselves, ethnographic methods captured the larger social environment surrounding conflicts and allowed for a full picture to emerge of the social geometry of the cases. For example, through observations, I knew that though Bill said he was not competitive and always

45

worked to help others finish well in sprints, he actually rarely helped others and always sprinted

for the line so that he, not his teammates, might win. Further, the time spent in close

relationships with those under study resulted in nuanced understandings of the social statuses

themselves that structured instances of conflicts. For instance, through observations, I noticed

how race category affected interactions much more than career or occupation. The dynamic gaze

ethnography affords the researcher to focus on detail while concurrently assessing the wider

social environment contrasts to the less-specific, more vague and thin information on cases of

conflict provided through surveys or official statistics.

This point is especially salient given that pure sociology explains (and predicts) conflict

based on information of all parties involved. In contrast to ethnography, data gathered through

other methods, such as official statistics or victimization surveys, are of limited value to studies

such as this one because these methods typically do not report information on all parties involved

in a conflict but are, instead, one-sided. As a result, most research on the relationship between

social structure and conflict yields information about the effect of intimacy on conflict because

official sources of data collect that information. For example, Marian Borg (1998) uses data from

the 1988 General Social Survey to test the relationship between support for the death penalty and

intimacy with a homicide victim. Likewise, Scott Phillips (2008) relies on secondary sources in

his research on social characteristics and capital punishment. In contrast, given the small size of

Team Hamilton and my intimate familiarity, I have insight into, and can provide, social

information about all principals involved in a conflict.

Analytic Ethnography and Theoretical Extension

This work is an example of an "analytic ethnography" (Lofland 1995; Snow, Morrill, & Anderson 2003), in that it "seeks to produce systematic and generic propositions about social processes and organizations…" Snow et al (2003) argue that analytic ethnography stands in distinction from ethnographies that interpret 'what is going on,' that attempt to uncover rules of behavior, and that highlight individual experience. As an analytic ethnography, this ethnography investigates the social processes surrounding conflict.

The approach I use to investigate conflict is that of "theoretical extension" (Snow, Morrill, & Anderson 2003). Snow et al (2003) argue that theoretical extension "extends pre-existing theoretical or conceptual formulations to other groups or aggregations, to other bounded contexts or places, or to other sociocultural domains.... [and] focuses on broadening the relevance of a particular concept or theoretical system to a range of empirical contexts…" In keeping with this approach, I apply a preexisting theory – Black's theory of social control – to an empirical context not yet researched (Lincoln and Guba 1985). By focusing in this research on the broad patterns of conflict found previously in other contexts, this ethnography broadens the relevance of Black's theory by expanding the range of contexts to which it is applied. Thus, this ethnography increases our knowledge about the social conditions that foster particular forms of conflict.

Implicit in the above approach is that I assume my observations would be comparable to those made by other observers similarly placed. This assumption stems from the fact that I do not delve into meanings or attempt to plunge the depths of any individual's mind: I observe conflict management techniques that are, as behaviors external to the individual, publicly available for viewing. The fact that I observe behavior and do not probe for or speculate on meaning does not

eliminate the fact that I admittedly interpret action as a researcher and then again as an analyst and writer of my account, and do so from a precise location within the social matrix under study. Nor does it mean that I do not affect the reality of each case of conflict that I am a party to – I do. However, looking at external behavior and not subjective meanings does decrease, by at least one layer, the level of subjectivity inherent in any ethnography – or any scientific study, qualitative or quantitative, for that matter.

My presentation, therefore, of my ethnographic perspective simply describes characteristics of one of the principals (me) involved in the setting that affected the cases I observed (Smilde 2007). It is important to note, though, that when I first began observing Team Hamilton I was interested in issues of gender. My interest in the conflict among team members did not arise until three years into my data collection. In consideration of concerns that my academic insights into conflict may have affected my behaviors during conflicts, I do not draw upon cases in which I was a principal actor that occurred after my change in research focus.

Being in the Field

It's the middle of August and we all gather together under the only tree in sight for miles. We're all hot, sweaty, and most of us already drank all the water we brought. As we pause to catch our collective breath, we all look around: no one is in sight. A single house stands about 300 feet away, shades drawn against the heat. A dog barks at us from behind a chain link fence. No breeze disturbs the air, a bane to us but an advantage to the stinging gnats and mosquitoes that buzz loudly in the silence broken only by the dog's constant alarm. Alex slaps at his arm as Mark swings his leg over his bike seat to lay his bike down on the barely perceptible trail. "Well," he says, "we might as well wait here, eat something. Hopefully Greg will find us."

Three of us follow Mark's lead, discarding our bikes in favor of a seat on the dry, itchy grass. Matt continues to stand, straddling his bike, one foot remaining in his pedals. He looks hard in the direction from which we came before bringing his gaze to rest on some indiscernible point over Mark's head.

I groan and stretch out completely in the dirt, shielding my eyes from the sun with my arm, dreaming about December temperatures that contrast so nicely in my mind's eye with the roasting 105 degree temperatures that currently torture me. I roll onto my stomach and survey our small group: we look forlorn. Jeff pulls out a small bag, pulling out a small wooden bowl and a black film canister filled with marijuana. Mark and Alex move closer to Jeff. Matt still stands. I use this spare moment while the other smoke to pull my pen and paper out from my pack and scribble field notes on the day's activities. I look up at the sound of Jeff and Alex's laughter; they are laughing at me. "What," I ask? "Just wondering if you're putting us in your paper." Alex answers. "Maybe," I answer, bantering with them, "you'll have to read it to see."

We all stop talking and look to Matt at the sound of his riding shoe clicking home in his pedal. "I'm going. This is ridiculous. We don't have water, you all are fucking around, and we haven't seen Greg for a fucking hour. I'm not waiting any more." I immediately look at Mark, noticing that Alex and Jeff do so as well. Mark stood. "Well. I guess you do what you gotta do but it seems stupid for two of us to be lost. We don't know where we are and Greg sure as hell doesn't know where he is. Let's just chill here – see if he finds us – and then find a church where we can refill our water."

Alex rolls his eyes in response before saying, "We've got more than four more hours of riding, at the very least. At this rate, we won't even be home before 9 [p.m.]."

In the pause that follows, Jeff rose to his feet. Once standing he addressed Matt, "What do you have to be home for? Come on, man. It's summer, it's Saturday, you're on a bike – why are you in such a hurry?"

Matt slaps another mosquito off his arm and sighs. "I'm going to roll ahead, find a church. If Greg doesn't catch us soon, I say fuck him."

Alex, Jeff, Mark and I all reach for our packs, stuffing our things back inside. Wordlessly, slowly, we all pull our bikes off the ground and mount them. Mark sweeps his arm towards our recently abandoned dirt patches "Make sure you didn't leave anything – go your sunglasses? Gloves?"

"Yep," I say, "I don't see anything."

Matt starts to pedal; I follow. Alex, Mark, and Jeff fall in behind me and we start down the dirt path. I look at my bike computer: we've been riding for five hours. I'm ready to be home.

Scenes similar to this occurred countless times over the period I conducted fieldwork on Team Hamilton. One of the reasons I share this scene is to show the ease of interaction and familiarity between the members of Team Hamilton and me. This intimacy stems from the fact that I began collecting data after having been a mountain bike racer and member of this cycling community for ten years. In other words, my research subjects from the Southeast United States were women and men with whom I had trained and raced for several years prior to beginning my research project. Thus, at the outset of the work I could be classified as a participant observer (Adler and Adler 1994).

Due to my preexisting relationships with Team Hamilton members, I did not face the issues of entry into my field of study that many ethnographers navigate. I did, however, contend with the tension of researching a group to which I belonged. Thus, the second reason I share the

above scene is to highlight team member's knowledge of, and what I evaluate as comfort with, my work researching this community. In general, my teammates knew that I studied their (our) interactions. Occasionally, as in the discussion at the opening scene to this chapter shows, riders warned each other about appearing in my "paper." However, all mentions I heard of this warning were in jest and humorous.

I gathered data while I actively participated as a team member, a fellow-riding enthusiast, a training-partner, and a volunteer. I was a participant-observer in all my observations though the role I occupied often changed. In most settings my participation related to riding and thus, also my race category: I am a professional category racer. This does not mean I always raced during events. For example, I went to compulsory team meetings as a team member and attended parties because of my membership in the mountain bike community. In some cases, I simply observed from the sidelines and attended races strictly to observe without competing.

Before, during, and after my research concluded I affiliated with Valley Bicycles, a small, independent bike dealer located in the heart of downtown. I participated and observed in this arena, acting as both rider and researcher. I took detailed field notes of bike races, training rides, fun rides, camping trips, volunteer meetings, trail work, and other social events such as parties and dinners. Of the 51 different riders I observed, 24 of them affiliated themselves with Valley Bicycles, 13 affiliated themselves with a competing bike shop, Gears, and 14 remained unaffiliated with any bike shop. Of these 51 riders, 15 remained actively, which I define as attending ride events twice weekly, involved for the duration of my fieldwork; the other 36 being inconsistently involved at a variety of times and for various durations.

Team Hamilton's Members' Characteristics

The riders I studied while I conducted this research were not diverse in terms of gender or race. Though they were more diverse in terms of class and age, they did not vary drastically on these dimensions. All but one of the riders I studied were white; all but five riders were men. The riders' current (at the time) class status reflected professional and working-class membership. Occupations varied. The community contained two lawyers, two tenured professors, one doctor, two real-estate investors, nine business owners, two students, one veterinarian, three bicycle mechanics, two auto mechanics, four manual laborers, and various other occupations and jobs. Twenty-one of the riders held four-year college degrees and 12 held graduate or professional degrees, while 13 riders held high school degrees as the highest level of education attained. Ages ranged from 28 to 55, but most riders fell between the ages of 30 and 45.

Within all settings I made an effort to include a range of ages, socioeconomic classes (when I knew), races and ethnicities, and gender, in my observations. Further, I attempted to observe participants from all competition categories. However, though I could purposefully observe a variety of participants at races, while camping, at parties and during some training rides, I was not able to be as selective during races and hard-training rides.

Ethical Issues

All racers signed a consent form acknowledging they understood the uses to which I would put the information I gathered from them. I guaranteed confidentiality to all racers involved. In keeping with that policy, I use pseudonyms throughout this paper. In addition, I told some racers that I observed about my project and explained it when they asked questions. Other

times I observed without informing any one. I often took notes openly, as well as after events either in the car on the way home or when I arrived home.

Most of the racers I never gave any indication that they were concerned about confidentiality. Two women racers did express concerns over confidentiality. I assured them I would protect their identities in all circumstances and would not reveal anything they said outside of an academic forum.

Coding

I coded my data using an exploratory method that combined traditional techniques and modern technology. I dislike Ethnograph, MaxQDA, and Atlas TI, the qualitative software available to me cost free. The expense of qualitative software packages limited my ability to try and use alternative software. This combination of circumstances pushed me to creatively find a different way to manage and code my data.

I coded data after writing field notes and transcribing interviews. During the open coding phase, I created a new file for each interview I conducted. In a separate file I created a coding legend. For each observation or interview, I highlighted text using a color I assigned to that concept or code. For example, I coded "ignore" red and "toleration" gray. I coded text that I interpreted as overlapping between two codes in two colors, highlighting the first half of the text one color and the other half another color.

I created a separate file for each code and merged all similarly coded text into that file. I put duplicate copies of text coded multiple ways in each code file that corresponded to that coded text. Once I established a comprehensive file for each code, I created a folder bearing the code's name. I then developed a new subtheme legend for each overarching theme and coded for

subthemes within a major theme's text. Following this step, I created new files containing compiled text corresponding to a particular subtheme. I saved subtheme files in the overarching code's folder.

Though this may sound confusing, I found this method efficient and organized. I accessed all my data easily, could make changes without difficulty, and could go back and forth between documents with ease. Further, I used the "track changes" Microsoft Word function to make notes in a document's margins.

Cases

During the course of studying Team Hamilton, I witnessed a range of responses to grievances that I categorized as: avoidance, sabotage, mockery, gossip, or toleration. The table below represents these responses by frequency and percentage that I observed while in the field:

Table 3.1: Conflict Management by Frequency and Percentage

Action:	Frequency:	Percentage:
Avoidance	506	13
Sabotage	585	15
Mockery	779	20
Gossip	896	23
Toleration	1130	29
	3896	100

I defined cases as situations in which behavior met with some form of conflict management. For example, if one cyclist yelled at another, I defined the incident as a single case. Likewise, if a cyclist mocked or gossiped about another, I defined those incidents as cases. These cases were easy enough to observe and I had plenty of opportunity to see these cases; throughout the duration of the study I rode almost seven days a week, any where between one and seven hours at a time, with Team Hamilton members. Toleration, however, proved the hardest to observe and define and I incorporated different strategies to do so. The first strategy I used was straightforward: I defined a case of toleration as such when a cyclist mocked or gossiped about the incident after some time had elapsed and yet this same cyclist had not reacted to the grievance in the instant in which it occurred. For example, once, on the way home from a ride, Andy told me that Bill had repeatedly cut him off and yet Andy had not reacted to Bill's behavior when it occurred. Another strategy I used to define a case of toleration is based on Black's (1998) argument that "toleration is measurable by comparing what might otherwise occur under the same circumstances." Accordingly, I noted patterns of circumstances in which riders often had conflict. I then noted when such circumstances arose and paid attention to how riders in the situation reacted. If a rider did not noticeably respond, I defined the case as one of toleration. For example, I noticed the pattern that, in general, riders drew negative attention to those who lacked bike-handling skills. I also observed that riders never reacted in the moment when Stan handled his bike poorly (so poorly, in fact, that he often put other riders in peril). Therefore, I defined these instances of non-reaction as cases of toleration.

<u>Ethnographic Reflection</u>

As I mentioned previously, in many ways, an ethnographic study of mountain biking is ideal for gaining insight into how riders deal with conflict and engage in conflict management. The close observation typical of ethnographic methods gives the researcher a nuanced perception of actors' social locations within a setting, as well as being particularly suited for discerning conflict management. My insider status had advantages and disadvantages. On the one hand, I understood the sport and its physical dimensions. As a member of the group I studied, I was familiar with many subtleties and undercurrents that outsiders might not detect. My position allowed me unique insights into disruptions to behavior and elevated my detection of conflict management that might not appear as notable to researchers who were not as embedded or familiar with the context. In addition, my familiarity with mountain bike racing and community members allowed me to understand argot and interactions that might confuse outsiders. Further, my position as a relatively long-term participant-observer endowed me with a historical view on relationships, as well as riders' movement and changed positioning within the mountain bike social world. Of additional note is that my access to this men's dominated world was enhanced by the fact that my husband was also an active member of the team. As such, he reported incidents to me, as well as corroborated some facts I observed.

On the other hand, despite these benefits I recognize that this position created tensions that influenced my analysis. For instance, my embeddedness and identity as a white, middle-class, professional athlete, feminist woman influences my access to, and interpretations of, the community of mountain bike racers I study (Adler and Adler 1991; Fonow and Cook 1991). Thus, as a researcher I had to attend carefully to pre-existing personal ties that might have

affected what racers were and were not willing to discuss with me, how I perceived behaviors, and limited the breadth of my observations.

<center>*****</center>

Participant-observation gives access to a diversity of insights into the inner workings of social life that are difficult if not impossible to generate through other research methods. In the team I studied, for instance, I observed that moral moderation fundamentally guided, and was reflected in, how riders managed conflict. Whether during rides, while carpooling, at dinner, over email, or when standing around in the bicycle shop, Team Hamilton riders mocked one another, passed along a piece of gossip about an absent rider, and tolerated grievances. As a member of this team, I participated in these interactions; as an observer of this group, I witnessed these behaviors. While my own social location undoubtedly limited my observations, as I discussed above, it also facilitated others. Overall, I feel that the conflicts I observed over the course of my time in the field are likely to be broadly representative of those that occurred among members of the group that took place in public.

CHAPTER 4

ORGANIZATION

Team Hamilton's contemporary organizational context was a product of its history and

the activities themselves around which the team ostensibly cohered. During the 1980s, Team

Hamilton launched as a road racing team. The roster consisted of riders from the southeastern

US. In its early years, the team amassed many wins and ultimately served as a launching pad

from which its riders moved onto domestic and international professional teams. As these riders

did so successfully, the team organizer looked locally to fill the open positions. Simultaneous to

this second recruiting wave, the headline sponsor of the team – Valley Cycles – came under new

management and many employees who worked both for the cycling team and Valley cycles,

including the team director, changed employ or moved out of town. This left the operations of

Team Hamilton in the hands of the new owner of Valley Cycles. Although the new owner

enjoyed both road and mountain cycling, he primarily focused on mountain bikes. Thus, when

positions on Team Hamilton opened, he filled them with mountain bike riders he knew from his

years of participating in the sport. Over time, mountain bike riders filled the entire roster of

Team Hamilton, though these riders also participated in road cycling to a lesser degree. Thus, the

activities Team Hamilton undertook were most often those associated with mountain bike riding.

These activities included organizing and attending mountain bike and road races, coordinating

mountain and road rides, and building trail.

Team Hamilton operated in a dissimilar manner from the highly and formally organized professional cycling teams one might read about in the news. For example, Lance Armstrong, arguably the most recognized cyclist in the United States, and his teammates could be recognized at a glance as members of the US Postal Service Pro Cycling Team on every single ride, and even in many casual situations, by their distinctive red, white, and blue uniforms. In contrast, even though Team Hamilton's uniform of neon green and black grabbed attention a mile away even on the rainiest of days, these riders wore their uniforms some times, and then, only if they happened to be clean. If professional team members were so lackadaisical about flying his/her colors, s/he would be reprimanded by the team manger for breaking a clause in her/his contract; not so for those on Team Hamilton. In fact, the most likely scenario is that no one would notice that a member wasn't wearing his/her uniform and no contract dispute would arise because no contracts beyond informal verbal agreements existed. In comparison to the overall, hyper-organized environments of professional teams, Team Hamilton generally exhibits low levels of organization as a dimension of its social space. This level of organization and the conflict that surfaces, however, varies across time, space, and activity.

Organization and Conflict Management

Durkheim argued that states that are more organized (centralized or absolute) are more punitive towards deviants (1899-1900). A comparison between the Roman Republic and the Athenian city-state shows this relationship well: punishment in the Roman Republic was less severe than punishment in Athens, a pattern explained by the fact that the government of the Roman Republic was less absolute than that of the Athenian government (Tiryakian 1964). Likewise, capital punishment decreased and many forms of corporal punishment were abolished

as the power of the monarchy in medieval Europe declined (Tiryakian 1964). Building on

Durkheim's work and extending it beyond states to all organizations and groups, both formal and

informal, Black formulated a general principle reflecting this relationship: organization increases

conflict management (1976). Cooney's (1997; 2009) work confirms Black's proposition that

more organized states are more punitive. In particular, Cooney (1997) finds that centralized

states kill more of their citizens and suffer fewer negative consequences for doing so.

In contrast to states, Team Hamilton represents a highly decentralized group.

Nonetheless, even within this group marked by extremely low levels of organization, increases in

organization – movement upwards in organizational space – were associated with systematic

increases in conflict and conflict management. Though organizational status among team

members was less pronounced than is typical among officials embedded in a highly organized

government, conflict management patterns mimicked those found in groups with high levels of

organization: conflict management was greater in a downward direction.

Team Hamilton's Organization

Team Hamilton's organization varied over time, and the activities in which team

members engaged also varied in organization. These differing levels of organization, according

to Black (1976), "include the presence and number of administrative officers, the centralization

and continuity of decision making, and the quantity of collective action."

Organization is present when operational dictates and/or norms (either internal or

external) structure team activity. Indicators of organization on Team Hamilton include:

- Rules / official procedures

- Amount of coordinated activity

- Existence of officials, leaders

- Number of people involved

- Geographical distance of activity from Hamilton

- Presence of other organizations

As mentioned previously, in contrast to organizations with high levels of organization, such as state and federal justice agencies, Team Hamilton operated with a generally low level of organization. Team Hamilton organized in diverse and overlapping ways, including by goal, by sponsorship, by dint of race promoters (such as categories for racing), and sport-specific etiquette. While Team Hamilton had informal leaders and people who performed specific tasks, very few positions on the Team were formal. As such, decision-making tended to be decentralized. This decreased the collective action of Team Hamilton and ultimately hindered its ability to effectively meet goals, including create a winning race team, achieve government-sanctioned trail access, lobby for county-wide bike lanes on roads, and establish share-the-road sensibilities within the community. In general, decisions were centralized only when team members were physically together during an event; otherwise, team members made individual decisions regarding cycling. This independent style of decision-making that dominated Team Hamilton spawned little conflict and did not attract very much sanctioning. However, as was the case with organization in general, the level of organization attached to particular activities in which Team Hamilton participated fluctuated. This flux affected how riders handled and reacted to grievances.

The actual activities in which the riders participated altered the organizational state. For example, races and/or rides in which a winner was declared were more organized than rides/races in which no one paid attention to finishing order. Rides on which all cyclists knew the

route had less organization than rides on which few cyclists knew the route. Organization increased during events with multiple goals and that depended upon coordination, such as multi-day stage races. However, the staggered race-starts of multiple races competing on a single, closed-circuit course, as was typical of mountain bike racing, were more organized than a group mountain bike rides with no formalized structure.

The general low-level organization within Team Hamilton helps to explain the non-confrontational conflict and moral moderation that prevailed within this organization. However, not all organization was low, nor was all conflict consistent. The variation in levels of organization experienced at different times and in different places by the team explains the ebb and surge, as well as the variation in type, of conflict on the team. In addition, Black notes the tendency for the "seriousness of deviant behavior to increase according to its organizational location" (1976 p97). In other words, behaviors that are treated as serious offenses when enacted within a context of high levels of organization will not necessarily be regarded as serious when enacted in a context of low levels of organization. This explains the pattern on Team Hamilton in which the same action attracted dissimilar reactions in varying contexts.

Overall, when the level of organization was high, like in road races, conflict was likewise more frequent and more confrontational. In these times, riders yelled, engaged in the rare instance of violence, and enacted total avoidance. In contrast, when organization was low, like when casually mountain bike riding, conflict did not flare, but remained low and nonconfrontational. In between these two extremes, when organization was comparatively moderate, conflict was also comparatively moderate. In these instances, conflict management tended towards gossip, mockery, and toleration.

Team

Team Hamilton's director, Jack – though his position was not as formal as the director on a professional racing team – was also the owner of Valley Cycling, one of the team's main sponsors. Jack was unpaid, instead volunteering his time to organize the team. At the beginning of the race season each year Jack called a meeting to discuss the upcoming season. Jack told riders this meeting was mandatory, but often riders did not attend, an action that incurred very few consequences. Those who did attend socialized for much longer in comparison to the time allotted to discussing official team information. Jack always held the meeting at the bicycle shop. He never made any chairs available, so riders milled about, stood in clumps, or sat on the floor. Invariably, after some indeterminate amount of time, Jack raised his voice to call the meeting to order. He then discussed team specific topics, ranging from details on how much money was in the budget for the upcoming year, which races riders wanted to attend, available sponsorship perks for the riders, and details on when uniforms would be ordered and how one should go about ensuring they received the correct size clothing. During these discussions riders piped in, cutting Jack or each other off mid-sentence to have their say.

Across the years, the level of organization Jack brought to bear on the team varied. For example, during the annual meeting referenced above, Jack handed each rider a worksheet showing all races he felt Team Hamilton riders should attend and asked that everyone commit to attending five. He went on to explain that he would tally the results to see which five the most amount of riders voted for and then would require that all members race these events. Despite this goal and the initial organization that went into it, Jack never followed through on his plan. Instead, throughout the year, riders either emailed or telephoned each other in order to urge one

another to attend particular races and, following this phase, to coordinate details for attending a race. In the following year, Jack made no effort to organize the team and even decided not to order new uniforms despite a change in sponsorship, an element reflected on the jerseys. During this year, the team seldom raced and instead staged and attended many internally competitive rides on both the road and mountain bike. Further, during this time, only two new riders joined the team and one moved across the country.

The next season proved highly different from the two previous years. Instead of being the sole sponsor, Valley Cycles shared the title-sponsorship with another company, Good Times Burritos. This partnership shifted most of the administrative organizing to Mac's, the owner of Good Times Burritos, shoulders. Taking on these responsibilities, Mac increased the level of organization on the team. He centralized many of the administrative details and took on coordinating racers' schedules. For example, Mac made certain races mandatory for Team Valley riders. For these races, he registered riders, secured lodging, created a race-weekend schedule of events that included where and when to meet in order to leave en masse for the race location, as well as provided burritos as meals.

This season marked a shift in the issues over which conflict occurred and in the type of conflict than that which previously dominated the team. Whereas in his capacity of team director Jack rarely had conflict with riders, Mac had constant conflict with them. Conflict often occurred over Mac's requirements and the general increase in organization Mac created. For example, Chris and Julie constantly arrived late to Mac's prearranged meeting point from which riders departed and caravanned to events. In many instances, this irritated others, including Parker who recurrently told others that he thought they should leave Chris and Julie. Though no one acted on his suggestion, others agreed with his sentiment and when Chris and Julie arrived, riders

harassed them about being late. In another case, when Chris and Julie arrived late Greg told them that they were "about to get left." In another instance, after waiting over forty-five minutes for Chris and Julie, Craig sarcastically affected concern and asked the couple if everything was all right. Over time, Chris and Julie stopped driving to races with others as a part of the caravan, instead opting to meet the rest of the team at the race site itself. Previously, the issue of being late to leave together for races seldom surfaced because riders coordinated their travel amongst themselves instead of as a result of a required method of travel.

The mandatory aspect Mac brought to Team Hamilton also created conflict in contrast to previous years during which few things were mandatory. A case arose over this issue when Jack alluded that Maggie must race in three races of his choosing in order to fill-out a co-ed race team. Maggie, a former professional racer, complained to Rick and Sue that "if Jack wants to pay me, then he can have a say in when I race. I quit racing professionally so that no one could tell me what to do. He has no idea how this works." Despite emphatically asserting her position on the issue when gossiping to Rich and Sue, Maggie did not rebuke Mac with equal vigor. Instead, she avoided him when a race was imminent that she did not want to attend or she did, in fact, agree to race. In another instance, Parker, another 'retired' professional racer echoed Maggie's complaint that "Jack needs to just stop; he can't tell me what to race if he's not paying. I'm not racing another 24-hr race. He just wants me on his team so he can win; well, you gotta pay for that." For his part, Jack, too, never used such forceful language when dealing directly with Mac. He did not, however, avoid Mac when required races loomed on the horizon that he did not want to attend; he simply told Mac he would not be racing.

These two examples mark changes in the organization on Team Hamilton that affected conflict among team members. This illustrates the general pattern that conflict varies with levels

65

of organization (Black 1976). In this setting, organization increased when Mac took over formal team leadership. Subsequent to this increase in organization, conflict also increased.

Racing Governing Bodies

At the time of this research, USA Cycling, a branch of the U.S. Olympic Committee (USOC), was an organization dedicated specifically to the promotion of cycling. Its oversight included races, race-promoters, teams, festivals, mechanics, coaches, and more. The two most popular cycling disciplines represented by the parent organization USA Cycling were mountain biking and road cycling. These sports were respectively governed by the semi-autonomous organizations the National Off-Road Bicycle Association (NORBA) and the United States Cycling Federation (USCF). However, the governance and organization of racing in the United States did not lie in the exclusive control of NORBA or USCF, but included a handful of alternative, independent race organizers. Still, though NORBA and USCF were not the only associations that promoted races and events, they were widely recognized as the most legitimate organization.

In part, their legitimacy stemmed from an exclusive mandate to appoint, develop, and produce competitors for Olympic and World Cup teams to represent the United States in both domestic and international competition. In partial fulfillment of this mandate, each year NORBA and USCF promoted an annual racing series, the National Championship Series (NCS) for mountain bike racing and the National Calendar Races (NRC) for road racing. These races were specifically designed as qualifying races in which riders competed for national ranking within their respective category, as well as earned points necessary to ascend categories. A racer who

finished as one of the top five competitors in three races in this series (and only in this series) earned enough points to advance to the next category.

Races ranked by USA Cycling were more highly organized than those held by independent promoters, as USA Cycling races contributed to a rider's national ranking and were accompanied by a great deal of formal fanfare: riders traveled from across the globe to compete in these races, industry and sponsor representatives attended these races to support riders, sell products, and advertise, and the cycling press covered these races in detail. Conflict on Team Hamilton increased during these races, becoming more and more intense.

On The Bike: Cycling Specific Organization

As referenced previously, overall, Team Hamilton's organization was not highly structured. This was especially true with regard to general team administration and project management. However, during certain activities, and even in particular moments within these activities, the level of organization increased. These different levels of organization existed on a continuum from more to less organization. For instance, road cycling occurred in a much more organized fashion than mountain biking. Within both road and mountain biking, racing was more organized than casual rides. Conflict varied with level of organization, increasing as organization increased (Black 1976).

Road Cycling

Many aspects of road cycling were highly organized. Formal and informal rules dictate behavior. Setting and organizational circumstances of the particular ride dictated the degree to which riders adhered to these rules. For example, cyclists riding on highways were more

organized than when riding on back-roads. Cycling on the road was precarious due to motorized

vehicles and was additionally regulated by state policies. In the state in which Team Hamilton

riders cycled, the law required that cyclists ride no more than two abreast and as far the right of

the roadway as possible. Though the law required that cars give cyclists a berth of three feet, this

did not typically occur. Instead, cars often passed cyclists closely and accelerated to do so. This

put cyclists at particular risk of being hit by a car if they rode in unpredictable or unsafe ways.

Ryan summed up the dynamics of a group road ride – navigating other riders, fluctuation in ride

speed, traffic – after a ride through the town of Hillsdale:

> The view from the back of this pack is not a pretty one. I spent the miles I was
>
> able to suffer through in constant flux, from coasting easy to giving everything to
>
> just barely hang on, big ring, little ring, never the right gear, and always a little
>
> nervous about the sketchy guy trying to ride up the middle of our double-wide
>
> pack, or the guy who crossed the yellow line to unzip his vest and almost got
>
> creamed by an oncoming pickup truck, or the nasty unforeseen potholes waiting
>
> to eat my wheels or - even worse - the pair in front of me.

Thus, when riding on busy roads and subject to state law regarding bicycle travel, organization

increased over that which typified dirt-road rides. In addition to place, cyclists racing were more

organized than cyclists riding together casually and cyclists on long, epic rides were more

organized than cyclists out for a short, local ride. Another layer of organization added to long,

competitive rides arose out of the norm for the peloton to continue without stopping and waiting

for riders who could not keep up – that the group "dropped." Riders on such rides often made

arrangements ahead of time for someone to pick them up on the occasion that the group dropped

them. The extra planning included provisions such as money, water, cell phone, and map. This

made for an increase in organization for individual cyclists. Greg notes the importance of this aspect of organization, and his negative reaction to being dropped, in the following passage after the group dropped him:

> "I couldn't hang. It sucked. No cue sheet, no map. Stop sign coming up, where was the pack, where was that van? Which way did they go? Up or down? Left or right? Where was I anyway? Dropped. That's where. Nowhere. No-Man's-Land somewhere in between life and death, at the corner of some road I don't remember and one with no sign at all. I rolled into a driveway, took a drink, tried decide what to do. I pulled out the phone, made a call to the Mapping Department at Loose Nuts HQ, tried to figure out the quickest and flattest route home. If I stretched out, took it slow, recovered a little, maybe I could have survived the trek back to town. Then, while Chris processed my coordinates, another dropee rolls down the hill. He had a cue sheet. His name was Greg. He figured on getting dropped."

This practice of dropping riders, as opposed to some rides that adhered to a "no drop policy" and instead waited for riders that rode at a slower pace than the group at large, alienated many riders and discouraged them from returning. Riders that did not prepare through self-organizing practices were those that most typically avoided group rides after even one experience in which they were dropped. In addition to variation in organization at the ride level, variation in the level of organization also occurred at many points over the course of a single road ride. Conflict correspondingly changed with these momentary increases and decreases in organization.

Competitive Road Rides: Townie Bike Rides

The Townie Bike Rides are an example of competitive road rides in which overall

organization was high. In this series of rides, cyclists' performances were tracked; their

participation was noted and they earned rewards on the basis of finish order. For example, on

TBRs, all riders who started the ride earned points towards an overall ranking. In addition, the

top three riders to cross the finish line earned points and money, the winner earning the most

rewards and third place earning the least. Points accumulated from ride to ride. After all TBR

rides for the season completed, the cyclist with the most points was declared the winner. These

points were tracked by an organizer and made public on a website updated weekly.

Specific rules regarding efficiency, safety, competition, and etiquette elevated TBR ride

organization in comparison to non-competitive road rides in which rules were not codified. TBR

rules were displayed on the TBR website and read:

> We ride double or single file at all times. Pay attention, stay awake, don't
>
> daydream about the glory days. We have the best structured training ride series on
>
> the planet. There ain't no entry fee--just show up with your steed (and a few
>
> essentials listed below) and ride.
>
> We do not have many rules, and if you will follow the guidelines below, you will
>
> have a successful TBR ride. Ride two abreast at all times, especially when first
>
> departing. Obey all rules of the road. (Red lights and stop signs). If the pack splits
>
> on the way out of town, don't worry (be happy), we'll regroup. We may go single
>
> file from time to time for safety reasons or other reasons. Keep your eyes and ears
>
> open. Look out for your brothers and sisters.
>
> **Helmets** - **HELMETS ARE MANDATORY.** Also, bring money, food, drink,

spare tubes, adequate clothing, and a helmet. We generally have 1 pre-announced store stop.

Sign in. No sign in, no point.

Parking - park in bank parking lot fer free.

No whining. You may pray silently for forgiveness, but ye is a Zealot, so get tough feller.

You ride at your own risk. You assume all risk of injuries. You are expected to ride safely at all times. Look at for the other person. You understand that sometimes crashes happen.

All Attack Zones and Sprint Zones are stated on this site and announced before each ride. A whistle blows to signal the entry into an Attack Zone. Attack early and face disqualification. Sprint and attack at your own risk.

YELLOW LINE MUST BE OBSERVED. AUTOMATIC DISQUALIFICATION FOR VIOLATION. NO EXCEPTIONS. A confirmed violation for any reason will result in complete D.Q. We cannot tolerate a yellow line infraction. PLEASE RESPECT THE INTEGRITY OF THESE RIDES AND DO NOT CROSS THE YELLOW LINE.

Store stop - We will have one pre-announced store stop on all rides. Bring money.

Pee breaks - The first is an hour after take-off. The front of the pack will slow down briefly to allow all those who have stopped to rejoin. You may pee at any time at your own risk (if you can chase back on). **PEE BEFORE WE START! PEE AT THE STORE STOP.**

Sag - **If you flat, you will get picked up, change your flat in the truck, and get dropped out when ready.** The follow vehicle is not for dropped riders. If you do fall off, don't worry. Pull out your map (available at start of ride) and have a great ride. The Pack will keep moving forward at all times, except store stops.

Tip the sag driver - (else the driver might not see you when you flat). Tools and spare wheels may be placed in sag.

Points - We have a handicapped points system that allows Cat. 3s, 4s, Vets and Females to compete on an equal footing with Pros, 1's and 2's. See the Points and Prizes page for a complete breakdown on points and how to earn them. 2 points for signing in and riding always.

Please show respect to motorists. Please show respect for the communities we cycle through by not littering, being careful where you pee, and obeying ALL RED LIGHTS AND STOP SIGNS. Don't flip the eagle to cops or passing motorists (unless they deserve it).

Inclement weather - case of rain or other inclement weather, we may shorten or cancel a ride. But, we will always try to do a shortened ride for points and prizes. Announcements made before ride. CHECK THIS SITE. If you show up and sign in, you will get at least 1 point at all times.

Pull - Earn rewards in Heaven, be a pack drover. Pedal on the downhill fool. A good pack drover will always pedal, never forcing those behind to feather the brakes.

Keep your women away from Carney!

Have Fun! (Mandatory)!!

THE BOARD OF THE [TBR]!

These rules – marking the TBR as competitive – served to increase the overall ride organization.

Mountain Biking

Racing

In contrast to road cycling, mountain biking had much lower levels of organization. However, like road cycling, levels of organization in mountain biking varied depending on the forum in which the riding occurred. Again, like road cycling, a mountain bike race had more organization than a mountain bike ride. Further, as levels of organization varied, conflict also varied. Regardless, though, of the forum, mountain biking as a whole had much less organization than road riding and much less conflict among riders took place while mountain biking. Colloquially noticing this pattern, Rick remarked that, "road riders are uptight; mountain bikers are laid back – two totally different personalities." What Rick failed to note, however, was that many riders, like those on Team Hamilton, participated in both road and mountain bike activities. Clearly, then, his explanation of why the difference existed is incomplete. Following Black's logic, I attribute this difference, in part, to the differences in the level of organization between these two cycling disciplines.

An example of the type of conflict that occurred in the setting of a mountain bike race is the case that occurred during a 24-hour race in Leesburg. In this case, Dani asked to borrow clothing from others in order to keep warm during a cold rainstorm. Not having anticipated the cold temperatures, Dani had not packed appropriate clothing for riding in the freezing rain:

Case 4.1: 24-hours of Leesburg

        Despite needing warm clothes, no one volunteered to lend Dani extra clothing. However, around 11:00 pm that night, Paula decided to quit racing. Noting Paula's decision, and the fact that she therefore no longer needed her warm riding clothes, Scott, Dani's boyfriend, suggested to Dani, while in front of Paula, that she borrow Paula's clothes. When Paula did not respond to Scott's suggestion, Dani asked her if she, Dani, could use her, Paula's, clothes. Paula said no, saying she might need them in case she decided to ride for fun. In reaction, Dani stared at Paula for about thirty seconds; Paula stared back. Dani exploded, "Fuck you, Paula. You're such a fucking bitch. Why are you even here? No one likes you, go home. Just go home."

        Paula replied, "Whatever, Dani" and started to get up from her chair. Dani blocked her way. Paula stepped around Dani and got into her car. Dani continued to rant to everyone sitting nearby about Paula, the "bitch." Drawing others into the conflict, Dani asked Tony, the team owner, why he let her race. He shrugged in response and told Dani the team lacked women. Dani replied that she would take it upon herself to find other women. She also asserted that she would no longer race if Paula continued to.

This case illustrates conflict of a more confrontational character than typically prevailed when Team Hamilton members were not racing: Dani and Paula publicly disputed, their voice volume and word choice were forceful, and Dani involved a third-party in their dispute. When the social situation allowed for actors in conflict to avoid each other, instances of conflict

decreased and the type of conflict engaged in became less hostile; when riders time spent together necessarily increased, like in race situations, conflicts tended to increase in frequency and become more hostile.

Terrain

The framework of the terrain over which road and mountain bikers rode differed. This difference accounts for some of the variation in organization between the two disciplines. The mountain bike trails Team Hamilton typically rode were only wide enough for one rider, forcing riders to ride single-file; on the road, riders often cycled two or more abreast. Further, mountain bike terrain forced riders to move laterally across the terrain instead of in a strict straight line as they navigated the best path over roots, rocks, and dirt; in contrast, on the road where few obstacles impeded riders, riders almost always traveled in a straight line. In fact, road riders often reprimanded those who moved laterally, chastising them by yelling "hold your line!" Mountain bike terrain also dictated slower speeds in comparison to the road bike; the rolling resistance from fatter tires with less air pressure, the increased friction of dirt over asphalt, and the more dramatic pitches mountain bikers ascended all slowed mountain biking speeds dramatically relative to road riding. In addition, mountain bikers drafted a significantly less amount of time than road riders. This side-stepped the necessity for a high level of internal group organization. Further lowering the level of organization was that, in contrast to road riding where different levels of fitness rode together, mountain bikers with different fitness found it hard to stay together if each was going his/her own comfortable pace. This meant that riders quickly spread out in intervals on the trail despite "riding together," the term group-ride in this context being a

misnomer. This lower level of organization decreased the opportunity for riders to interact and engage in conflict.

Passing

Mountain bike races were more organized than mountain bike rides and incurred more conflict. One organizational element in racing that contributed to the overall greater level of organization than that found during group rides was that cyclists who raced were divided into ranked groups for competition purposes. Each racer competed in a particular umbrella of increasing skill: "beginner," "sport," "expert," "semi-pro," or "pro". Each of these categories was divided into a men's and a women's subcategory and given a different start time for their race. Thus, in the typical cross-country mountain bike race format multiple subcategories raced on a closed circuit simultaneously.

These two aspects of organization – ranking racers and staggered start-times, which were present in racing but not in group riding, created conflict. One issue over which conflict erupted stemmed from the fact that racers from other races often caught and passed slower racers from other races. Passing others on a trail built for one-person travel was a costly action that took skill and slowed riders down, ultimately adding the time it took to pass riders to the time it took for a racer to complete his/her race. The time it cost riders to pass others varied greatly depending on the terrain and skill of those involved. At minimum, a smooth, uncomplicated pass might taken 10 to fifteen seconds; passing multiple riders compounded the time penalty incurred from passing other riders who started ahead but raced at a slower pace. In addition, passing other riders was risky; mountain bikers typically raced on narrow singletrack intended for one-person travel; when passing other riders, one rider must yield to the other and/or the rider overtaking

another rider must ride off the trail, potentially over tricky terrain. As a result of passing, riders added time to the amount of time it took to complete their race and risked wrecking.

The circuit format on which racers completed numerous laps, combined with multiple races occurring simultaneously, forced all racers to navigate passing or being passed by others. USA Cycling and NORBA created rules to address this issue; they required a lapped rider to yield upon request of the rider overtaking them instead of passing without permission, and declared that no rider shall interfere with another rider's race. However, a racer was only considered lapped if he or she was in the same class as the passing rider. Thus, by the USA Cycling's definition of "lapped," a pro man racer cannot lap a pro woman racer and a pro woman racer cannot lap a man expert racer, making the rule irrelevant in those situations. Arguing that there was "no clear cut solution to this problem," the Wisconsin Off-Road Series (WARS), a series respected and well know by riders across the country, suggested that "racers all work to communicate better during events and have empathy for the other racers on the course."

Much conflict from this problem occurred between women and men racers, as opposed to between women or between men. Women, by virtue of the fact that they were the last group to start and were not separated from slower women like pro men were from slower men, the women pro women almost always caught and passed riders who started in front of them. In addition, again because they were the last group to start – often as late as 25 minutes after the pro men started – on a closed circuit course of which racers completed multiple laps, the slowest women were often caught and passed by the fastest of the pro men. These organizational elements that were particular to racing and thus absent from group rides created conflict over passing and being passed. A case that illustrates conflict stemming from this organization occurred at a small

race in Riversburg. In this case Greg angrily, and publicly, blamed a woman racer for his poor

race performance while he read his result posted under the registration tent:

Case 4.2: Riversburg Passing Conflict

> I lost the damn race by two minutes? There is no way! It's that fat bitch's fault.
>
> She wouldn't let me pass! You know the one …I finally had to force my way
>
> around by pushing her off the trail. I could have caught Sam if it hadn't been for
>
> her!

In this case, Greg identified "that bitch" as the reason he did not do well in the race. He

denounced her as such to his friends, but while in a very public place, as the source of his

compromised time. In another case of conflict that arose by virtue of this organization of races, a

NORBA official pulled Krista aside after a race and told her a "vet" – a man rider aged between

40-49 years – category racer filed a complaint against her for passing too aggressively. In

another instance, as the pro/expert women waited behind the junior expert men – male expert

category racers under 18 years of age – Valerie cautioned these racers to "remember to move out

of the way quickly" when asked. Further, she singled-out Matt from these racers and, in front of

both groups of racers, recollected a past incident where Valerie felt he did not move out of her

path fast enough. In yet another case, Emily requested the man in front of her let her pass,

politely adding, "when you have a chance." The man ignored her and sped up, pulling away from

Emily. After a few minutes Emily had again chased down the man; she asked him if she might

pass him. The man ignored her a second time, again speeding his pace and pulling away from

her. When Emily caught back up to him a third time, she changed tactics for dealing with him.

Instead of asking the man for permission to pass him, she told him she was passing on his left.

The man told her to wait until a better spot. Emily hesitated for a moment, but then told the man,

"passing on your left, NOW." As she passed, Emily heard the man whisper "show-off" under his breath.

Causal Riding

Mountain bike riding, as opposed to racing, was less organized than any of the other riding forums noted above. As with mountain bike racing, the format for the activity of mountain bike riding was not one in which riders were highly interdependent, except for safety. In fact, the organization was so loose that, on occasion, a rider on a group ride may not have seen any other riders for a lengthy period of time. Typically, organization occurred to the extent that riders met to begin riding together, that they stopped at the same place on the trail, and that they resumed riding after these stops. More conflict occurred at these points of heightened organization than occurred at other points during rides.

The conflict that occurred during these moments generally stemmed from issues surrounding the informal order that captured a rider's physical and technical ranking in comparison to others on the ride. Riders with high rank typically indicated when the group started riding, when the group took a break from riding while on the trail, and when the group resumed riding after a stop. Rank also dictated the order in which riders took to the trail. In addition, the organization imposed by singletrack – that one person at a time enters the singletrack and all ride in a line – created tensions with regards to passing, as I mentioned above with racing, and over issues of technical skill-level. The ideal mountain biker on Team Hamilton rode all technical obstacles. For example, if a log fell across the trail, instead of dismounting the bike to cross the log, riders hopped their bikes over it while still mounted. However, riders' abilities to stay mounted while navigating technical obstacles varied: some cyclists rode most

obstacles, some rode few. Dismounting for obstacles dramatically slowed a rider's pace and, subsequently, slowed riders behind them.

Noting this phenomenon, riders hierarchically organized themselves for travel on singletrack; skillful riders led and less able riders followed. This lineup had an "official" dimension – the rider's NORBA race category – but it was also subjective. The subjective aspect was particularly emphasized when two riders were the same NORBA rank or when a rider did not have a NORBA ranking. Typically, riders tolerated those who violated this informal lineup. Toleration metamorphosed in favor of more aggressive, but still non-confrontational, conflict when riders repeatedly transgressed the lineup. In these cases of repeat violation, riders gossiped about the offender. Another tactic used by riders in the face of repeat violators was to aggressively pass the offender. In addition, in rare instances, riders specifically requested that another allow them in front. Riders who sought permission always did so politely and without rancor. For example, in one instance, Scott, the slowest cyclist in attendance on one ride, did not stop with the other riders to eat. Instead, he paused when he reached the group and told them he would continue onward so as not limit the amount of time the group waited on him. He acknowledged his low position in the trail-order by telling others to let him know when they wanted to pass him after catching him. When this happened and riders caught him, Scott pulled far off the trail to allow them to pass. In another case marked by toleration, after stopping to eat, Mark indicated that the group should resume riding and pushed off down the trail. Rick, Steve, and Derek all hesitated to follow him. After a pause, Rick and Steve started to move but, noticing each other's motions, stopped. Following this indecision, Derek took off in front of both these riders, followed by Rick and then Steve. In a contrasting case, Greg, a sport rider, jumped after Jeff on the trail. In reaction, Bill and Nick shared a look and rolled their eyes before starting

down the trail after him. While eating at a restaurant without Jeff after the ride, Bill and Nick rehashed Jeff's violation. Bill recounted that when he caught Jeff on the trail, he wordlessly passed him at a precarious point in the narrow trail and caused Jeff to wreck. Nick suggested that this action might cause Jeff to learn a lesson, though Nick did not detail what that lesson entailed.

Another increase in organization stemmed from the physical setting: casual rides in the mountains and in cold weather had greater levels of organization than rides close to home and those that took place in the summer months. Mountain rides generally encouraged carpooling or meetings at obscure spots. Riders were often late to meet each other in these cases. In contrast, local rides were much more loosely organized. Local knowledge about trails allowed for much less coordinated activity. For example, if a rider was late to the ride start, knowing the trail allowed that rider to take shortcuts to intercept the group. In addition, riders typically relied on one or two riders to know the route and time-length for mountain rides, whereas most riders knew local trails. The informal leaders in such cases added to the organization of the ride as people looked to these individuals for decision-making and blamed them for mishaps. Further, mountain riders increased self-organization because riders needed to bring a large amount of gear with them to mountain rides instead of walking out the door wearing their gear as they would for local rides. This resulted in many instances in which riders forgot things. Consequently, riders constantly borrowed from each other during mountain rides. This increased conflict over the issue of chronic borrowing. For example, after forgetting to pack food for the mountain trail, Jack asked Luke if he could borrow some from him. Luke responded negatively, telling Jack he had barely had enough food for himself. However, this was untrue, as Luke told

Chris and Krista; Luke had plenty of food but did not share it with Jack who, in Luke's words, was a "mooch."

As is evident, then, casual rides in the mountains had higher levels of organization than locally held casual rides and more conflict occurred during mountain rides than occurred during local rides. For example, on an extremely cold and strenuous ride in the mountains Ray told Krista to "go to hell" and accused her of being "conceited" after Krista suggested to Ray that she should retrace her steps back to the car because she showed signs of extreme fatigue that hampered the rest of the group. In another case, while lost in the mountains for two extra hours than expected, Chris blamed Mark for getting them lost, insulting Mark for being a "pot-head." These contrast to the very low level conflict that occurred during local rides. When riding locally, riders generally employed tolerance in the face of grievances, even over sources of typical conflict, such as tardiness.

Team Events

With organization levels between those found on road rides and mountain bike rides, team events exhibited moderate levels of organization. Take, for example, the Fall Tour. In this event, a central person voluntarily took on a leadership role. This lead organizer both performed and delegated tasks that included soliciting money from sponsors, securing multi-day lodging for racers, buying and preparing food for racers over several days, arranging volunteers, building and grooming trail, putting together the route the race would take, updating the website, publicity for the event, arranging travel to and from the race site, creating maps for racers to take along with them, providing an overview of the race topography and length of each stage, ensuring available food/water stops during the race, and creating a safety strategy, among other things.

With the performance of each task, and the recruitment of others to aid in the execution of the task, layers of organization were added.

A hierarchy of leadership emerged as people took on roles of varying import. Concurrently, interdependency and the potential for collective action increased. However, none of these positions, roles, or tasks were formal or systematically specified. In some instances, roles were duplicated as riders adopted them at will, and some tasks were executed in duplicate while others went undone. As a result, the hierarchy that grew out of these events was not settled. Under these conditions, while toleration prevailed, instances of conflict that arose between riders quickly became explosive. Beyond toleration, in the face of grievances during events riders quickly resorted to gossip, avoidance, and heated, though nonviolent, confrontations. The case below offers a representative illustration of the middle-range conflict that occurred around team events. This case quickly escalated to an argument between principals. Rather than continuing to escalate into a more aggressive and violent conflict, Jack opted for extreme avoidance – exit – as solution to the conflict:

Case 4.3: Fall Tour

After a particularly fast Thursday night ride in which Drew and Jack took turns setting a fast pace, a dispute erupted after Drew remarked that one of the stages in the Fall Tour should be held on the trails the group rode that night. Though both Jack and Drew helped organize and execute the tour in past years, Jack spearheaded the plans this year. Hearing Drew's suggestion, Jack turned to Drew and shouted, "It's going to be at Chase Street. I've already decided so shut your fucking mouth." Jack then mounted his bike and rode away up the trail. Drew turned to another rider, Jeff, and rhetorically asked him to repeat what Jack said.

Avoiding looking at Drew and instead looking over his left shoulder, Jeff told Drew that Jack said to "shut up." Drew replied, "Y'all about to see Jack get his ass kicked." He then jumped on his bike and took off after Jack. We caught up with Drew and Jack as they stood in an empty parking lot yelling at each other. Drew told Jack to "get [his] teeth fixed" and Jack retorted that Drew needed to take care of his "weight problem." After a bit, Jack ran to his bike and rode away down the street. Drew came back and asked, "Ya'll wanna keep riding?" Drew made no other comment about Jack for the rest of the night.

This case illustrates the increase in conflict severity that occurred during events that required riders to organize above and beyond normal levels. It is juxtaposed to times in which the team had little organization and riders dominantly responded to tensions with tolerance.

In addition to riding events like that referenced above, organization increased during instances of collective action, such as the beginning of the racing season when riders needed to raise sponsorship money, order uniforms, purchase new bicycles, and plan a race schedule. In each of these instances of increased organization, conflict among Team Hamilton members increased.

*****

As a dimension of social space, organization explains a wide- range of facts. Generally, organization explains variation in conflict management across time and place; specifically on Team Hamilton, organization explains conflict management across type of cycling and type of cycling event. In the face of even small increases in the level of organization on Team Hamilton, riders who normally tolerated grievances behaved much more assertively and confrontationally.

In other words, as riders ascended organizational space, conflict increased and conflict management intensified.

Overall, Team Hamilton generally operated with a low level of organization. In this environment of little organization, toleration, gossip, and mocking prevailed as the dominant methods of conflict management. However, the activities themselves in which Team Hamilton riders participated were more and less organized in comparison to each other. As a discipline, road riding involved higher levels of organization than mountain biking. Certain moments and practices within road racing had extremely high levels of organization. These points in time of very high organization explain the instances of intensified confrontational conflict management that occurred among Team Hamilton members.

In drastic contrast, group mountain bike rides had very little organization: riders organized to meet, stop while riding, and resume riding. Under these circumstances, very little conflict surfaced between riders; when tensions arose, riders tolerated them. Mountain bike races and team events occupied a middle ground between these two extremes with regard to organization. The moderate levels of organization that characterized mountain bike races and team events created conflict in which riders typically tolerated or avoided each other. However, within these activities, riders occasionally entered into heated exchanges. Close examination shows that these anomalies to the general pattern are explained by momentary increases of organization within the overarching moderately organized setting. More generally, the variation in organization explains the variation in frequency and increases in conflict. In sum, then, confirming Black's (1976) general hypothesis regarding organization and conflict, Team Hamilton's pattern of conflict management varies directly with organization.

CHAPTER 5

TEAM ME: RANK

"Throughout the time that we were [so far ahead of all the competitors that they were out of sight], she told me what to do and I did it. At first there was another woman with us, too, but [her bike malfunctioned]. I suggested we wait for the woman. Well, really, I asked Iona what she thought about waiting; she vetoed it, said "that's racing." So we kept pushing; Iona telling me what to do. I was a bit skeptical about whether to listen but figured she wanted to [keep away from the racers pursuing us], so what the hell – she knows a lot more about racing than I do. Towards the end, we tried to [make the pace so high that the other could not continue on] but quickly realized neither of us was going anywhere. Then, about, I don't know, maybe ten minutes to the [finish] line she said we should cross the line together because even if I beat her I'd be disqualified [because of an earlier incident]… I can't believe it now, looking back, but for some reason I totally agreed not to sprint her. I mean, you know she only said that because she thought I'd win, or else she'd have just gone for it. I kick myself whenever I think about it. It actually keeps me up at night. I cannot believe I let her talk me into that."

This case illustrates the influence of rank on conflict. At many points in this case Krista tolerated Iona and submitted to Iona's authority: she let Iona persuade her to not stop to wait for the third rider whose bike broke, she allowed Iona to dictate how they should ride in order to

evade the pursuing peloton, and she ceded the sprint instead of contesting it when Iona intimated that she would ensure the officials disqualify Krista for an unorthodox flat tire change earlier in the race. Commenting on her tolerance, Krista regretted her actions. The question this instance of apparent raised consciousness begs is: given the structure of the case, would Krista behave differently if she found herself in similar circumstances again?

In the world of cycling, Iona outranked Krista. Iona raced as a professional; previously and currently rode for professional, well-known team(s); won many domestic races and particularly dominated locally; received sponsorship from many high-profile companies; her riding was widely publicized, including a feature article in the Economist magazine; knew all the officials well; competed in the Olympics for cycling (not as a member of the U.S. team). In contrast, at the point in time when this case occurred, Krista did not race professionally. Nor did she affiliate with any well-known team; as a relative new-comer to the sport, she knew few other cyclists but did know of Iona by reputation; she did not know any of the officials, nor did they know her; she only competed in three other road races, not wining any of those. In total, Iona occupied a higher status than Krista. The status difference between these riders, in which Iona outranked Krista, explains the pattern of conflict between them – that Krista tolerated her grievances with Iona instead of ignoring, yelling at, or hitting her.

This finding is consistent with Black's (1976) proposition that low status actors attract more conflict than high status actors. Work by other scholars supports this premise. Cooney (2009) found that higher status immigrants in Ireland experienced less ethnic hostility than lower status immigrants. Morrill (1995) made similar findings in his research on corporations: high status executives met with a great deal less conflict than lower status employees. Likewise, Senechal de la Roche (1997) established that the lynching of high status community members

87

was virtually unknown, in contrast to the more frequent cases of lynching of low status community members.

Rank – Not Wealth – As the Vertical Dimension of Social Space

Rank reflects the degree to which riders excel at competition and garner a reputation based on their excellence, or lack thereof, in cycling. Rank is reflected in the vertical dimension of social space in this analysis of conflict among Team Hamilton members. This conceptualization of the vertical dimension differs from Black's (1976), who defines vertical space as that which captures the uneven distribution of wealth. The reason for this alteration is the data: material stratification explained the behavior of conflict at times, but stratification based on cycling fitness and skill better explains conflict patterns between team members.

Stratification based on rank as opposed to material stratification is more useful for this analysis in light of this study's setting. In general, Team Hamilton members lacked variation in class or culture. In other words, Team Hamilton members were quite homogenous. The homogenous character of Team Hamilton cyclist's class and the resulting lack of relevance to explaining conflict is similar to Black's (1989) finding (supported by Moskos (1986) work) that race was irrelevant in explaining legal discrimination in the course of military justice because in the military, personnel rank overshadows all social characteristics, including race. In their general absence, then, cultural and class differences were subordinated to rank – which varied widely among principals involved in cases of conflict. Additional evidence particular to this setting that supports operationalizing the vertical dimension in terms of rank and not wealth is that due to the substantial time commitments of training and traveling, racers often held to part-time jobs or were unemployed, but were high status none-the-less because of their cycling rank.

88

The pattern of conflict with regards to rank among Team Hamilton riders was: 1) downward conflict was more hostile and frequent than upward conflict and; 2) horizontal conflict was more malicious and confrontational than vertical conflict. A marked example of the power of rank on behavior among Team Hamilton riders occurred during a very demanding Townie Bike Ride (TBR) in which Rick and four other riders worked together to distance themselves from the rest of the peloton when nearing the final sprint. Recalling this four-man effort the following day, Rick spoke excitedly, his hands flying through the air as he narrated how the sprint unfolded. He quickly pointed out that:

> "No one would do any work. I know I could have just led them all out but I'm not stupid. I'm one of the strongest AND smartest guys out there. I [was very aggressive in trying to make sure we stayed together, working as a unit, helping each other]...I [was trying] to coach the other guys along without yelling."

As Rick related his tale, he sprinkled in gossip about the failings of two of the other riders in the group, saying they were inexperienced, did not work hard enough, were not fit enough to ride in a way that benefited their goal; in other words, he belittled them as cyclists. He did not, however, make any comment about the third rider in the group of four – Lance. This oversight appears curious when juxtaposed against Lance's version of this incident in which he admitted that his behavior did not conform to the norms on Team Hamilton. When Lance spoke about the case, he readily identified that he, in particular, did not do his share of work. In fact, Lance happily reported that not only did he rely on others efforts to keep away from the pursuers, he recognized that this behavior violated cycling etiquette. He gleefully reported – while giggling in delight – that, "I knew they were looking at me with daggers in their eyes wondering why the old guy was just hanging on. Then they wanted to kill me when I out-sprinted them. I'm a wheel-

suck, a leach. It was funny. I could see it in their eyes. They hated me but no one said a thing. Rick about lost it. He was on the edge but pulled it back together."

Given Lance's description of his overt transgressions, why did the three other riders tolerate his behavior? Further, why did Rick not mention Lance's breach but gossiped about the other two rider's behavior he found disdainful? Both these puzzles are explained by Lance's rank in relation to the other principals involved in the cases: Lance is one of the highest ranked cyclists on Team Hamilton and the other three riders ranked below him.

Discerning Rank

Rank was embedded, reflected in, and signified through many avenues on Team Hamilton, including by dint of race promoters (such as categories for racing), in sport-specific etiquette, and through sponsorship. With regard to conflict, within vertical space, riders with higher rank attracted less conflict, in general, than those with lower rank. Further status equals often engaged in conflict. Cases in which the pattern of conflict is explained by rank often occurred over issues involving perceived violations to social norms interaction and the moral order of the team in general. More specifically, conflict across cases included issues of competition, physical prowess and skill, mental fortitude, and determination (or lack thereof). For example, violating rules of trail etiquette, Jessica annoyed Ayden when she blocked him from passing her on the trail. In another case, calling his authenticity as a cyclist into question, Chris mocked John for not showing up for a ride scheduled during hurricane weather. A conflict arose between Mark and Greg when Greg accused Mark of not doing his share of work on a ride. Each of these cases involves principals of dissimilar rank.

Facilitated by competition but tempered by interdependency, conflict in such cases tended towards moderation. The moderate forms of conflict members of this team most often engaged in were gossip and mockery. These forms of conflict contrast to more violent conflict, such as gang violence that includes killing, as well as minimal conflict such as that which Baumgartner (1988) found prevailed in the suburbs.

Cycling Categories

As referenced in the chapter on organization, typical race structure separated races and racers into hierarchical categories. These divisions theoretically engendered appropriate and fair competition by grouping racers with roughly equivalent skills and fitness. This division did not attempt to ensure that all competitors in a group win, but that all competitors in a group fit within a range of similar skills and fitness levels. This logic suggested that if a member of a specific competition group competed outside of his/her "appropriate" group, he/she would either noticeably out- or under- perform other racers. All racers competed in a single group nested within one of five larger categories of increasing skill: "beginner," "sport," "expert," "semi-pro," or "pro,"– racers with little experience and fitness raced in the beginner category and the most advanced, fit, and fastest racers raced in the pro, or professional, category. These general categories were further subdivided by gender, creating men's and women's categories within the beginner, sport, expert, semi-pro and pro fields. For men, each category was also subdivided into age ranges. Each age range was assigned a start time staggered with other age groups within a category. Each of these men's groups started before any women racing within a category, who all started together regardless of age, begin racing.

Though racing was only one type of activity in which Team Hamilton members participated, race categories explained the pattern of conflict between principals involved in a case regardless of the setting. In general, the highest status riders, men pros, attracted the least conflict and the lowest status riders, beginner women, attracted the most.

A clear example of a very highly ranked rider – winner of multiple Tour de France stages – Asa, influencing conflict occurred on a TBR ride:

Case 5.1: The Yellow Jersey Visits Hamilton

As the ride leader pulled out of the parking lot, signaling that the ride started and all should follow, other riders that were lower rank than Asa but higher rank than most others in the peloton hung back instead of rushing to the front of the peloton to set the pace as they typically did. Once the ride was underway, riders speculated with each other as to whether the rider rumored to be Asa was indeed him. After a general affirmation of Asa's identity swept the pack, riders responded to his high status by affording him greater latitude of behavior than usual for Team Hamilton riders. For example, when at the store stop half-way through the ride, one cyclist encouraged Asa to take the place in front of him in line at the cash register so that he could avoid waiting behind over 100 riders lined up to buy sports drinks. In another instance, Asa and the rider he was visiting in Hamilton took the helm at the front of the paceline and set a very high tempo that quickly dropped many riders. Instead of blowing his whistle and cautioning the duo to slow their pace as the ride leader typically reprimanded lower-status riders that set such a fast pace, the ride leader made no attempt to interfere or temper the speed.

In contrast to the deference shown to a high status rider by lower status riders in this case, riders of equal status often reacted heatedly when grievances arose between them. This finding supports Black's (1976) proposition that lateral conflict is greater than vertical conflict. The spirited, and some times aggressive, conflict that often arose with more frequency between status equals than between riders of differing ranks is explained, at least in part, by the fact that riders with equal rank competed within the same physical proximity, giving them ample opportunity to engage in conflict with each other. For example, these riders competed for physical position with others who were also in their race; clearly, this same jockeying for position did not occur between riders from two different races. As a consequence of this increased frequency of interaction, riders of equal status in competition with each other experienced a great deal of conflict.

The paceline (see Appendix A) was another setting that showcased rank as a highly salient and influential variable on the behavior of riders on Team Hamilton. By virtue of the way a paceline works, over the course of a ride all positions in the paceline change many times. In other words, all positions are in constant flux. This unsettled order means that a rider who may have started the ride as the fifth rider from the front might move to fourth, then third, then second, then first position. Team Hamilton riders viewed positions near the front as most desirable as opposed to those towards the rear. Therefore, the state of these fore-positions as coveted and unsecured pitted riders against each other: On the one hand, riders in the coveted positions did not want to relinquish their places. On the other hand, riders not in these valued positions tried to gain them. Compounding these issues, the constant rotation made all positions insecure.

Embodying the hierarchy on Team Hamilton, high status riders most often filled the front positions in the paceline and low status riders filled rear ones. As Team Hamilton cyclists with high status finished their turns at the front of the group, they infrequently allowed all riders to pass by them before rejoining the paceline as the very last rider. Instead, in most cases, higher status riders sought to rejoin the group near the front after they finished their turn as the lead rider. Lower status riders tolerated this and often voluntarily made room for them without being asked. In other cases, when a high status rider rotated off the front, s/he made a perfunctory but polite request that a lower status rider allow them into a particular space.

For example, Frank, a very high status rider, typically rotated off the front only to rejoin the paceline within about four or so places from the front. In most cases, lower status riders voluntarily created a space for him without him requesting they do so. In some cases, Frank desired positions occupied by other high status riders. When the rank of these riders exceeded Frank's, he did not seek their positions. When the rank of these riders was lower than Frank's but not significantly so, he typically requested permission to merge in front of them and the other rider yielded. No one rebuked Frank or challenged his actions. In addition, no one ever made a comment – negative or otherwise – about Frank's method of rejoining the paceline. More contested cases tended to involve more equally ranked riders. In these cases, typically, the rider rotating off the front pointedly stopped moving backwards, hovered parallel to the position s/he desired, and glanced at the rider in the coveted position as an indication that they wanted to move into that particular space; at this point, the other rider often yielded his/her position. Often this interaction occurred with no spoken communication.

In still other cases, hostile conflict occurred over positioning when riders repositioned themselves in aggressive ways, such as by forcing their way between other riders. These cases

tended to involve riders of equal status at moments in time in which high levels of interdependency pervaded the ride itself (see Chapter six for more on pacelines and interdependency). This often elicited stronger reactions than silent body language from distressed riders, including voiced protests, gossip, and mockery. For example, in one case, Bill, a sport category rider, attempted force his way in front of Mike, also a sport category rider, in the paceline. When Mike did not give way, Bill exclaimed, "Oh, come on. Are you kidding me? You're not even [helping to set the pace]." Mike ignored him and Chris, riding behind Mike, told Bill he would make room for him. Bill pulled into the spot Chris opened for him and continued to loudly berate Mike for not letting him in.

In addition, Team Hamilton riders often blocked unknown riders who rotated off of the front and then attempted to merge back into the middle of the paceline instead of joining at the rear. These cases usually involved subtle signals that favored body language over spoken communication. Typically, however, strangers and new team riders made no attempt to position their selves' mid-pack, but instead joined the back of the paceline as textbook paceline practice dictates. As such riders' vertical statuses became settled, their behavior in the paceline often strayed from this initial conventional behavior. For example, in the first few weeks that he attended rides, Scott, a new Hamilton resident, took his turn at the front of the paceline and then always rotated to the very rear of the paceline. As riders learned Scott's rank – such as that he used to race for a prestigious team and was a strong rider – Scott's behavior changed, as did reactions from others to his behavior; he rarely rotated to the rear of the paceline and instead typically merged back into the paceline within ten positions from the front with no ensuing conflict with other riders.

Further, in trying to gain more advantageous positions in the paceline, riders often tried to reposition themselves in front of each other not only after rotating off the front – the most typical and thus least aggressive and conflict-filled time to reposition one's self – but also by surging forward from farther back in the paceline. Most often these attempts consisted of non-confrontational methods that riders employed when movement within the peloton seemed unintended and casual. In reaction to these attempts, riders who lost placement often protested by silently signaling their displeasure through body language such as headshaking and hand movements. These signals were only visible to riders behind the aggrieved rider – typically lower status riders – which is fitting given the morally moderate moral order of behavior on Team Hamilton. An example of such a case involved four similarly ranked riders. In this case, the peloton stopped at a red light on the way out of town. Instead of coming to a full stop along with the other riders in the group, Matt and Ryan stayed in motion, albeit slow motion, and continued to inch forward on their bikes. This gave them momentum to quickly accelerate in front of John and Chris when the light turned green. Chris responded by throwing his arms up, while John shook his head, in visible feedback of displeasure.

Sponsorship

In general, sponsorship simultaneously signified and elevated a rider's rank. Sponsorship, often conspicuously signaled via uniforms and equipment such as the bicycle, communicated to others that the sponsored rider was high ranking and thus worthy of receiving resources to aid cycling pursuits. Thus, sponsorship reflected rank and conferred status on riders. Sponsorship from a well-known source increased a rider's status more than little-known sponsorships. Accordingly, riders with well-known sponsors attracted less conflict than riders with little-known

or no sponsorship. Riders with less sponsorship tolerated behaviors from riders with more sponsorship more often then they did so from riders with equal or less sponsorship. Riders with insignificant or minor sponsorship also attracted more conflict in general than riders with more prestigious sponsorship.

Cases in which rank is central to explaining conflict occurred frequently. The start-line of races was a setting in which such cases occurred with particular regularity. In this setting, riders of various rank commingled, all focused on competing successfully against one another. Though race category separated riders by rank, it did so with broad strokes. This made it so riders with drastically different rank did not race against each other, yet riders with finer differences in rank still raced together. In other words, within a single category, racers still varied in terms of rank. This affected riders in various ways, including when congregating at a single point to begin racing – the start line. In this setting, lower status riders allowed higher status riders to maneuver closer to the start-line but did not allow riders with low status this same freedom of movement. In fact, riders with very high status often bypassed riders who had already staked-out their position and positioned themselves (see Appendix B for explanation on staging) at the very front of all the assembled riders. In cases in which this occurred, lower ranked riders rarely voiced protest, though they did respond non-verbally, through actions such as eye-rolling and the exchange of knowing looks. Underscoring the deference to high status riders, two cases arose in which low status riders attempted this same behavior of bypassing staged riders in order to take a position on the line ahead of the rest of the field. In both instances the riders knew the promoter putting on the race and, in both these cases, other riders loudly protested this behavior with yells of, "No way!" and "You better move your ass!" In one of these cases, a competitor pushed the

rider who attempted to by-pass the staging process off the line with such force that the attacked rider fell.

In another revealing case that highlights rank in general and sponsorship as an aspect of rank in particular, an unknown rider took part in a TBR ride while wearing a Rock Racing uniform and riding a bike similar to that issued to Rock Racing team members – one of the premier professional cycling teams in the nation. During the ride, others were very tolerant of this unknown rider's breaks in etiquette. For example, no one moved into the gaps this rider allowed to open in front of him; this contrasted to typical behavior for riders on the TBR who usually immediately filled gaps that opened in order to preserve the draft. In addition, no one gossiped or otherwise commented on the fact that this rider disrupted the paceline and the draft by riding in a position a bit to the left of the group instead of in the draft of the rider immediately in front of him. However, as the ride unfolded, it became clear that this rider was not strong enough – of high enough rank – to be a racing member of the Rock Racing Team. On the TBR ride the following Saturday, when this rider returned, members of the peloton no longer tolerated his unorthodox method of riding: cyclists merged into the spaces he left open and one rider even pushed him off the road onto the grass instead of letting this rider into the paceline. This rider attracted additional conflict in the form of gossip and criticism. One rider commented on the Rock Racing jersey, rhetorically asking those around him, "Can you imagine paying that much for a kit? It probably ran him about $120. Sucker." Another rider agreed and added his critical commentary and unforgiving criticism to the discussion.

In this case, the conflict that the faux Rock Racing rider attracted varied with the speculation, and subsequent resolution, of his cycling ranking. When riders in the peloton thought there was a possibility that this rider was a high ranking cyclist, a member of an

internationally competitive professional road cycling team, they tolerated behaviors that typically

drew quick sanctioning. However, as his lack of fitness shed light on the fact that he was not a

member of this high status team but truly a mediocre rider who bought– instead of "earned" – a

jersey, riders in the peloton no longer tolerated his behaviors and instead gossiped, criticized, and

sabotaged him.

Beyond Toleration: Gossip, Mockery, and Rank

Gossip

Team Hamilton cyclists dominantly tolerated grievances. When conflict grew more

aggravated, riders often reacted by gossiping about the other protagonists in the case. Gossip

ranged from benign to extremely critical. Riders with similar rank gossiped often about each

other and low-ranked riders gossiped about higher-ranked riders more often than the converse

occurred. Riders most commonly gossiped about cycling-specific issues. In many cases, riders

gossiped about others' lapses in cycling etiquette, poor skills, and fitness. For example, in one

case, a rider reported that another rider with the same rank as the rider gossiping continually

made technical mistakes while they rode mountain bikes together. In another case, a rider

gossiped about another cyclist of similar rank riding his mountain bike slowly on the downhills.

On a different occasion, a rider reported that a lower ranked rider whined throughout a ride,

asking how much more time a ride would take to finish.

Riders also used gossip to emphasize the contrast between themselves and others. For

example, Alan simultaneously highlighted his own dedication to riding by attacking Caleb, a

slightly lower-status rider who was not present, when he said, "I can't believe Caleb. He just

bought the nicest Sram components for his road bike but he doesn't even ride it. What's the

point?" In a similar case, Valerie asked Greg if he had noticed Wes's new $6000.00 bike. After Greg nodded yes, Valerie rolled her eyes and said she hoped she had that same kind of money to "blow on a bike" when she had her mid-life crisis, even if she "constantly [got] dropped like Wes."

Some times, gossip took on a critical edge. This occurred most often when the principals involved in the case held similar status. Critical gossip strayed from ride-specific issues and attacked riders' personal characteristics and practices. For example, in one case, a rider reported on another rider's lack of bike-etiquette and continued on to describe this rider as petty and "a bitch." In a second case, after a rider reported on how a status-equal repeatedly attempted to pass him on the trail in places the offended rider deemed as inappropriate and unsafe, he disdainfully added that this particular rider lived dangerously, made stupid decisions, and often binge-drank while in the company of much younger friends. In another case, a rider made a groaning noise when a lower status rider pulled his car into the parking lot. The groaning rider then told all assembled that he wished this particular rider had not come because he smelled. The gossiping rider continued to talk about the lack of personal hygiene he suspected of the other rider. In another case, a higher status rider, Nick, gossiped to a lower status rider, Jeff, about the actions of a third very high status rider, Cesar, who was absent. Nick told Jeff that Cesar repeatedly and aggressively flirted with Nick's girlfriend. Both Nick and Jeff agreed that someone needed to teach Cesar a violent lesson regarding appropriate behavior.

An example that underscores gossip as a conflict management technique is the case between Sarah, Ellie, and Krista – three riders of similar rank. In this case, Sarah and Ellie were friends that rode together often. As a relative newcomer to the team, Krista only knew Sarah and Ellie by sight. On one occasion in particular, these three riders attended a moderately paced

group road ride where Krista overheard Sarah and Ellie gossiping about her. Years later, Krista and Ellie, too, gossiped about Sarah in her absence. This illustrates the pattern of conflict between team members in cases in which they no longer merely tolerate grievances with each other:

Case 5.2: Three's A Crowd

Sarah and Ellie rode side by side in the paceline as the group left town for a two hour ride. Krista, the only other woman on the ride, positioned herself towards the end of the paceline. However, at a stoplight on the edge of town, Sarah dropped her water bottle. The light turned green and the group started to move. Ellie waited for Sarah to retrieve her bottle as other riders surged around them. When Sarah put her bottle back in the bottle cage, she and Ellie started to pedal and rejoined those who had come around them at the stop light. In this shuffle, Krista ended up behind Sarah and Ellie in the paceline; neither Sarah nor Ellie noticed this happenstance. After some time passed, Sarah asked Ellie for information about Krista, apparently unaware that Krista could hear them. Sarah dismissed Krista without much thought, saying only that Krista was a "bitch" that Sarah described as too competitive and selfish. Hearing this commentary, Krista kept silent, tolerating the women's gossip about her.

After a few years, Krista and Ellie became friends. Krista still remembered the case in which Sarah called her a bitch and Krista tolerated it. She asked Ellie if she remembered the incident. Ellie did and told Krista that "[Sarah] was just jealous." Ellie defended her role in the conversation by telling Krista that she, Ellie, did not even know Krista and just took Sarah's word on the issue. When Krista pointed out that Sarah had not known Krista either, Ellie just shrugged and, in turn, assessed Sarah as "a bitch."

Mockery

In addition to gossip, when conflict between riders escalated they often mocked each other. Mockery surfaced in the face of competition and issues of rank. Mockery, like gossip, occurred regularly and ranged in harshness. Mockery, however, differed from gossip. While riders gossiped about each other when the subject of the gossip was absent, riders openly mocked each other in one another's presence. Mockery often exaggerated behaviors and slanted towards the fantastical. Riders most aggressively mocked status equals. Riders mocked new riders, particularly low-status new riders, in the least hostile manner. Long-standing team members with low status attracted moderate mockery. Nicknames served as a typical form of mockery. In one case, team members dubbed a moderately high status rider who drove an old, broken-down camper the manufacturer named the "The Dolphin" the Dolphin Whisperer. In another case, a high status rider nicknamed an extremely thin low-status and long-time team member as "Skeletor." In both these cases the riders themselves adopted these nicknames, going so far as to sign emails under this moniker. In another case, a high status rider nicknamed a low-status rider "BDB." This stood for "Bus Driver Brian."

The tactic of mocking through nicknames took a slightly different twist in the case in which the "Dan Faction" targeted Will:

Case: 5.3: WIIIIIIIILLLLLLLLLL

> In any instance in which Will became the focus – either in conversation, when he
> arrived to events, or even if he summited a hill during a ride in progress – a
> member of the Dan Faction would emphatically draw-out his name by calling,
> "WIIIIIIILLLLLLLLLLL." After time elapsed, almost all riders on Team
> Hamilton mocked Will in this way. Will tolerated this mockery for many months

with little response. Eventually, however, he showed irritation in the face of this conflict, though his reactions remained mild. For instance, he shook his head when a rider roared, "WIIILLLLLLL," for a time he avoided riding with many team members, and, in one case, he told a status-inferior to "shut-up."

In addition to nicknames, riders often mocked others over physical characteristics. For example, riders recurrently mocked Frank's ("Frank the Tank) large stature. For example, Scott mocked Frank by suggesting to riders who were his and Frank's status equals that, "if things went really bad, we could all eat Frank" because everyone else was too skinny. In another case, Doc mocked Frank at a stoplight by asking him to move onto the painted line to set-off the embedded sensors that detect a car's weight and thus tell the light to change to green. In each of these cases, Frank tolerated the mocking. In fact, often, Frank mocked himself, too, when others made fun of his girth. In addition to physical characteristics, riders mocked others over issues of physical and mental fortitude, specifically attributing a lack of these characteristics to the person they mocked. The following selection taken from a message emailed to 52 team members illustrates such a case:

Case 5.4: Black Saturday

> "The fastest bailout in the history of cycling took place as JJ tucked tail and headed for home after 2 pedal strokes. JJ claimed he suddenly remembered he had not yet had sex. He immediately headed for home for a romp in the hay. JJ also immediately kicked himself out of SFS. And with JJ's loss, that why this SFS will forever be known as Black Saturday. Everybody knows hard men and women don't need sex."

This public email mocked that Mike met team members for a long ride, 130 miles, but decided to go home at the last minute instead of continuing with the peloton. Missing from this email are factors that influenced Mike's decision to not ride, such as the threatening hurricane weather, including heavy rain and high wind gusts. The author of this email mocked Mike's decision, as well as poked fun at Mike's sex life, two seemingly unrelated topics. However, the pairing of these two disparate topics was an ordinary pattern. Often, as the following case again evidences in an email recapping a ride, mocking not only exaggerated real conflict but also created imagined tensions between riders of similar status:

> "The Shyster's cunning and deceptive turn of speed in the closing kilometers is not what made this SFS adventure so black. Neither is the well known fact that the Shyster is nothing but a big fat lying SOB, and a drunkard to boot who likes to fight and sometimes threatens others with bodily harm for no reason at all, And it's also not the fact that the Shyster has shit on all those that have extended a helping hand to him. No, darkness descended on SFS for entirely different reasons in spite of the fact that the he is a drunken pugilist who will take advantage of a (former) friend."

Riders commonly levied imagined slights similar to those in this email against each other. In most cases, riders tolerated these imagined conflicts instead of responding to the author's stories. At times, however, mocking highlighted and exasperated existing conflict between riders. In these instances, tensions surrounding conflicts often increased. This proved the case in reaction to the following email:

> "They don't say Jeff is an asshole for no reason. On this past Saturday's SFS adventure to Point Peter, Jeff split the pack only 45 miles in and dropped the

Belgian hammer on his former friends, refusing to let them rejoin. SFS leader

Bill, Roberto and Doc were caught with their pants down, literally. These three

are part of the old guard that actually take their pants completely off when taking

a roadside urinalysis. When Jeff saw Bill's britches hanging in a bush, he hit the

accelerator and headed for home. Bill, Roberto and Doc came running out into the

road shaking their fists at Jeff, who was looking back and cackling like a hyena.

What an asshole. The three were last seen headed back into the woods, bare

bottomed and incensed at the lack of respect they'd been shown."

The author's rank exceeded all those he mocked in this email. The three protagonists the author wrote about all shared similar rank. Instead of ignoring the story, Doc, Jeff, and Bill exchanged hostile emails that also mocked each other. Doc replied with a story about seeing Jeff tap-dance wildly downtown with Bill while drunk, implying that Jeff's supposed tap-dancing and Bill's involvement revealed them as the actual homosexuals. Following Doc's email, Jeff defended himself by remarking that Doc "should know" all about homosexual behavior. He went on to bring Doc's sexual preferences into question, highlighting as evidence Doc's "need" to defended himself instead of merely tolerating and not reacting to the original story. Bill did not reply to these emails with one of his own, instead gossiping about Doc and Jeff on a ride, but not mentioning the original author of the email at all, thereby tolerating his behavior.

Mockery also served to reprimand riders for violating cycling etiquette. Through mockery, riders communicated unspoken rules regarding appropriate and inappropriate on-the-bike behaviors. Higher status riders often initiated such cases and directed them towards moderate status riders; no low or moderate status riders initiated mockery of higher status riders. For example, after Krista recommended that the pack cease repeatedly waiting on Maria, a low

status rider, and instead continue at the faster pace typical of the regular, weekly ride in progress, other riders poked fun at Krista. They made comments such as, "Krista said Fuck 'em, let's go," and, after a rider dropped something and the pack slowed to allow the rider to retrieve the item, "watch yourself, Krista'll vote to leave your ass next time." Through mockery, team members shifted the blame for violating the informal norm of not leaving women riders who cannot keep up with the peloton to Krista's shoulders. Of note is that no mocking occurred in similar circumstances but with gender differences in principal actors. In other words, when men urged leaving low status men to ride in alone, no one voiced or acted in any deviation from the norm. This indicates that no violation of behavior occurred and thus highlights gender as an important variable to the mockery Krista encountered (see chapter eight for a fuller discussion on gender, status, and conflict).

Conflict and Status Change

As the discussion above illustrates, rank impacted conflict on Team Hamilton. However, both rank and conflict varied across time and by setting. In fact, a single rider often varied in terms of status on Team Hamilton over time. In such cases, as a rider gained status, the type and amount of conflict management s/he attracted and repelled changed. This flux proved the case for Jeremiah, a 33 year-old professional racer at the time of this study's analysis:

Case 5.5: Jeremiah

Jeremiah began riding mountain bikes 20 years ago. Initially struggling to do well in races, Jeremiah received little peer support and often wound up the focus of much criticism and gossip. For example, early in his racing career, Jeremiah took a trip to a neighboring state for a bike race; many other racers from his hometown

106

also traveled to this race. However, while his hometown riders traveled together, they did not invite Jeremiah to travel with them and he arrived in a strange town alone. Jeremiah knew a few riders local to the race venue and had knowledge that riders from his hometown intended to lodge with these riders. He phoned ahead of his arrival and left a message on one of these local riders answering machine. Darrell received the message and immediately called every one he knew and warned them that Jeremiah called looking for a place to stay. Darrell suggested that others not open their doors to any knocks.

When Jeremiah called Darrell a second time, Darrell told Jeremiah he could not stay with him and suggested he ask John down the street, despite an earlier warning to John not to help Jeremiah. John, too, told Jeremiah he couldn't stay. Ultimately, Jeremiah booked a hotel room for the night.

Over the years, Jeremiah continued to race and ascends categories. Over time, Jeremiah ranked top ten in the nation, sponsored by one of the most prestigious race teams in the country. In his hometown, the same that he has lived in all his life, other riders, the same riders who rebuffed him, hail him as a hero. They invite him to attend their local races when he returns home from national and international racing, they ask him for training advice, and even threw him a surprise wedding shower. Notably, Jeremiah again traveled to attend the same race mentioned above years later. This time, Darrell boasted three weeks or so in advance that Jeremiah intended to stay with him. When he arrived, Team Hamilton enthusiastically welcomed Jeremiah. In fact, one member requested that Jeremiah stand with him with his arm draped around his shoulders. This rider then

used a copy of this photograph as his profile picture on a social networking website.

This case shows how an increase in a rider's status resulted in a decrease in the amount of conflict he attracted. Initially, Jeremiah ranked lowly in the status hierarchy and attracted a great deal of conflict. As he gained rank through race wins and notable sponsorship, riders no longer reacted aggressively towards him when grievances arose. In fact, Jeremiah ultimately repelled conflict as riders clamored to interact with him in peaceful ways. As a case in which a rider's status changed over time, Jeremiah offers insights into how different statuses attract or repel conflict. Such cases are illustrative in that they provide evidence that status, not social psychological processes, convincingly account for change in conflict management behaviors.

Infrequent Responses

Riders on this team rarely resorted to violent confrontation in the face of grievances. However, on occasion, riders entered into conflict using such tactics, especially when the principals ranked equally on the team and the setting in which they acted was highly organized (see chapter four for a more complete discussion on organization and conflict). More likely to occur than violence, though still extremely infrequently, was aggressive, non-violent behavior, such as harsh confrontation or derisive and cruel mockery. Rank explains these instances, as they often involved riders of similar rank. For example, in one case, Tina, a professional racer, and Tom, an older racer who sponsored a now-defunct but one-time major road team, clashed on a particularly challenging TBR ride:

Case 5.6: Alto

As the peloton neared the turn towards Alto and the first intermediate sprint of the day, Tom attempted to better his position in the pack. He accelerated and then wordlessly moved into the group, attempting to force his way in between Tina and the rider in front of her instead of asking or signaling his intentions. Realizing what was happening, Tina protected her position and did not yield. When Tom continued his attack, Tina closed the gap Tom eyed, squared herself on the bike in a stance that readied her in case Tom bumped her, and spoke sharply to him, "Nope. Don't do it Tom. I don't have the strength today to come around you when you blow up."

Tom responded, "I'm coming in. I'll take you down and crash you out. Either way, I'm coming in."

Tina did not fall back but because Tom was bigger and had a physical advantage on the bike, she was forced to the right hand side and consequently squeezed in front of the rider that had been to her right – a rider who yielded to the chain reaction of movement. Tom now sat beside Tina to her left. She shook her head and told him, "Man, I don't feel good today Tom and I just don't need you blowing up in front of me so that I have to go around you. Not today."

Tom didn't respond immediately. After about a minute or so he said, "It's so much better up here. I hate it back there. This position is perfect, about ten or so from the front."

Tina replied, "Well, at least you're not in front of me." Neither spoke to each other again before Tom fell off the pace on the next hill.

This case was unusual in that the conflict was confrontational and public, an element explained by the equal vertical status of the principals involved: Tina was a professional cyclist who repeatedly impressed others with her strong performances on challenging rides. Tom was an older cyclist who for the past several years had heavily sponsored a professional men's road team based in Hamilton. Departing from normal conflict management techniques, Tom was persistent, physically aggressive, and threatening. Tina's dealings, too, were more confrontational than usual in that she did not tolerate Tom's behavior, physically tried to thwart his aim, verbally attacked his cycling abilities, and did not help him when he attempted to repair the social damage after the incident but instead further drew attention to the fact that she often out-performed him on rides.

In another highly unusual case, a rider, Keegan, responded aggressively when he noticed another rider, Caesar, who ranked very highly in comparison to all Team Hamilton riders, repeatedly touching his wife's bottom despite his wife's protests. Keegan quietly told Caesar that if he "ever touched Julia again [he would] break [Caesar's] hands." However, subsequent to this untypical response, riders returned to their normal conflict management techniques, including Keegan and Caesar. As the ride finished, Caesar put his hand on Keegan's back and asked him to ride the local trails with him some time soon. Keegan did not throw Caesar's arm off or punch

him as he threatened earlier; instead, Keegan told Caesar that he would, indeed, ride with him in the near future. Julia, too, dealt with the conflict in typical Team Hamilton fashion. As opposed to screaming or crying foul, Julia reacted to Caesar's behavior with gossip. She told other team members of Caesar's behavior, often starting her narrative with, "Can you believe….." Further, in an email that mocked Caesar, the highest status rider on the team, Sam wrote:

> "After 125 miles and 6 ¼ hours in the saddle it was black day because of the disturbing and preternatural sexual promiscuity of a certain member."

In this email sent to all Team Members, Sam noted the incident involving Caesar without naming him, instead referring to him as "a certain member." In further, on-going mockery, riders continued to make fun of Caesar's behavior well after the incident. In one case, a rider noticed a hole in Julia's shorts and labeled this apparel, "Julia's Caesar shorts." In another case, a rider asked Keegan if he should invite Caesar on a hike they planned. Keegan responded in-kind with mockery by saying, "Yes. He can sleep in your daughters' tent." In each of these cases of conflict that occurred over the issue of Caesar harassing Julia, riders evoked patterns of conflict typical for Team Hamilton members. The relationship between Julia and Caesar, as well as other principals and Caesar, explains this non-confrontational behavior: Caesar drastically outranked all riders involved.

However, these non-confrontational conflicts contrasted to the way Keegan violently threatened Caesar, despite the fact that Caesar outranked Keegan, too. In this case, rank does not explain the conflict. What does explain this conflict, however, is the cultural distance between Caesar and Keegan: Caesar was born abroad, moved to Hamilton in his early thirties, and spoke in broken English. In this case, then, cultural status modified rank status as the most salient variable in the social morphology surrounding the handling of a grievance.

******

On Team Hamilton, I found that a cyclist's rank – including physical supremacy and sponsorship – generally trumped as the dimensions to which all other elements of stratification, such as culture and class, were subordinated. In only one case, that involving Caesar and Keegan, did rank not explain how principals handled the conflict that arose. In this instance, culture, not rank, explained the behaviors. However, as a highly salient structuring force, rank explains the typical direction of conflict – from high status riders to lower status riders. Black's (1976) proposition that downward conflict is greater than upward conflict captures this point. In addition, in instances of confrontational conflict, the principals involved were often ranked similarly. This is consonant with Morrill's (1995) findings that competition among departments that are similarly important to achieving an overarching goal within a single corporation promotes conflict. It is also consistent with Black's (1976) proposition that lateral conflict is greater than vertical conflict.

Despite the infrequent case of confrontational conflict, on average the conflict in this team was non-confrontational. Gossip and mocking reflected this team's temperate response to tensions and grievances. These restrained yet derisive conflict management tactics are hallmarks of the moral moderation that prevails within this team.

CHAPTER 6

THERE IS NO "I" IN TEAMWORK: INTERDEPENDENCY

While waiting for Valerie to meet us for a mountain bike ride, Krista confided to

me that she "needed" to talk to Valerie about Valerie's habitual tardiness. I asked

Krista why she hesitated to talk to Valerie about this issue. Krista shrugged and

told me that she was unsure why but she felt uncomfortable bringing up the issue

with Valerie. She then sighed deeply and told me she was "just going to do it"

because it had "been an issue for a while" that Krista opted to tolerate instead of

confront. Krista felt that if she continued to tolerate Valerie's behavior she was

going to "blow up and have to take another break" from riding with Valerie.

Krista went on to tell me that she constantly repeated to herself the phrase "I'm

just here so I can ride" over and over again in her head when she rides with

Valerie in order to avoid "getting really fucking mad at Valerie's passive

aggressive behavior." When Valerie did meet-up with us just a few minutes later

Krista immediately began her what was for her a difficult conversation:

Krista: I need to tell you something and I hope you don't get angry because my

message is really just informational. It's not a personal attack or anything so don't

interpret it as mean.

Valerie: Okay. Hello to you, too.

Krista: Hi. Sorry. Okay. I need you to be on time when we ride because I only have a short amount of time to be out and the past three times that you've shown up so that late half my ride time was already gone.

Valerie: Why don't you just go ahead and I'll meet you on the trails, then.

Krista rolled her eyes: "Can you just be on time and we can go together? Especially these trails – they're totally sketchy.

Valerie: Okay. I'll try.

This case shows the most typical pattern of conflict on Team Hamilton in the face of interdependency: palpable, but ultimately restrained, conflict management. In this incident, after tolerating Valerie's repeated lateness for some time, Krista and Valerie clashed over the issue of tardiness. In keeping with moral moderation, over the course of their exchange, these riders responded to each other with increasing animosity conveyed in subtle ways. Valerie appeared to initially listen patiently as Krista struggled to articulate why Valerie's behavior bothered her. However, Valerie's rhetorical suggestion – both women were well aware of the threat that riding alone posed to their safety – that Krista ride alone instead of wait for Valerie revealed that Valerie was more aggravated by Krista's confrontation than her calm veneer portrayed. Bristling at Valerie's couched enmity, Krista rolled her eyes, elevating the conflict that much more.

Ultimately, however, because they depended upon each other for safety on the trails, their conflict ended with each tolerating the other's behaviors.

In her work, "Collective Violence as Social Control," Roberta Senechal de la Roche (2001) defined functional interdependence as "the degree to which people cooperate with one another" (127). She argued that functional interdependence among a group faced with a grievance is a component of a social structure that is conducive to the collectivization of violence (de la Roche 2001). Extending her definition by using it to explain conflict within a group as opposed to conflict across groups, this chapter describes the impact of interdependency on the conflict management among team riders.

In general, the presence or lack of interdependency is recognized as affecting conflict (De Dreu & Beersma 2005; Tjosvold, Hui, & Yu 2003). Much research suggests that heightened interdependency inhibits conflict (Doyle 1997; Hirschman 1977, 61; Stein 1993; Viner 1951, 261; Gasioroski and Polachek 1982). Interdependency is a factor of consequence across social contexts, but is particularly salient in the social life of many teams. This is because members of teams share common goals and need to work collaboratively in order to reach their goals. For example, members of corporate business teams charged with product innovation rely on each other for success, no one person being able to achieve the goal without teamwork. Likewise, football players must work together to overcome the opposing team's defense and score touchdowns, a task no individual football player could accomplish effectively. Further, the sport of cycling demands high levels of teamwork in order to achieve cycling-specific goals. Remarking on the crucial role team members play in achieving goals, seven-time Tour de France winner Lance Armstrong notes:

"It takes eight fellow U.S. Postal Service riders to get me to the finish line in one

piece, let alone in first place. Cycling is far more a team sport than spectators

realize, and it's an embarrassment worth cringing over that I've stood on the

podium of the Tour De France alone, as if I got there by myself. I don't just show

up there after almost three thousand miles, and say, "Look what I did." When I

wear the yellow jersey, I figure I only deserve the zipper. The rest of it each

sleeve, the front, the back, belongs to the guys."

In general, the case involving Valerie and Krista illustrates the pattern of the restrained, non-confrontational conflict management that generally prevailed among Team Hamilton members. This moral moderation, marked by restrained conflict in the face of tensions, is explained by the interdependency among team members. As interdependency among team members varied with setting and situational elements, conflict varied as well. Indicators of interdependency on Team Hamilton include:

- quantity of functional activity / event (i.e. amount of trail work)

- temporal distance from a functional activity / event

- number of cyclists fulfilling functional roles / performing functional needs (i.e. three trail builders; one ride guru)

- level of task risk / safety

- type of event

Though similar and often overlapping, interdependency differs from organization in that

interdependency was present when riders came together to produce a desired outcome because this outcome could not be accomplished alone.[3] As noted in chapter four, organization was present when operational dictates and/or norms (either internal or external) structure team activity. Thus, interdependency and organization vary independently. On Team Hamilton, interdependency was high when the function performed was risky, involved hard work, required a great deal of time, demanded skill, or entailed much money. Relatedly, team member status varied with the centrality of his/her tasks and/or roles to the group's activities: the greater the importance of the task or role, the higher the status and vice versa. Further, a rider gained functional status when he/she performed a role or executed a task that few others took on but on which others depended. Conversely, interdependency was low when an abundance of people performed needed functions and those functions were easily carried out with little investment, challenge, or burden.

Interdependency manifested in many forms that impacted the group unevenly. Some activities, such as trail work, created interdependency, while other acts, such as by cooking dinner for trail workers or donating beer and tools, also supported and sustained interdependency, but less centrally so. Thus, over time and across settings, interdependency varied: riders were highly interdependent at single moments in time, while much more loosely interdependent at others. As interdependency varied, so too did conflict.

On Team Hamilton, riders were highly interdependent for safety, trail work, and ride execution. Riders also relied on each other for carpooling to far-away races and rides, for circulating ride-relevant information such as trail closures, and for social networks and contacts

---

[3] Though similar statuses, distinguishing functional status from radial status illustrates that people can be more or less integrated without being dependent upon each other in order to reach a goal. In other words, functional status differs from radial status (integration) in that functional status captures integration and interdependency, while radial status only captures integration.

from which they might solicit sponsorship dollars. In general, this interdependency prevented

many clashes from arising and discouraged violent, aggressive conflict in favor of more

moderate conflict management techniques. As such, the general pattern of conflict with regards

to interdependency is that of toleration.

Interdependency and Functional Status

Two particular roles that team members occupied earned significant status: the guru and

the trail worker. Because the team relied heavily on the work done by riders performing these

roles, non-confrontational conflict management prevailed when a grievance was upward;

however, when a grievance was downward, conflict management was more palpable, involving,

for example, confrontational yelling and barbed, provoking comments. Team member's

interdependency did not go unnoticed by riders. Instead, most riders acknowledged and valued

the efforts made in performing tasks and undertaking roles that benefited the team as a whole.

For example, on more than one occasion, team members pooled their money to purchase a gift

for Mac, showing their appreciation for his work finding sponsorship for the team. In another

instance, Jenna made dinner for Luke, Josh, and Ryan to thank them for their labor trail working.

Performing these functional roles and tasks not only earned others' gratitude, it also elevated a

rider's functional social status.

The Guru

Riders on Team Hamilton were highly interdependent with regards to ride execution.

This included issues of navigation, refueling logistics, ride routes, times, and distances. These

issues arose because most team-rides exceeded three hours and consequently covered great

distances. In order to conduct rides of such length, riders needed particular knowledge. Riders

needed information on the terrain over which they intended to ride, how to piece trails together,

how to avoid dangerous routes that traveled on main roads, store locations for refilling water and

food, and an understanding of how much time the total ride would take. Riders had knowledge

about these issues in varying degrees that correlated with status: the greater the depth of ride-

specific information a rider had the greater that rider's status. This status was particularly salient

because many cyclists on Team Hamilton did not prepare themselves with any information about

rides, instead depending on others for ride details.

This dependency afforded "gurus" a great deal of power and, subsequently, status. The

person or, in some cases, people, who knew the most about all aspects of a ride typically made

decisions regarding the peloton's collective actions. These ride gurus decided the time rides

started, the ride route, and when and where the group stopped along the ride to eat or even use

the bathroom. A guru's status extended beyond ride specific events and influenced other areas of

social life. With regards to conflict, gurus influenced patterns of toleration, gossip, and mockery.

Such was the case with entrenched and long-time guru Sam Hill. Folklore surrounding Sam that

mythologized his riding talent illustrated the status he garnered by virtue of his ride know-how.

Sam was known for his prowess on the bike despite the fact that he was not the highest ranked,

fastest rider on Team Hamilton. For example, an email to Hamilton's university cycling team

that encouraged riders to join Sam in an upcoming ride described Sam as a god. An email that

followed this one told a fictional story in which Sam performed impossibly amazing physical

feats on his bicycle. When prodded for his reaction to being painted as such an extraordinary

rider Sam responded, "It's good to be king."

Echoing this sentiment, after a cyclist who had decided at the last minute not to attend a

particular ride heard that Sam had been there, she remarked that she was glad to have missed the ride. She went on to say that her policy was to assume that, "if [Sam's] there, I shouldn't be." By this statement, this woman meant that Sam's presence signaled that the ride would be too fast and hard for her to keep up. That this woman made this statement is particularly reflective of Sam's status because she said it despite regarding herself as a fit, capable rider and the fact that she has never even ridden with Sam. Instead, she based her assessment on Sam's widely known reputation as a ride guru.

The high regard cyclists held for Sam stemmed directly from his ride guru status: he solicited cyclists' participation, chose routes, knew all route turns by heart, ensured store-stops occurred at timely junctures, and wrote post-ride stories. Throughout the year, Sam reliably attended weekly Saturday and Sunday team rides. For these rides, attending riders typically did not discuss a pending route except to ask Sam questions such as, "where are we headed today?" The only input solicited or given by riders was if Sam asked about others' time constraints. Sam always signaled the ride start and everyone followed him without any idea of Sam's intended route. Further, Sam always rode at the front of the paceline for at least the first 20 minutes or so, another indication of his status in that this time length far exceeded any other rider's turn doing the same job. Additionally, throughout the duration of the ride, Sam called out directions as riders approached turns. He also announced store-stops and bathroom breaks. In fact, riders told Sam when they needed to use the bathroom and left it to him to call the peloton to a stop – which he some times did and some times did not do.

In addition to decisions pertinent to rides, gurus' authority extended to small decisions like where the team will stop to eat dinner should the ride have taken place outside of Hamilton. In one case, another guru, Stan, suggested the team stop for dinner at a Chinese restaurant.

Though Chris and Mark hated Chinese food, neither voiced their distaste and both stopped at the restaurant to eat. In another case, two riders reported that they attended and brought a gift to a baby shower hosted by Stan despite the fact that they barely knew the couple for whom the shower was given. Overall, as these cases show, interdependency between gurus and riders produced toleration and other moderate reactions to tensions. This general pattern of moderate conflict management extends, in general, to interdependence – and functional status – garnered through trail work.

Trail Work Status

In addition to ride execution, riders relied on each other to maintain trails, to increase the quantity of trails available for riding, and for generating money to buy trail tools. Within social space, trail-working efforts enhanced a rider's functional status. In Hamilton, there was a dearth of publicly available mountain bike trails. Consequently, riders built their own trails. Riders who undertook this task earned much status, primarily from three features of trail building: one, trail building was hard physical labor; two, it took a lot of time and; three, in Hamilton, most, if not all, trail building occurred illegally. Thus, trail builders achieved status because other riders depended on them to provide the physical setting needed in order to mountain bike. In addition, trail builders benefited from other social advantages that came with building the trail in that they had a hand in determining the trail's shape and they knew the location and topographic characteristics of new trails.

Few riders trail built, thus few people acquired status through this activity. In general, then, in the face of most grievances, riders tolerated those with trail work status. This pattern held true for those riders that rarely tolerated tensions in other settings and around other issues.

For example, Mark always assigned Charlie and Valerie to the job of raking. Though both found this job boring and undesirable, neither Charlie nor Valerie complained directly to Mark or refused the task. They did, however, both complain to the other – status equals – about raking and voiced a desire to plot the trail through the woods, a job that only Mark and Sam performed.

In the single incident I recorded in which a rider with subordinate status initiated conflict with a rider of superior status over trail building issues, Krista, an intimate of a high status rider who also trail built – confronted Mark and Sam about not being included in trail engineering. In response to Krista's dissent, Mark and Sam agreed she could forge the next section of trail. After admonishing her that, "it's not as easy as it looks," Krista recruited Valerie to help her. Together, Krista and Valerie cut a rough line through the woods to mark where others should create a distinct path. Almost immediately, Mark and Sam, who had been watching the women and not raking as was the task Krista and Valerie swapped with them, halted Krista and Valerie. Mark rhetorically asked if they really though the trail should go the way Krista and Valerie were forging. Krista and Valerie exchanged looks. Valerie affirmed that she thought it was a good line, though admitted it would be challenging. Sam said he thought no one would successfully ride their line and that it would just frustrate riders. He then cut an "alternative" path so that riders would have a choice. On rides subsequent to the completion of the trail that traveled over this location, Mark and Sam always remarked on "the girl's line" and noted to all present both that no one could clear it and that most riders took the alternate line Sam created. In addition, Mark and Sam rarely failed to rhetorically ask Krista and/or Valerie whether they had "cleaned," or successfully ridden, the section of trail they built.

This case shows the status hierarchy garnered vis-à-vis trail work and its impact on patterns of conflict: Mark and Sam, consistent trail workers, were high in status and Krista and

122

Valerie, riders less likely to trail work, were low in status. As such, Krista and Valerie generally

tolerated the work that correlated with their subordinated status – raking – though they disliked

the task. In this sole instance of challenge to this hierarchy that I observed over trail work issues,

Mark and Sam initially responded with tolerance. Over time, however, though their conflict

management techniques remained nonconfrontational and mild, they ceased responding with

toleration. Instead, they began to mock Krista and Valerie, a more malicious method of conflict

management, and challenged their credibility as mountain bikers by questioning their trail-

building judgment.

Interdependency and Toleration

Safety

As noted above, Team Hamilton members were interdependent upon each other for ride

knowledge and trail work. In addition, Team Hamilton riders relied on each other for safety

during long rides that involved a fair amount of risk. In the face of this dimension of

interdependency, riders tolerated objectionable behaviors that, in other situations, provoked more

aggressive conflict management. For example, in one instance, Chris and Mark planned to ride

together after Mark finished work for the day. This timing put their ride in the dark. Chris

remarked to a friend who did not ride that he wished Mark could ride earlier because Mark was

always late and this pushed the time they finished riding to close to midnight. The friend asked

why Chris did not simply ride alone at an earlier time. Chris told him that he felt unsafe alone on

the particular trails he wanted to ride because the trails were very technically challenging. Chris

wanted another rider present in case he sustained an injury. Therefore, he tolerated Mark's

tardiness.

In another, similar case, Greg always attended the Thursday night ride instead of riding earlier in the day but constantly complained about, as he put it, "group dynamics." By this statement Greg meant that when riders did not take care of their bikes, and some times even when they did, parts broke or tires went flat. Fixing these issues on the trail took time away from that which could have been spent riding. When asked by a rider who Greg often complained about why Greg continued to attend the group rides if he was so impatient Greg replied, "Safety in numbers, dude. You never know when crack-heads are going to be hiding out in the woods getting high." He went on to tell a story about a stranger in the woods throwing broken bottles at a rider who surprised him while he was getting high.

For similar reasons, Jesse also cited that she would rather ride at a time less convenient to her and "put up with other's issues" than ride alone. In particular, she said she worried about "getting raped or hit by a car." These cases underscore the interdependency among riders. They also highlight how riders exercised toleration in the face of grievances and tensions instead of more confrontational conflict management that occurs as a result of interdependency among team members in the quest for safety.

Ride Knowledge

In addition to interdependency for safety precipitating tolerance, interdependency for ride execution also produced toleration. A particular case involving Sheila, a low status rider, showed how riders tolerated Sam in the face of being dependent on him for his ride knowledge. In this case, in a departure from the typical pattern of behavior regarding low status riders who do not sustain the pace on road rides and low status riders who violate formal and informal rules of cycling practice, Sam tolerated, and urged others to tolerate, Sheila's behavior.

Case 6.1: Sheila

On a group road ride, Sheila struggled to keep up and often broke cycling

etiquette in an attempt to achieve a better position in the bunch – and thereby

capitalize on the advantage group position gives to the rider because of the

physics involved in drafting – so that she might continue with the bunch. Noting

that Sheila struggled to keep up, Sam told others to slow their pace, plus he

pushed her up hills. Following suit, other riders also pushed Sheila and acquiesced

to Sam's wishes by slowing down. During the ride, no one commented on

Sheila's lack of pack-skills or how her behavior negatively impacted the ride. In

other words, the peloton tolerated behavior they typically did not, and changed

their own behavior, to aid Sheila at Sam's urging. In fact, in counter point, the

next day, a man no one knew started the ride with the same riders minus Sheila.

Like Sheila the day before, the man was unable to stay with the pack's pace.

Instead of waiting or pushing him, the peleton let him fall behind and ultimately

left him with no discussion or attempt to assist him.

In another instance that shows how dependence on Sam for ride knowledge evoked

tolerance from others, Sam played a practical joke on Bill who responded with mild rebuking

and toleration.

Case: 6.2: Practical Joker

On a summer ride, the group stopped at a store at the midway point of a long ride

in order to refuel on food and use the bathroom. After a few minutes, all the

cyclists on the ride waited outside the store, ready to resume riding, except for

Bill. Noticing Bill's absence, Sam urged all the riders to quickly start riding away

125

from the store so that they would be out of sight when Bill exited, and thereby panic Bill. Sam chuckled to himself as he shepherded everyone onto their bikes, telling them to hurry up and giggling about Bill's angry reaction to Sam's joke. At one point, Chris noted how mean this prank was and asked a fellow cyclist why they were doing Sam's bidding. However, instead of resisting, every single rider capitulated to Sam's wishes by riding away and stopping just out of sight. After a few minutes, Bill surged into view riding quickly as if to catch the group. When he saw us he stopped and said, "Whoa. What the hell? I thought ya'll forgot about me and left." At that, Sam started to laugh hysterically. Bill turned to him, and said, "Dude. You're such an ass. I don't know why I put up with your shit." Sam replied, "Damn, Bill. Let's go already. Where've you been?" With that, Sam started riding down the road and everyone followed.

In three additional cases that underscore the impact of dependency on patterns of conflict, Sam created email addresses using other riders' names. This made it appear as if these riders – Rick, Bill, or Matt – wrote the emails. In an attempt to further make it appear as if these riders sent the emails associated with the addresses Sam established, Sam signed these riders' names in closing each email. Every email that originated from one of these fake email addresses was inflammatory. For example:

> I would simply point out that Shackles celebrated love makin has ground to a screeching halt. You can't be no Love Shack if you are tethered to one woman with a ball and chain, have a bone in your nose, and a prince in your Albert. Like smooth and creamy Peter Pan peanut butter, I spread my lovin around. That's how come I'm the new, true Love Shack. As for my turn of speed, when your love

126

makin is as refined as mine, all you need to do is swagger down the street at low

speed. Women can tell by the way I walk that I'm a speed demon, if you know

what I mean. Let's all raise our glass to Shackles. He's a long ways gone, if you

know what I mean.

Wes, but you can call me Love Shackles.

Using double-talk to taunt Wes (Love Shackles), in this email Sam goaded him about

spending time with his new girlfriend but attributed this attack to Bill by using an email address

that made it appear as if Bill sent the email. Neither Bill – nor Rick or Matt – confronted Sam

over this practice. When asked why he tolerated Sam's behavior, Bill rhetorically questioned in

return, "What am I going to do about it? And really, I just don't care. I just want to ride."

After receiving one of these emails, I suggested to my husband that I establish a fake

email address that looked as if it belonged to Sam and write fantastical messages to the group in

his name. My husband cautioned me about doing so, suggesting that I did not want to invite

Sam's gaze to focus on me. I immediately responded that my husband was correct and tossed the

idea aside. This decision, like these cases in which Sam hijacked other riders' names and emails

show the pattern of upward toleration that prevails, especially with regards to those others

depend upon, in situations of interdependency.

Trail Work

In addition to safety and ride knowledge, when issues that caused tensions arose in the

course of trail working, riders typically did not make a fuss, instead reacting calmly. For

example, in most settings, riders criticized others and gossiped about issues of waiting – waiting

for late riders, waiting on the trail if a rider's bicycle malfunctioned, waiting for slow riders to

catch up with the group, waiting for others to finish eating and/or smoking pot. In contrast, riders tolerated stops to trail work during rides despite these cases involving the typically conflict-ridden issue of waiting.

For example, Rick often complained about any stops the group made on rides. He told others that he had a limited amount of time to ride due to his family and work commitments and, consequently, wanted to "ride when I'm riding." He often accused others of "not keeping [their] shit tight." By this statement he meant things such as not keeping their bike in working order, failing to bring necessary gear and food on rides, and failing to arrive on time. However, though he never dismounted his bike to help and occasionally rolled his eyes, Rick did not make antagonistic comments when, on rides, the cyclists came to barriers on the trail and stopped to remove them.

Another example of increased toleration in the face of trail working was the Team's behavior with regard to Brian. In general, the Team showed a marked distain for Brian; many avoided him and he was subject to a great deal of malicious gossip and mockery. However, on the few occasions in which Brian attended trail-working parties, Brian attracted much less conflict. In a turn of events, instead of ignoring him, riders greeted him. Further, in these instances, Brian did not arise as a topic of gossip, nor did riders criticize him. Though Brian was not consulted on his opinion on where the trail should go and was given the more tedious tasks that needed to be done – behaviors he tolerated – he was none-the-less tolerated in this setting by riders with whom he typically had conflict.

The three arenas of dependency discussed above – safety, ride knowledge, and trail work – generally encouraged toleration among riders. However, as interdependency within these arenas varied, so too did the conflict management that prevailed.

<u>Decreased Interdependency and Aggressive Conflict</u>

Despite interdependency generally tempering clashes in favor of toleration, when grievances arose, it also, at particular times, exacerbated conflict. Riders with high functional status, like those of ride guru and trail builder, often reacted aggressively to tensions with riders who offered little in the way of advancing team goals, particularly at times in which interdependency was salient. At these moments in time, the targets of hostilities were most typically non-contributing riders. In other words, low interdependence – or independence from Team Hamilton – created conflict. For example, whenever trail builders began or were in the midst of building a new trail the frequency and intensity of conflict between these riders and others, particularly those who were not central to the task hand, increased.

Conflict management techniques that arose around the issue of trail building at moments in time where interdependence and independence were simultaneously salient features of social space on Team Hamilton included out-right criticisms (self-help), baited statements (self-help), including, "…if any of you ever came out to work," and barbed, rhetorical questioning, such as "where were you during trail work on Monday?" Riders to whom these criticisms were directed rarely confronted those making these criticisms. Instead, they tolerated them. Riders who responded typically replied with an excuse related to work or family, such as "Man, the kids," "My wife needed me home," or "I worked late." No non-trail building rider ever suggested that they just did not want to attend the trail-building session or that they found building illegal trail too risky. In other words, downward conflict dominated over trail work issues.

In addition, as a behavior that underscores interdependency and functional status as dominant features of social life on Team Hamilton, trail builders tended to treat their knowledge about new trails as secret information that they only passed-on to select non-trail building riders.

Those who received information about new trails but that did not help build them typically either had a lot of status themselves because they ranked highly or they benefited from a trail builder's status as an intimate. For example, Steve always informed his riding partner, Craig, about new trails that Steve worked on even though Craig rarely built trail. Similarly, trail builders often informed Mac, the team director, about new trails though he seldom worked on them. In contrast, team members had a standing rule for the Thursday night ride stating that they would not ride new trails if non-team members attended the ride.

Conflict that arose over the trail Big Ridge is particularly illustrative on this point. In addition to building trail in Hamilton, team members built trail in the mountains an hour and a half north. Over the years they had developed an extensive network of trail and were constantly expanding it. One especially risky and ambitious trail riders built was dubbed Big Ridge. Big Ridge trail descended from one of the highest points in the state to the river situated in the valley below; in other words, Big Ridge was long and covered a lot of terrain. In addition, the trail was illegal, a typical feature of Team Hamilton's trails. Big Ridge, however, was especially risky because it was located in national forest. In fact, Big Ridge used a very short portion of, and then veered off from, a national forest trail. To avoid detection, and subsequent penalty, trail builders worked on the trail very early in the morning and even occasionally at night. The remote location of Big Ridge also meant that trail builders needed to drive and then camp in order to work. These elements – the risk, sacrifice, and hard work trail builders incurred while working on Big Ridge – contributed to the high frequency and heated nature of the conflict that arose over the control of information about Big Ridge.

In the initial months following the completion of Big Ridge, riders who built this trail were adamantly close-mouthed about it. At first, they only rode the trail with others who worked

on it. This policy quickly dissipated due to the fact that the trail builders often rode with intimates that did not trail build. For example, Krista and Sam, a married couple, rode almost every ride together; Sam helped build Big Ridge but Krista did not. Likewise, Drew and Brian, roommates, always rode together; Brian helped build Big Ridge but Drew did not. Information about Big Ridge spread through these relationships. However, intimates to those who built Big Ridge were constantly reminded of their privilege and of the desire to keep the whereabouts of the trail secret. This element created conflict. For example, Craig, a trail builder, specified to Mike, his training partner, that Mike could not tell Luke about the trail if Craig showed Mike the trail. Though Mike acquiesced to Craig's request that Mike exclude Luke, doing so created tension between all three of these riders. In the days that followed on the heels of Mike's ride on Big Ridge he leaked to others that he rode Big Ridge. Since the trail builders spearheading the building of Big Ridge had solicited help from almost all team riders – most of whom never ended up working on the trail – most Team Hamilton riders knew about Big Ridge's construction. So, when Mike mentioned that he rode it, he perked others' interest. As Mike's sometimes riding partner, Luke knew Mike had not helped build the trail and asked who showed it to him. Mike avoided answering the question.

At some point following this incident, Luke asked Mike to take him to Big Ridge the following weekend. Mike said he had plans that kept him from doing so. After this second interaction between Luke and Mike about Big Ridge Mike avoided Luke. Noticing this, in reaction, Luke made a fuss whenever Mike did not avoid him. He made comments such as, "It's been awhile," "Glad you could make it," and "Hey, you don't have someplace else to be?" In addition, when Mike was absent, Luke gossiped about Mike's personal life. For instance, on a ride with four other teammates, Luke told a story Mike had once confided in him about a fight

between Mike and his girlfriend. Luke's rendition of the story painted Mike as irrational, domineering, and misogynistic. For his part, during this time period, Mike largely either tolerated Luke's behavior, ignored him, or otherwise avoided him. Though this was the general way he managed his conflict with Luke, Mike also exacted retribution in a subtle way: he talked incessantly about the magnificence of Big Ridge and detailed his repeated trips to this trail whenever he crossed paths with Luke. In addition, during this time of estrangement between Luke and Mike, Mike started pitching in more often and helped complete the Big Ridge trail. After a few months, during which information about Big Ridge was freely given and most Team Hamilton's members rode it, Mike and Luke's rift seemed repaired: Luke stopped deprecating Mike when he was absent, ceased mocking him when they crossed paths, and offered Mike to share in smoking pot with him on a group ride. Mike, too, returned to old friendship patterns with Luke, greeting him in face-to-face encounters instead of ignoring him and stopped peppering his conversation with allusions to Big Ridge.

Although Mike and Luke's conflict might have caused irreconcilable damage to their relationship it did not. As is typical of the relationship between conflict and interdependency on Team Hamilton, the conflict between these teammates receded and their amicable relations resumed. The intensity of their conflict varied with a surge followed by the wane of emphasis on interdependency vis-à-vis trail building.

Another, more dramatic example highlighting the influence of low interdependency on conflict is the case involving Tim and John. In this instance, trail-builders were working to develop an extensive new trail at a very risky location. Tim worked on this trail weekly but John never worked; in other words, John was less interdependent with Team Hamilton members than

Tim. Clashing over the issue of trail work, Tim aggressively baited John, escalating the conflict beyond the norm:

Case 6.3: Trail Work Clash

John asked Tim if he planned on attending a ride with a few of John's friends in order to ride the new trail. Hearing this, Tim retorted, "Oh, the trail none of you work on? Oh, wait. That's *all* the trails." John looked at Tim for a second before responding, "We do work, a lot of work." Tim asked, "Where? You don't do anything. Some of those guys do sometimes but really, very little." John raised his voice and loudly retorted, "Just because we don't punch in on *your* time clock doesn't mean we don't do trail work." Tim laughed, "Oh, where do you do it then? Gene's? Where no one rides?" John replied, "I can't believe you said that." Tim interrupted him, cutting him off, "I really have nothing more to say. If you all think you do shit, you apparently live in your own little world." Tim then rode away.

In this case, Tim, a trail builder whose efforts benefited the team, criticized John and his friends for not doing their part. Tim's criticism departed from the way riders typically dealt with each other over tensions: it was public, overt, and hostile. John, too, deviated from how riders typically responded to trail builders. Instead of pleading excuses for not helping, John assertively challenged Tim's rebuke. On a more general level, this case shows an interaction between a rider whose role was central to the continuity of cycling in Hamilton and a rider who contributed little to achieving this goal, a free rider. The conflict between these two cyclists was shaped by this geometry in light of the high level of interdependency among Team Hamilton's cyclists. The result was non-conventional conflict for Team Hamilton – overt confrontation.

133

Another case involving Krista and Mac followed the same pattern: conflict that departed from the conventional redress Team Hamilton riders typically engaged in during an instance in which interdependency was threatened:

Case 6.4: 24-hours of the flu

> Mac asked Krista to race with three men in the co-ed division of a 24-hour race. The day before the race, Krista fell sick with a sinus infection and a fever. She phoned Mac with the intention of bowing out of the race. After she explained her sickness to him, Mac told her that despite her sickness the team still counted on her to race. He specified that she could keep her race laps to a minimum, instead of racing the same number of laps as the other team members. He also told her that he would pay for her to race. Krista capitulated and agreed to still race despite the fact that she felt Mac did not "merely suggest" she race, but that he "strong armed" her into racing. On race day, Krista's teammates encouraged her to keep racing throughout the 24-hour race period despite her illness. Instead of agreeing that she only do a few laps, Mac and her other teammates never suggested she miss one of her turns but tacitly made her feel as if she needed to continue racing by making comments like, "we're all in this together," and "I don't feel good either but I know it'll be worth it when we win." For her part, Krista stayed in her tent between laps, complaining that she was too sick to do anything but lie down. After the race, Krista told an acquaintance that she ran into while washing her bike at the race in question that she was not "having any fun" and she would not "make the same mistake again...these guys suck…they're totally insensitive…I can't believe I'm out here."

134

This case is an example of an instance in which conflict management takes on a more aggressive tone in the face of low levels of interdependency. In dealing with Krista's potential independence, Mac diverged from how team members typically dealt with grievances and insisted that Krista follow through with her commitment to race despite the fact that she was ill. Krista tolerated Mac's assertiveness, conceding to his wishes. Unlike Mac's actions, Krista's toleration of Mac's behavior, and her subsequent avoidance of Mac and her teammates during the race, however, was in keeping with the nonconfrontational conflict management that dominated on Team Hamilton.

Another case involving Jack and Jeff further illustrates how conflict became more hostile in the face of decreased interdependency:

Case 6.5: Burritos and Bikes

Jack, former co-sponsor of Best Burritos-Valley Cycles race team, began recruiting riders for a Best Burritos Racing Team after Best Burritos and Valley Cycles parted ways. Jack asked Jeff, one of the highest ranking team members that raced for the joint team, to solely align himself with Best Burritos Racing Team. Jeff refused to do so, though he agreed that he would race with Best Burritos for any race in which Valley Cycles Team did not race. In response, Jack raised his voice, used hostile patterns of speech such as interruption and harsh words, and accused Jeff of not being a "team player, " of failing to recognizing Jack's "sacrifices," and of lacking "loyalty" when Jeff refused to commit to Jack's racing team for the upcoming season.

After Jack and Jeff's conversation, Jeff and others gossiped about Jack's attempt to convince Jeff to align himself with Best Burritos. These team members

concluded that Jack's current method for recruiting Best Burrito team members

arose from a sense of desperation brought about from stress incurred after Jack, as

Jeff put it, "smoked his business away and pissed so many people off."

Jack's behavior – his persistent confrontation and harsh words – in the face of a challenge

to his team's interdependency – or, put differently, an increase in independency – marks more

inflammatory, vehement conflict management that generally prevailed on this interdependent

team. Jeff and others' reactions, however, did not stray from the typical conflict management

method bred from the interdependency among Team Hamilton members: they tolerated this

malicious conflict, dismissing it by interpreting Jack's actions as the result of stress.

Extreme Interdependency and Aggressive Conflict

In marked opposition to cases in which team interdependency was low, cyclists riding in

a paceline were highly interdependent. The paceline is a formation in which cyclists ride very

closely behind one another. By riding within inches of each others' wheels – the rear wheel of

the rider ahead and the front wheel of the following rider – cyclists create a draft. Drafting is a

technique riders use to overcome the drag created by wind resistance: the lead rider in the group

"breaks" the air and creates a slipstream for following riders. Drafting reduces all but the lead

rider's energy spent to maintain a particular speed. Drafting, and pacelining by extension, is

cooperative for two primary reasons. First, each rider relies on others to observe known

techniques and predictable actions. Riding closely together is risky and creates a precarious

interdependence among riders where the motion of one affects all. Each rider in a paceline

affects and is effected by the riders in front of him/her. The number of riders ahead cumulatively

magnifies these effects. For example, if a rider ahead of another unexpectedly hits his/her brakes,

all riders behind must also break. Likewise, if a rider in front accelerates, the riders behind must also accelerate in order to remain in contact with the group; to do otherwise would cause that rider to drift out of the draft – the lack of which makes maintaining a high pace hard to do – and at risk of not staying with the group. Similarly, all riders are affected if a rider creates a gap between him/her and the rider in front of him/her. If that gap becomes wider as the rider continues to fall back, riders behind the rider opening the gap are at risk for losing contact with the larger group or must use energy to surge around the rider in peril in order to reconnect with the paceline. In an effort to reduce the personal risk of this occurring, of "getting dropped," riders are vigilant about who is in front of them. The threat of this risk creates tension and invites potential conflict among riders. These same cumulative risks also exist for any lateral movement among riders. In addition, these close quarters mean that crashes are a constant threat. Consequently, riders must constantly anticipate and react to others movements; lapses in doing so invoke quick sanctioning.

Second, riders rotate successively: the lead rider spends time at the front of the group only to rotate off as the next rider in the line takes up the helm. The rider recently at the front then slows, letting the group move by, and rejoins the group in a farther back position. This allows the group to maintain a high rate of speed, typically higher than a single cyclist could maintain by him/herself. The theoretical norm in pacelines is for the rider rotating off the front to rejoin the group as the last rider in the line. However, on Team Hamilton, this typically does not happen. Instead, in some cases, riders either rejoined the group further towards the front by asking another rider politely to make space for them. In other cases, a rider in the paceline invited the rider that was moving off the front to rejoin the group in front of him/her and made space to do so. Other times the rider coming off the front pointed to a place and moved into it as

137

another rider in the paceline yielded in accommodation. Occasionally, the rider rotating off the front forced his/herself into a space as a rider in the paceline yielded in the face of being pushed off the road or crashing into the incoming rider.

The likelihood that any of these practices occurred depended on the social geometry of the case, but was overwhelmingly influenced by the current level of interdependency within the setting. Riders who did not participate in this formation did not affect the social aspect of the paceline because they were dropped from the rides, unable to maintain the same speed as the group. A variable that did complicate the social dimensions of pacelines were the presence of less fit riders that were able to ride with more fit cyclists because of the benefits the draft provided. This resulted in riders with dramatically different fitness and skill levels riding together. Each rider's threshold for being able to stay with the group was in direct relation to the speed of the ride: more riders were able to stay with the group on slow rides and fewer riders were able to stay with the group on fast rides. Generally, as group speed increased, paceline efficiency increased. In other words, the group became more interdependent as the tempo of the ride quickened. When this happened, riders increasingly depended on each other to behave in predictable ways.

This heightened interdependence often led to conflict. For example, in one case, Greg publicly confronted the rider with whom he had a grievance instead of tolerating the grievance or resorting to a more subtle method of conflict management as was typical when the same issue arose in settings where riders were less interdependent. In this case, Greg was direct in his communication instead of subtle and ultimately underscored the conflict by avoiding the rider with whom he was in conflict. He further elevated the conflict by openly involving others when he warned them about the other rider's risky bike handling:

Case 6.6: Greg TBL

On a TBL road ride in which riders rode side-by-side in pairs, Greg, a Hamilton native watched as an out-of-town rider unexpectedly swerved too close for Greg's comfort to the cyclist riding beside him, another out-of-town rider also unknown to Greg. In order avoid a crash, the rider who made the initial sudden move pushed against his partner – a behavior the partner did not anticipate, as was made apparent when he cautioned, "Hey, hey, hey." The rider in violation responded apologetically that his attention momentarily lapsed and he was sorry. A few minutes later Greg watched as this same rider overlapped wheels with the person in front of him, crossing his front wheel with the other cyclist's rear wheel; a position almost guaranteed to cause a crash. When this happened, Greg pulled out from his position behind this rider in the paceline and moved so that he was momentarily beside the careless rider. "Man," he said, "you're scary. Learn how to ride. You're gunna crash us all out. Don't come back until you figure it out." After delivering this message, Greg surged a few places ahead. When he pulled back into the formation in a new place he loudly warned others to watch out because "some guy back there's trying to take us all to the ground."

In addition to increasing interdependency by its mere enactment, riders in the paceline were more and less interdependent at different times on a ride. For example, interdependency increased when the pace of the ride quickened. When this happened, more riders were at risk for being dropped and the physical proximity of each rider decreased, creating a higher risk for crashes. Thus, riders carefully guarded their position in the paceline and, as noted above, vigilantly watched for unexpected movements that might create a crash. Conflict elevated under

139

such circumstances. This occurred in a case between Chris and Michael, where Michael initially tolerated Chris's behavior but, as the ride quickened and the interdependency between riders in the paceline heightened, Michael engaged in more aggressive tactics in response to his grievance with Chris. In this case, Michael initially resorted to humor to soften his request that Chris move to make room for him at a time in which the riders in the paceline was not very interdependent. In the face of this same issue, but at a point in time in which rider interdependency in the paceline increased, Michael changed tactics to more aggressive means that included direct communication and physical touching – a risky, confrontational action when on a bike in a closely packed group:

> Case 6.7: Michael and Chris Fight Over the Draft
>
> > In this case, Michael rode beside Chris, who positioned himself between the two riders in front of the pair instead of squarely behind only one of the riders in front so that Michael might also benefit from the draft from the other rider in front. Michael tolerated Chris's etiquette violation for the first half hour of the ride while the group slowly made its way out of town. Once beyond the stoplights and constant traffic, the pace of the ride quickened. Riding in the wind instead of largely in the draft, Michael asked Chris to move to the right. In doing so, he cloaked his request in humor, mocking himself as weak and therefore in desperate need of the draft to help him stay with the group. Chris moved but after a few minutes he drifted back to riding between the two riders in front of him, again pushing Michael to the left and out of the draft. Michael again tolerated this but only for a few minutes: on a hill, faced with expending a great deal of energy to climb the hill without the draft because of how Chris positioned himself, Michael

assertively told Chris to move because he, Michael, was "dying over here." Chris

did not respond. After a very short pause, Michael raised his voice and curtly told

Chris to move over as he, Michael, leaned into Chris and pushed against him.

Chris moved without verbally responding. After a few minutes, Chris pulled out

of the paceline and repositioned himself away from Michael.

Another case underscores this same pattern:

Case 6.8: Leonard

As the peleton climbed their first challenging, sustained hill of the ride on the way

out of town, Leonard, a repeat offender of ride etiquette, accelerated quickly and

signaled to Ann that he intended to merge back into the paceline in front of her.

Ann opened a space for Leonard and he moved in. All riders who witnessed this

interaction tolerated it. Towards the top of the hill, Leonard moved back out of the

paceline, allowing others to move ahead of him as the group outpaced his speed

up the hill. A few minutes later, after the peleton had crested the hill and the rode

flattened, Leonard accelerated forward and once again motioned to Ann to allow

him into the spot in front of her. Ann again slowed almost imperceptibly, just

enough to open a gap, and Leonard thanked her as he moved into the now open

space. Behind her, Bill chastised Ann, softly muttering that she should not have

let Leonard in. He then surged forward and, without asking, merged into the

paceline in front of Leonard. After a few seconds, Greg, Jess, and Ann followed

suit, all moving in front of Leonard.

This case shows two different responses to the same behaviors: Leonard asking Ann to let

him in and Ann allowing him to do so. However, though the behaviors were the same in both

cases, riders who witnessed these interactions responded differently at different points in time. This difference is explained by taking interdependency into account: the first case occurred when interdependency was low relative to the second case in which interdependency in the paceline was elevated. As a result, the responses by riders affected by Leonard and Ann's behaviors varied: when interdependency was low, they tolerated the actions; when interdependency was high, they responded with criticism and assertive behavior that negatively impacted Leonard.

Sprint-Finishes

Another element of TBR rides, and competitive rides in general, that both increased the interdependency of riders on the ride as a whole and created instances of extreme interdependency among riders, are the fact that riders contested the finish. Riders participating in sprint-finishes were exceedingly interdependent for safety and to win. The fact that riders contested the finish on competitive rides catalyzed simultaneous increases in interdependency at many other points on a ride. In other words, to the casual observer, it might appear that cyclists who won races did so by virtue of their sprinting efforts in the last 200 meters of the ride. However, a rider's finishing position rarely, if ever, simply resulted from this short burst of power at the end of the ride. Instead, many other momentary instances and elements of elevated interdependency occurred during the ride prior to the finish that affected a rider's ultimate outcome. For example, as rides neared their finish, teamwork increased so that a team might put their rider over the finish line in first place. In pursuit of this goal, specific roles, such as that assumed by the rider chosen to lead the designated sprinter to the line (the lead-out) and the rider whose job it was too sprint for the finish (the sprinter), that lay dormant over the course of the ride were activated. Thus, as the ride neared its end and the interdependency ramped up, the

142

frequency and severity of conflict increased. Riders often engaged in direct confrontation, such as yelling, during these moments. For example, in one case that occurred during the final acceleration before the sprint a rider shouted at Matt to "hold [his] line," meaning for Matt to not move laterally. In another case, a rider yelled, "No! Stay where you are!" when Nick changed positions while sprinting.

The few cases of confrontational conflict management among Team Hamilton members surfaced during these moments of extreme interdependency. This dramatic, even violent, conflict contrasted to the more moderate conflict management that occurred when riders were less interdependent. The case involving Ben and Mike illustrates this pattern:

Case 6.9: Wrestling

Ben and Mike, two professional riders, loudly exchanged insults during a race in the lead-up to the sprint after Mike pushed Ben off the road when attempting to force Ben to yield and allow him into the paceline. After Ben recovered and safely navigated back onto the asphalt, he shouted for Mike to pull over, declaring he would "fuck [Mike] up." Ben reacted, telling Mike to "shut the fuck up and stop acting like a baby." Mike then pushed Ben and both fell to the ground where they wrestled each other until others pulled them apart.

In this case, violence erupted over an issue that cropped up often and was typically handled through much less confrontational means. This violence is explained by the fact that the case occurred under conditions of particularly elevated levels of interdependency. Likewise, in a case involving Chris and Dave, violent conflict occurred in another situation of extremely high interdependence: a criterium road race. Of all cycling races, the criterium cumulatively has the highest levels of interdependence during all points of the race. Riders competing in these races

143

complete multiple laps of a closed course for a pre-determined amount of time, typically one to

one and a half hours duration much shorter than a cross-country road race). The relatively short

time-length of these races enables racers to physically sustain a very fast rate of travel. In doing

so, the peloton's interdependence during these races reaches dramatic heights. In particular, the

finishes of these high-pace races are the penultimate in interdependency for riders participating

in cycling activity on Team Hamilton and, as such, are notorious for producing conflict. Riders

harshly, and often viciously, react to grievances that arise during this moment of extreme

interdependence. Illustrating this pattern, in one case, two professional men had a run-in that

turned violent during and immediately following a National Race Calendar (NRC) criterium.

During this race, Dave forcefully pushed Chris into the curb when Chris refused to yield his

position. In reaction, Chris punched Dave, almost causing a wreck in the peloton. After the race

ended, Dave attacked Chris with a 2x4. He hit Chris's bike, smashing the down tube, while Dave

held it up to avoid being hit with the piece of lumber. Dave recalls the incident this way:

Case 6.10: The 2x4

"The actual incident started like two weeks before at the [Hamilton Speedway].

Chris was bumping me in the sprint - but that's casual, that's racing. Especially in

the sprint, if you are sprinter, it is happening up there. It's not that big of a deal,

but he was really, really aggressive after the race. He wanted to fight with me. He

said he wanted to punch me here and there, and I said no, I don't fight. My

specific words were, "I'm not a fighter, I'm a lover." And that made him really

mad there. It was normal [bumping] during the race. It was after the race that he

came after me. I bumped with other guys during the race, but they didn't come

after the race. Because in the top fifteen, that is what happens. You bump each

144

other, you go to one wheel, then another. But it was after the race that he wanted to fight. But I'm not that way, so I turned my bike and rode away. But he was really aggressive.

But after, we were racing in [Hillsville] at 10 o'clock at night, in the rain. With five or six laps to go, everyone was in a single line - I started passing to get to the front. He intentionally put his arm off the bar and pushed me off the road. I didn't crash because I've been a professional rider for the last 20 years. I started when I was 14 and I'm 42 now, so I know how to ride the bike. 99 percent of the other riders could crash and be hurt because we were going really fast and at night. That's when I lost my temper, and I regret it. I waited for him after at the finish line, to ask him why he did that. And I could see him coming towards me to fight again. At that moment I don't know if it was for defending myself or what, I just grabbed a two-by-four; everyone knows about it, I'm not lying - when we did the hearing with the USCF, I admitted it. And I apologized, I lost my temper. I grabbed it to scare him. I hit the bike. I didn't try to hurt him. If I wanted to hurt him I would hurt in him the race, you know? That's the easy way.

That's pretty much my story. I lost it there - I don't know why, because I've never done that before - I've never ever. I've raced all over the world. I've been in thousands of sprints, and we fight each other. But that's in the race. After the race, we go and have a beer together. My best friends are the sprinters that I race against. Like [Larry]; we're friends and we bump each other every single race. It's a part of racing. [The incident] was too much."

As these cases show, when team members were extremely interdependent, conflict escalated dramatically. Instead of tolerating grievances, cyclists employed much more aggressive conflict management techniques. At times, these responses to tensions included instances of yelling and violence. This pattern – the positive relationship between high levels of interdependency and aggressive, hostile conflict – contradicts Black's (1990) suggestion that interdependency curbs aggression, as well as empirical findings.

Total Exit (independency)

Occasionally, cases arose that did not fit with the prevailing pattern of conflict on Team Hamilton. For example, in one case, Candice viciously attacked Krista verbally over the issue of money. Following this conversation, Candice completely withdrew from Team Hamilton, not interacting with any riders. In another case, Mac failed to deliver uniforms despite receiving $185 from team members wanting to purchase extra uniforms. The team members who gave Mac money responded in various ways: For example, Scott never asked him about the issue though he discussed it with others; Krista phoned him and requested an explanation; Larry questioned him about when the uniforms would arrive. In marked contrast, an enraged Brett aggressively confronted Mac and accused him of stealing the money to aid his failing business. Further, whenever Mac came up in conversation among team riders, Brett expressed the opinion that Mac was a drug-abusing liar and was adamant that Mac had premeditated stealing the money ostensibly earmarked for extra uniforms.

These cases are notable in that they appear to depart from Team Hamilton's typical pattern of conflict management. However, in both of these cases, the riders who respond in ways that endangered team interdependency subsequently quit the team. In the case of Candice, she

recently gave birth and decided she no longer wanted to spend time racing. In Brett's case, he recently married and moved to another town. Therefore, through exit, both of these riders were no longer interdependent with other team members, and instead independent, ex-team members.

<center>*******</center>

Interdependency among riders, coupled with the acknowledgement by team members of this dependency, increased the status of those who undertook necessary tasks and roles. In other words, riders who performed needed functions to sustain the group gained functional status. Black (2000) defines functional status as a type of social status derived from performance. In general, interdependency restrained the conflict team members employed in reaction to tensions. However, Team Hamilton showed three distinct patterns regarding interdependency: First, at times in which interdependency was low (independency relatively high), like the case in which Krista was sick or Jeff did not join Team Best Burritos, conflict was aggressive and frequent. Conflict was most moderate when interdependency was moderate, as was the typical mode of operation on Team Hamilton. This pattern is consistent with pure sociology and empirical findings (Black 1990). For example, Senechal de la Roche (1990) found that interracial ties deter race riots; Max Gluckman (1956) noted that feud and vengeance are most least to occur between highly independent groups and; multiple ties, such as marriages, between groups decrease severe conflict (Colson 1953). Yet, at points in which interdependency was very high, like in the paceline, conflict was frequent and more severe – even violent at times – than normal for the team. This positive relationship – high interdependency and high conflict – complicates the known relationship between interdependency and conflict, hitherto only documented as a negative, linear relationship. The curvilinear relationship between interdependency and conflict

<center>147</center>

suggests that the relationship between these two variables is more complex than previously thought.

I found that toleration was the most typical response to all tensions. On the other hand, when threats to interdependency surfaced, including instances in which team members shirked responsibilities or did not further team goals, malicious and inflammatory conflict increased. In these occasional cases, conflict management included low-level self-help, such as criticism, barbed comments, manipulation, and raised voices. However, even in such moments of elevated conflict, interdependency tempered conflict management so that the pattern of nonviolent and relatively non-confrontational conflict prevailed. Overall, interdependency – the need to work together and thwart threats to the team's functioning – was an aspect of social space that tempered conflict management towards the non-confrontational. Thus, interdependency helps to explain the moderate conflict that prevailed as the moral order in Team Hamilton.

CHAPTER 7

INTIMACY: NARROW AND DEEP

The members of Team Hamilton often had a hard time pinpointing when they met each other, the year and the setting often receding beyond the grasp of memory. Many blamed the utilitarian garb each rider wore for this missing detail, finding that the functional clothing, especially the helmet, masked differences in physical details and rendered riders carbon copies of each other. Noting this phenomenon, Matt reported:

> "Everyone looks the same at first. Even now, though not as often as before, if I run into someone I know well on the bike in a place I don't expect to see them, I won't always recognize them immediately."

Echoing this theme, Krista related that one evening in the co-op, a physically small grocery store in Hamilton, she held the door open for a man entering behind her. She looked twice at his face, knowing she had seen it before but just could not place it. While purchasing her groceries, the same man stood in line behind her. Suddenly she knew he was one of three other riders who rode mountain bikes together with for four hours the week before. When this dawned on her, she turned to him and said, "Hi Eric." He slowly smiled and said hi in what sounded to her like a surprised tone that indicated he did not recognize her. Instead of reminding him of who she was, she left, a bit embarrassed by the interaction. The following week Krista saw Eric again, this time on a road ride. At a stopping point in the ride she approached him, confident that in this

setting he would instantly know her, and asked whether he knew it was she who said hi to him at the co-op. He replied that he didn't realize it at the time but did a few days later.

These two incidents highlight the generally narrow social parameters in which Team Hamilton riders interact with one another, namely while riding or in activities that involved cycling. Riders did not regularly interact outside of cycling specific events. Predominantly, Team Hamilton members met regularly in pursuit of specific goals, but did not much socially gather for any other reason. Thus, they can be characterized as narrowly intimate. This narrow intimacy explains the variation in form, as well as the severity, of conflict within this team. Overall, I found that as the depth of intimacy between riders increased conflict decreased. Likewise, as intimacy became less narrow between riders, conflict decreased.

In other words, as social ties among team members strengthened, conflict lessened. This is consistent with Black's proposition that conflict varies with intimacy (relational distance) (1976). Indeed, this pattern between intimacy and conflict is well documented. Research shows that intimacy tempers a great variety of conflicts, including lynching, avoidance, legal cases (i.e. court rulings on rape cases, on intimate partner homicide), and rates of private versus public conflict (Senechal de la Roche 2001; Baumgartner 1988; Estrich 1987; Lundsgaarde 1977; Cooney 2002).

Further, the addition of the voluntary aspect of this team also shaped the conflict management among team members. Specifically, with regards to voluntary membership, the potential addition or subtraction of a team member at any time added a level of unpredictability to any prevailing social geometry. This unsettled state gave rise to more forceful conflict than if the social hierarchy had been settled (Gould 2003). Thus, instead of absent or minimal conflict, the combination of narrow intimacy and voluntary membership produced moral moderation and

150

explains the high frequency of gossip among riders on this team, as well as avoidance as conflict management.

Narrow Intimacy

      In this study, measures of intimacy arose out of how frequently riders interacted with other team members, the duration of riders' interactions, how varied the type of involvement among riders, the accumulated time spent among riders over years, and how overlapping riders' ties were to wider networks. Intimacy conceived in this way differs from interdependency. Individuals can be intimate without being interdependent, as in the case with cousins living in two different cities that rarely see each other but speak often over their lifetimes. Individuals can also be interdependent without being intimate, such as a parent relying on a teacher s/he has never met to educate his/her child. Between riders on Team Hamilton, intimacy and interdependency were empirically integrated; however, they are analytically distinct.

      In general, on the one hand, the single-stranded nature of riders' interactions limited intimacy by curtailing the breadth of experiences shared by riders, as well as limited social knowledge about others. On the other hand, riders met often and maintained lengthy relationships with, relative to numerical enduring relationships in other social arenas, few people. As a result, relationships tended to be deep but narrow in intimacy.

Creating Intimacy

      Between riders on Team Hamilton, intimacy deepened through shared experiences. At times, the degree of interdependency between riders sharing a particular experience influenced the level of intimacy between or among team members. For example, Greg and Todd lost their

bearings while riding and searched for familiar ground together for over 12 hours. The time they spent together included sleeping over night in the forest with no shelter or food. These two riders referenced this notable event frequently in conversation as an experience that bonded them to each other. In another instance, Meg broke her collarbone while riding with Jake. Jake carried Meg for over three hours to find help. Both riders recollect this event as distinguishable from other rides and felt it strengthened their friendship. Meg remarked that she "now know[s] who [she] want[s] on [her] team during Armageddon."

The frequency with which riders interacted also impacted intimacy: the greater the frequency of interaction, the greater the intimacy between riders. Regular ride attendance, actively assuming roles that entailed meeting with others, romantic relationships, roommate arrangements, working with another rider, and duration of membership all increased the frequency of interaction and consequently increased intimacy. In addition, frequency increased intimacy by creating shared experiences, enlarging shared social networks, and increasing the social information known about others.

Relationships characterized by high levels of intimacy exhibited high levels of tolerance. For instance, Brian D. and Drew were highly intimate and highly tolerant of each other. These two riders trained, lived, and socialized together. During my observations, I did not record any conflict occurring between these riders and noted many instances of toleration, instances that arose from contexts in which neither rider demonstrated tolerance for similar behaviors from other riders with whom they were less intimate. For example, in more than one case, when the pack stopped to eat on rides, Brain D. waited for Drew to finish his trail food before resuming riding but did not wait for other riders to finish. The converse also occurred: Drew waited for Brian D. but not others. In another instance, Steve dropped a tool on the trail and asked everyone

in the group to wait while he went back to retrieve it. Drew told Steve he was "slack" and that he would not wait. This contrasts to how he tolerated a similar action from Brian D: Brain dropped his sunglasses and turned around to pick them up. In this instance, Drew told the group that he would wait for Brian D.

This same pattern held true for Krista and Steve, a married couple; each tolerated actions from the other that they did not tolerate from other riders. In one case Krista tolerated, and then advocated that others also tolerate, Steve's tardiness and suggested the group wait for his arrival before departing on their ride. In contrast, in cases where the tardy rider was not Steve, Krista consistently recommended leaving late-arriving team members. In recurring instances, Steve urged the group to stop during rides in order to give Krista a chance to catch-up. In these same instances, Steve would motivate the group to re-start as soon as Krista arrived, even if other team members remained unaccounted.

The riding-partnership relationship further illustrates this tendency for toleration to increase with intimacy. Riding partners on Team Hamilton shared a great deal of intimacy. As the term suggests, riding partners are two or more riders that habitually ride together. Often, partners paired up by virtue of age, ability, availability, fitness and gender. The high level of intimacy between partners is explained as the result of two elements: One, riders who trained in partnerships spent a great deal of time together and; two, they shared a wide range of experiences. Riding partners frequently traveled together to races and, on these trips, shared hotels and meals, as well as the race-experience itself and the retelling of the race. In addition, some training partners spent time together in other casual social situations, such as dinner-dates and sporting events. Riders who did so often brought family members with them, thus creating additional ties, as well as the sharing of personal social information. Thus, riders who trained

together were highly intimate, a feature that affected how they dealt with each other when grievances arose between them. Most often, they dealt with issues that created conflict through toleration.

Variation in Intimacy: Deeper, Multiplex Relationships and Partisanship

Rider intimacy explains a portion of why conflict management on Team Hamilton varied at the case level. Though the team members generally only interacted while riding, some riders had overlapping ties in that they lived together, worked together, or were romantically involved. These additional ties created alliances and factions that influenced patterns of conflict. In general, alliances and factions increased confrontation (Shakur 1993). As these relationships both developed and disbanded across time, conflict varied in both frequency and tone. This is consistent with Black's (1998, p126) proposition: "partisanship is a joint function of social closeness to one side and social remoteness from the other."

Alliances

At times, Team Hamilton riders allied with one another. Relationships between riders in alliance were still typically single-stranded but they shared an element in common among each other, such as age, gender, parenthood, issue of concern, or even an activity. For example, Team Green was a strong alliance within Team Hamilton. The Team Green alliance was comprised of riders who smoked marijuana while riding. The element around which they coalesced was the desire to stop often during group rides to smoke, as well as to smoke during team activities, including group rides, at races, and during social gatherings. Conflict over these issues often arose with riders who did not smoke marijuana or who did not want to in public. Typically,

154

Team Green's politics dominated and those who did not want to participate in smoking tolerated Team Green's ways. Occasionally, however, departing from this pattern, clashes arose between the Team Green alliance and riders who did not smoke pot.

Team Hamilton members that smoked marijuana often colloquially referred to themselves as members of "Team Green" and referred to those who did not smoke as members of "Team Clean." The converse did not prove the case: riders who did not smoke marijuana did not self-identify as Team Clean, nor did they refer to those who did smoke as Team Green. The exception to this rule, when riders who did not smoke made reference to the division of riders into Team Green and Team Clean, was typically made by members who formerly self-identified with Team Green but no longer smoked. Team Green members occasionally "traded," as Team Green riders put it, to Team Clean; very few clean riders turned green. For example, in one instance, Steve knew his annual drug test for work was imminent so he declared himself a member of Team Clean for a month before the test. In another instance, Doug stopped smoking pot for a few years because of mandatory drug testing at races. These illustrations underscore that Team Green allied with each other by virtue of shared activity, while Team Clean cohered by dint of exclusion. Further strengthening the Team Green alliance, riders often bought and sold marijuana from each other and socialized with each other while smoking. In contrast, Team Clean's relationships did not develop deeper like that of Team Green. Team Clean's relationships remained single-stranded, as they did not cohere as fellow non-users.

Overall, conflict between Team Green and Team Clean was non-confrontational: riders mostly gossiped, mocked, and impatiently tolerated each other. For example, on many occasions, Team Clean members gossiped among themselves about, in Matt's words, "the copious amount of pot" Team Green riders smoked. Krista wondered aloud many times as to how Team Green

riders managed their daily lives. And, in more than one instance, Team Clean riders took the

opportunity to mocked Team Green riders for "being too high" when they forgot riding shoes,

helmets, or made other errors.

Most conflict between Team Clean and Team Green occurred over issues of waiting,

such as waiting for Team Green to finish smoking. When these cases arose before a ride actually

started, non-smoking riders often displayed their impatience by riding on their bikes in circles in

front of or around smoking riders while urging them to finish by asking rhetorical questions such

as Chris' repeated mantra, "Are you done yet? Are you done yet? Are you done yet?" When

Team Green stopped to smoke during rides, conflict some times progressed from mere

impatience and passive aggressive tactics to more forceful but still pedestrian methods of conflict

management that included negative body language, like the rolling of eyes, and, in a few cases,

loud groans. Other times, conflict during rides that emerged over this issue escalated even

further. In these more aggressive conflicts, Team Clean members simply did not stop to wait on

Team Green, but instead rode ahead, leaving Team Clean smokers. Conflict often continued

post-ride, especially after rides with many smoke-stops. On such occasions, non-smoking riders

often gossiped to each other, echoing sentiments similar to that of Max's statement, "How many

fucking times do they need to stop? It's out of control. I'm not waiting any more." The reactions

detailed here varied with the statuses of individual riders that were present and represented either

the Team Green or Team Clean alliance.

In general, Team Green riders had more status and were more intimate with each other

because of the multiplex relationships that they had developed around smoking pot.

Consequently, despite the reactions by Team Clean to Team Green's behavior, Team Green

rarely paid heed to, and seldom changed their actions to accommodate, Team Clean's

preferences. In fact, in most instances, Team Green riders ignored the grievances from Team Clean. The most severe instances of conflict between these two groups arose when Team Green stopped ignoring these tensions. In these instances, conflict changed from its typical nuanced character to overt. This pattern is apparent in the case that arose in discussing an upcoming group ride:

Case: 7.1: Hamilton All-The-Way

Steve, a Team Green member, announced the date for the annual ride that was organized with the goal of riding all Hamilton's trails in one day. As informal spokesmen for this ride, Steve emailed Team Hamilton en masse via their listserv. Phil, a recent convert from Team Green to Team Clean, responded to Steve's email with the following message that he sent to all on Steve's original recipient list, not simply Steve:

"This will be a clean ride, eh. It's all about the ride."

In this email, Phil attempted to assert his preference that this particular ride should not include any drug activity so that all riders, not just those comfortable with this illicit activity, felt welcome. Following this public email, Phil privately contacted Steve – a fellow Team Clean member – and told him the same message, specifically adding that he wanted to bring his son to the ride – an eight year-old – and didn't feel comfortable doing so when drugs were present. In response to Phil's email, Drew, who smoked pot, wrote a message that he directed to Phil but emailed to the entire team, making the conflict public. In a flippant tone that did

not hide his aggravation, he told Phil that he, Drew, intended to smoke regardless of Phil's expressed wishes that the ride not include any smoking. In turn, Phil again emailed the entirety of Team Hamilton and, very formally, shared with them that he would avoid the ride:

Dear fellow cyclists,

I am not comfortable participating in this years ride. You don't need me to make Athens a great bike friendly place. I apologize to anyone who feels let down by this decision.

Best wishes to all,

"Phil"

This email illustrates a heightened conflict between Team Green and Team Clean in which the conflict management departed from the typical way team members behaved when tensions arose. The public airing, the personal attack, and Drew's antagonistic tone are hallmarks of this difference. Further reflecting the fact that this conflict was different than usual was the increase in gossip vilifying Phil – but not Drew – among the Team Green alliance following this exchange. For example, Max, a Team Green rider, speculated that Phil had a drug problem he was attempting to manage by avoiding social gatherings in which drugs were present. Mark, another on the Team Green alliance, dismissed Phil as unimportant, suggesting he was not a valuable team member. And Jack, also of Team Green, thought Phil was extremely selfish and unrealistic to demand the Team, and not Phil in isolation, changes their habits. In contrast to these unsympathetic reactions, Valerie, a Team Clean member, supported Phil when she argued that he only wanted to include his child in an activity he felt passionately about, not that he was

trying to force anyone's hand. Krista, also a Team Clean member, evaluated Phil's position leniently in that she speculated that Phil's wife no longer wanted Phil around drugs because their children's ages made the issue more salient. The pattern of these cases is one in which Team Clean members showed sympathy and Team Green showed animosity for Phil. This underscores the partisanship among the Team Green alliance in the face of tensions that called for a change in their illicit behavior.

Factions

In addition to alliances, factions also occasionally developed among Team Hamilton's members. More dramatically so than alliances, factions bred conflict among team members. Factions arose when intimacy among riders increased due to many overlapping networks. In other words, when relationships were no longer single stranded, but were instead multiplex, and deep, factions arose. Riders who were a part of a faction tended to have more conflict with riders who were not a part of that faction than riders who were not a part of any faction had with others. The conflict management between riders on a faction and those who were not a part of it tended towards avoiding riders whom they had a grievance, as well as gossiping and mocking these riders. This finding belays the argument that strong communities – the faction of riders within the larger Team Hamilton Community – tend to behave in aggressive and hostile ways towards outsiders – Team Hamilton as a whole (Baumgartner 1998). As an extreme example, Senechal de la Roche's (1997) work on lynching is illustrative of this point that factions can be aggressive towards non-members. She found this proved the case in the southeastern United States where internal community factions managed conflict with individuals external to those factions but who still lived with the community in an extremely violent manner – through lynching.

Further, riders in factions were partisan; they supported each other in the face of conflict with riders outside of that faction and internally sanctioned riders who were a part of the same faction if that rider made friendly overtures towards a rider that offended one of the faction's riders. Suttles (1968) found similar behavior among members of ethnic communities in Chicago. When disputes arose, people who were members of the same group as the principals involved in the conflict mobilized to support the person from their own group (Suttles 1968).

This pattern of conflict regarding factions is illustrated Case 2.1. This case also shows a change in conflict that occurred as the social morphology of the principals involved shifted over time.

Dan's Faction

Dan Mittner came to Hamilton in the mid 1980s to attend university. While there, he noted that, in contrast to the price of real estate in his home state of California, Hamilton real estate was inexpensive. He subsequently formed a partnership with his brother, who then moved from California to Hamilton, and together, using money borrowed from his parents, bought and renovated hundreds of properties around downtown Hamilton. Capitalizing on their opportunity to buy low, renovate for little money, and either rent or sell high, this venture proved highly lucrative and earned the brothers a great deal of money. As their business grew, the brothers hired employees to fill the needs of the business, needs that included maintaining the up-keep of rental houses. Skilled in construction, Mark, also an avid and highly skilled mountain biker, sought and was hired for the position of maintenance manager. To perform his job, the brothers gave Mark a company truck.

Mark fit well with Dan and his brother; many of their interests converged. Dan and his brother Josh enjoyed socializing, as did Mark, and all three liked intoxicants. As a result, they often spent time together both during and after work hanging out, drinking, and getting high. Because he also enjoyed the outdoors, over time, Mark convinced Dan to try mountain bike riding. Dan did, quickly embraced it, and soon began taking advantage of his ability to set his own schedule by riding daily for long periods of time. Many times Dan would encourage Mark to join him, an arrangement that suited Mark well.

Soon, on Mark's initiative, Dan joined Team Hamilton. With Mark advocating on Dan's behalf, on group rides, other Team Hamilton members tolerated Dan's slower-pace. At turns in the trail or at the top of hills, they paused for him instead of leaving him or complaining about the delay he caused. Often after Dan had inconvenienced others by causing them to do more than pause their ride and instead to wait for a while for him to catch up, Dan would suggest a "smoke break" for which he provided high quality pot in generous amounts.

Shortly after Dan began riding with Team Hamilton, he hired Oliver, a fledgling cabinet-maker who lived with Mark and who also avidly rode mountain bikes. According to Oliver, Dan played a crucial role in establishing his business, or, in Oliver's words, "getting me on my feet." Around the same time, Dan purchased a house to renovate that was centrally located to trails Team Hamilton members built in the mountains an hour north of Hamilton. Dan made this purchase in order to provide, as he stated, a "home-base" for long-weekend rides. Nearly every weekend, thereafter, Team Hamilton members drove to Claysville to both work on Dan's house, cut trail, and ride long hours. Most often, Dan, Oliver, and Mark made this trip, even going to work on Dan's house on weekdays, all the while receiving on-the-clock pay. On weekends, many riders drove the hour to Dan's mountain cabin to work and ride.

Over time, there was little variation in who went to Dan's: Dan, Oliver, Mark, Jeff, Krista, Valerie, Steve, and Greg, consistently made the drive, though others showed up on occasion. In the words of Max, this group of riders had a "secret handshake." Max explained that by this statement he meant these riders excluded and discouraged others from joining their activities. Riders who worked on Dan's house – and rode and cut trail together afterwards in the mountains – negatively sanctioned team members who did not. They gossiped about the lack of help and consistently excluded riders from all social gatherings who did not work on Dan's house. Riders who helped would also dramatically regale other team riders with stories of their fabulous weekend exploits at the cabin. This further alienated riders who were not invited to Dan's and polarized Team Hamilton into opposite camps.

Among the riders who helped at Dan's, a clear faction consisting of Dan, Oliver, and Mark emerged as a result of the intimacy and overlapping networks that sprang from daily working and socializing together. Dan, Oliver, and Mark often excluded others from rides in town and out of town – a behavior that had rarely occurred previously and, on the rare occasion when it did, did not continue with any consistency. They also ignored riders. For example, in one instance, Krista drove to meet a group of riders that included Dan, Oliver, and Mark, for a ride in the mountains. Arriving at the restaurant where they agreed to meet, Greg immediately said hi and Steve walked over and gave her a hug. Dan and Oliver, sitting in a booth alone together, did not acknowledge she arrived, nor did Krista greet them. In addition, Dan, Oliver, and Mark's gossip about other riders was extremely negative and filled with harsh criticism. Further, at times, their conversation with other riders was extremely hostile. The case involving Ellie illustrates this:

Case 7.2: The Dan Faction – Ecologists Disguised As Cyclists

162

While driving to the mountains with Dan, Ellie, an ecology graduate who studied weather remarked that the rainfall for a particular area was low given the historic averages. Dan, who had no known expertise in the ecology of the area and, in fact, hailed from California, challenged Ellie's credibility on the subject. He argued that the area in question actually always suffered from low levels of rain and that the present lack of rain was historically typical. In the moment, Ellie did not respond to Dan but let the conversation lapse. Later, though, she angrily complained to Krista and Steve about Dan's "lack of respect." She further said that Dan was "such an asshole" and wondered aloud why he behaved in such off-putting ways.

Another case highlighting the change in frequency and tenor in the conflict management among team members that emerged in the wake of the Dan faction involved Mark and Valerie. This case departed from the mild, subtle conflict that occurred in the face of tensions when Dan's faction was not part of the Team's make-up. The notable elements underscoring this difference are that Mark did not attempt to negotiate a solution both he and Valerie agreed upon, instead asserting his will on the issue, and the conflict occurred and was pursued in a public place instead of under more private, covert circumstances:

Case 7.3: The Shifters

In this case, Mark contentiously and combatively refused to pay Valerie money due to her for a bike part according to the terms of exchange these two riders previously agreed upon. After not receiving the money for over three months, Valerie eventually asked Mark if he could write her a check for the shifters she sold him. He refused to do so, telling her he planned to return the shifters to her

163

instead of keeping them. Valerie replied that she did not want the now used

shifters back, citing that now that Mark had used them she could no longer sell

them as knew and thus demand a premium for them. Mark argued with Valerie,

accusing her of overcharging him and staunchly reusing to budge on the fact that

he would not pay her. After an awkward exchange in which Valerie timidly

asserted herself and Mark aggressively rebuked her, he left the bike shop to

retrieve the part in question from his car. When he exited, no one in the store said

a word. Mark quickly returned and handed Valerie the shifters. Valerie stared

hard at Mark and walked out of the store. After she left, Mark said, "She's such a

bitch." Greg agreed quietly, saying, "She can be."

A few months, after the completion of Dan's cabin, Jonathan, an avid mountain bike

rider, moved to Hamilton from California to take part in an ecology master's program at the

University. Upon meeting Ellie, also an ecology graduate student, Jonathan, joined team

Hamilton for rides and eventually become a Team Hamilton member. Initially, Jonathan and

Ellie spent much time together outside of school: they rode, dined, and always drove together to

Team Hamilton events if both were attending. However, after Jonathan moved into a basement

apartment below the main floor of Dan's residence, Jonathan and Ellie no longer spent any time

together. Instead, Jonathan spent most of his spare time with Dan, Mark, and Oliver; he traveled

to rides with them instead of with Ellie and ceased riding bikes with her except on group rides.

At approximately the same time that Jonathan moved in below Dan, Mark and Oliver moved into

a house together that Mark bought with Dan as a co-borrower on the loan. As with Dan's

mountain home, Mark's new house needed work and Team Hamilton members provided Mark

with free labor. In fact, Mark offered Oliver free rent in exchange for helping him renovate the house.

This increase in, and strengthening of, ties among riders within Dan's faction promoted conflict among Team Hamilton members that departed from how they typically handled grievances. For example, after a series of events that compounded the already complicated intimacy relations among Dan's faction, a case between Dan and Ellie arose in which Ellie dramatically diverged from her usual subtle handling of grievances.

Case 7.4: The Shower

One night, Ellie, who had a long standing, casual but secretive sexual relationship with Mark, had a one-night stand with Oliver. In the same week, she also received an offer from Dan to join him in the shower. Ellie declined Dan's offer, citing the fact that he was engaged to be married. Immediately following Dan's suggestion, Ellie left his house and phoned Krista, telling her all about the incident. Ellie continued to gossip to all Team Hamilton about Dan's overture.

The weekend following Oliver and Ellie's tryst and Dan's proposal to Ellie, Dan, Mark, Oliver, and Jonathan went to the mountains. On the way, they called Steve to invite him to the next day's ride. In this case, Dan, who spoke with Steve, specified that Steve could bring his girlfriend and roommate Krista but not Ellie.

Both Ellie's and Dan's handling of these events represent a departure from how Team Hamilton members behaved towards each other when aggrieved before Dan's faction became a part of the fabric of the team. For her part, Ellie's public report of Dan's offer drastically departed from her typical, more covert behaviors regarding personal information in general and of this type in particular. A case in point is the affair with Mark that she kept confidential for

over two years and her encounter with Oliver that she shared with only two others. With regard to Dan's behavior, his specific articulation and forthright in demand of Ellie's exclusion was a dramatic change of pace from the nuanced and subtle conflict management riders employed with each other before and after Dan's faction breached Team Hamilton. Hither to this point in time, members of Dan's faction exclude others, but did so through very subtle methods, such as ignoring and gossip.

Over the next two or so years, Team Hamilton's riders dealt with conflict using methods previously, and post this point in time, seldom seen. The noxious management of tensions prevailed regardless of the issue over which the conflict occurred. For example, in a case that at Dan's mountain house, Dan chastised Valerie for gathering cans for recycling, an activity all knew was important to her. He told her that he wanted to throw the cans away and insisted she give him the cans she collected, after which, he threw them into the trash while she watched. In another instance, Valerie, Krista, Mark, and Oliver drove back from the mountains together in Krista's car and could not agree on whether to stop and eat or continue home: Krista and Valerie favored continuing while Mark and Oliver favored stopping. During discussions, Mark leaned towards Oliver and in an intentionally loud whisper said he would never make the mistake of driving with Krista or Valerie again. In another case, Valerie left Krista at a race site six hours away from home after Valerie refused to alter her intended plans so that Krista could return home earlier than agreed upon. In another instance during a race, Krista and Valerie, who riding up hill at the same time, aggressively yelled at each other while in the presence of strangers. In their exchange, Krista condemned Valerie as "completely selfish and egotistical" and Valerie accused Krista of being "untrustworthy and petty." In yet another case that took place during this time, Dan and Luke drove home together from a ride. During the trip, Dan packed a bowl of

166

marijuana to smoke and offered it to Luke. He took one hit and handed it back. Dan bulked, pushing it back, and told Luke to "finish it." Luke declined, again handing it to Dan. He roughly snatched it from Luke's hands and told her him that he "wasted [his] pot." According to Luke, Dan refused to speak to him for the rest of the drive. In all these cases, the level of conflict increased markedly from levels prior and subsequent to Dan's faction.

Approximately three years after joining Team Hamilton, Dan married and moved back to California. When he left, Jonathan moved in with his girlfriend; Oliver continued to occasionally work for Dan's company that still operated despite his physical absence, and Mark remained in Dan's employ. Without warning, a week after Dan left, the locks on his mountain house, which he told Team Hamilton's members that they could continue to use, were changed and a sign was posted in the driveway, ending all access to Dan's home. These changes marked an ebb in the conflict within Team Hamilton. This change did not go unnoticed. Remarking on it, Scott suggested, "Life is better without Dan." In another instance, Steve joked openly with Krista and Greg as they planned a weekend's ride that they no longer needed to guess about whether or not they could go to Dan's cabin or worry about who they were not supposed to invite.

These casual observations on the decrease in conflict were correct. After Dan's departure, the frequency and intensity of conflict decreased among Team Hamilton members: gossip, mocking, and avoidance decreased in favor of toleration. Further, the instances of gossip and mocking that occurred were, in general, less confrontational than instances that occurred when Dan's faction operated within the group. Conflict among riders continued to ease when, a year after Dan moved, Mark married and moved north three hours. In 2007, Dan and Mark returned to Hamilton to take part in the Fall Tour. Over the course of four days, no cases of conflict arose that involved Dan. In fact, only a few riders remembered him and those that did spoke very little

167

with him, including Mark. When asked if he was excited to see Don, Mark replied with a non-committal, "Ehh. I don't know why he spent all that money to come back."

The change in conflict, both in frequency and in tone, adjusted with the strength and quantity of ties among riders. When Dan's faction cohered, the riders who were a part of it lived, worked, and played together. Their relationships deviated from the deep yet narrow relationships Team Hamilton members typically exhibited. Relatedly, with this modification in intimacy, the conflict also varied, becoming openly antagonistic and discordant between riders in Dan's faction and riders outside of it. At the same time, partisanship among riders on Dan's factions increased, an element that additionally contributed to the contentious relations between Dan's faction riders and non-faction riders. When this faction disbanded, the conflict returned to that of a more moderate character. This shift underscores the direct relationship between conflict management and the social morphology of the principals involved in the case.

The Curvilinear Relationship between Tolerance and Intimacy

Consistent with Baumgartner's (1988) findings, I also found that an extreme lack of intimacy between or among riders positively correlated with tolerance and a lack of conflict in general. For example, in one case Don tolerated when Matt, a new rider, completely stopped in the trail after hitting a rock instead of quickly moving to the side so that he would not block others. Instead of pushing past Matt, as Don did to others on different occasions, Don asked Matt if he was okay and then waited while Matt regained his composure. In another instance illustrating this pattern, Mark escorted a new rider out of the trail after the new rider's light extinguished during a night ride. This contrasted to a case involving Greg in which Greg's light bulb blew, eliciting Mark's mocking statement of "Man, you need to get your shit tight."

Riders of moderate intimacy – those who rode together regularly but did not interact outside of team events, and those who were neither new nor old in comparison to other team members – showed the least toleration of each other in the face of tensions. This may be due, in part, to the ever-present threat of a changing hierarchy, and these riders unsettled place within that hierarchy, that stems from the voluntary character of team membership (Gould 2003).

Intimacy, Volunteerism, and Persistent Conflict

Riders on Team Hamilton often resorted to avoidance in the face of persistent tensions and conflict. Consistent with Black's (1998) discussion of avoidance, riders avoided each other to varying degrees, ranging from minimal, moderate, and complete (Hoffman 2002). The voluntary character of Team Hamilton membership, along with the interdependence of team members, influenced the degree of avoidance riders employed when engaged in conflict.

Minimal avoidance is the least aggressive form of avoidance. For riders on Team Hamilton, minimal avoidance typically consisted of cases in which particular riders were purposefully uninformed of a ride or activity, and cases in which riders ignored others when in group situations. For example, Greg did not call Paula when he and two other riders planned a trip to the mountains. In another instance, Mike specifically dodged Mark's prodding about whether Mike and Kevin arranged to meet to ride the following morning, telling Mark he was "unsure" what they would do. In a third case, Max greeted Charlie, Dan, and John but not Kevin when he met the team to ride. Minimal avoidance surfaced more than any other degree of avoidance among team riders.

Moderate avoidance was more overt and hostile than minimal avoidance. Most moderate avoidance cases arose in which riders pointedly did not share with, or excluded, others when in

169

group settings. In many of these cases, riders did not share items such as trail food or marijuana, thereby publicly punishing the excluded rider and communicating his/her deviant status to others. For example, in one instance, Steve shared his wife's homemade cookies with Valerie and Dan but not with Max, who Steve closely competed with, while re-grouping on a Team ride. In another case, Jessie pulled out three beers from his backpack when he crested a hill during a long ride. He handed one each to Dan, Mark, and Oliver but offered none to Krista.

Moderate avoidance was more egregious when it occurred on the trail or out-of-town because in each of these settings items were scarce and could not be replaced easily when depleted. The case in which David selectively shared his marijuana arose two hours into a four-hour winter mountain bike ride in a wilderness in the mountains is an example of moderate avoidance. Mitch dealt with this affront by telling the others that he would go ahead, instead of wait for them to finish getting high, and wait for them at the top of the hill they were currently climbing. Mitch's tempered response to David's snub bears the marks of the high level of interdependence among riders on this ride – riding in the wilderness on unmarked trail meant the riders needed to stay together to pool their geographic information and not get lost during a time of year in which darkness fell early and temperatures reached freezing at night. This limited Mitch's range of conflict management responses: instead of telling David to get lost, as he might have during a ride close to home in the summer time, Mitch moderately avoids David in kind as he rides ahead of the group.

In another case of moderate avoidance, at a 12-hour race, Drew avoided Kelly, Tony, Matt, and Mac after tensions arose between Mac and Drew. In a show of partisanship, Brian D., Drew's roommate, avoided Kelly, Tony, Matt, and Mac, as well. Instead of all congregating in Kelly's RV to smoke marijuana and share stories, Drew and Brian D. set up a tent with chairs far

from Kelly's RV. However, as the light rain that fell at the beginning of the race turned into a torrential downpour, Drew and Brain D. sought shelter in Kelly's RV. In the face of depending on Kelly for shelter, Drew and Brian stopped avoiding Mac and instead tolerated him so that they might be more comfortable. According to Kelly, as the rain started to fall harder on the riders, tensions between Drew and Mac, "just evaporated."

In addition to minimal and moderate avoidance, Team Hamilton members completely avoided each other at times. Complete avoidance, or total exit, is the most extreme degree of avoidance and included severing all ties to other riders on the team. Riders with little over-all status were those who, over time, most often completely avoided others and ultimately ceased riding altogether. For example, Debbie, a very low status rider, completely avoided Team Hamilton following persistent conflict. In the following passage Debbie describes her reasons for exiting Team Hamilton:

> I don't really ride much these days. I'm just not into it. Maybe if there were more girls but I hate being the only one. It just got so that it was hard to be the only one so much of the time. Like, on rides, if we stopped to pee, they'd never wait even though women take longer. So I'd either have to race to catch them, get dropped, or repeatedly remind them to please wait a bit longer before we even stopped at all."

In another case, Charlie, an awkward, overweight, and socially isolated rider, also ultimately completely avoided the team. When detailing why he stopped riding with team members he mentioned that he was "just over it." He also said that he wanted to spend more time with his girlfriend and on his graduate studies. When asked if he missed riding and he replied, "No. Frankly, they can all kiss my ass. I don't miss the politics at all."

171

As both Debbie and Charlie illustrate, over time, low status riders are those who often totally avoid team members and stop riding. Further underscoring this phenomenon Charlie's mention that "they can all kiss my ass" and his allusion to politics are particularly interesting: instead of responding to the question of whether he missed riding, Charlie brought up issues of conflict on Team Hamilton instead of a discussion about bike riding as an activity itself, which could have been the answer emphasized in response to a question about bike riding. particular response underscores the influence of structure on behavior and suggests that the social dimensions of the context often exert control over individuals pursuing their manifest goals and interests, in this case, riding bikes.

<div align="center">*******</div>

The narrowly intimate of Team Hamilton's social morphology contributed to the moral moderation that characterized this organization's moral order. The majority of the relationships on Team Hamilton conform to this model and contrasts to multiplex relationships in which people are bound together in multiple roles, such as domestic and public roles, which characterize pre-modern communities (Gluckman 1967). Single-stranded interaction among team members created a narrow intimacy due to limited shared social information, a lack in variation of shared experiences, and a lack of overlapping social network ties. However, this single-strand of intimacy tended to run deep, increasing in depth with time, learned information about others, and accumulated experiences, though these experiences typically remained related to cycling. Thus, variations in intimacy among riders explain variation in the level of toleration riders show in the face of tensions. Further the voluntary membership of this team created a setting where members were able to avoid others when confronted by conflict.

Riders with established relationships with other team members attracted the least amount of conflict and were least likely to be subject to or employ avoidance. New riders' infractions were often tolerated and these riders, in turn, typically tolerated grievances that arose. The riders whose tenure on the team placed them between these two extremes most typically responded to tensions with the least tolerance, were likely to attract conflict, and were thus most likely to be subject to and employ avoidance. However, these patterns varied in the face of deepened intimacy, as in the case with alliances, as well as when intimacy deepened and multiplex relationships existed, as is the case with factions. In these instances of strong ties, toleration decreased between non-partisans and gossip, harsh criticism, mocking, and avoidance increased. Conversely, between partisans, toleration increased and avoidance decreased. This pattern underscores the moral order of this team as one of moral moderation: a curvilinear relationship existed between the strength of social ties and conflict management, with most riders falling between these two extremes. Thus, the tenor of the team was not minimal conflict but slightly elevated conflict. This was exacerbated by the lack of a fixed hierarchy. The result was moral moderation.

CHAPTER 8

THE BOYS VERSUS THE GIRLS: GENDER

Race, social class, and gender structure social experiences in powerful ways. On Team

Hamilton, all but two riders were white and most were members of the middle class. Race and

social class did not emerge as salient variables in the behavior of conflict. Similarly, the

relatively restricted age range of Team Hamilton cyclists produced little noticeable effect on

conflict patterns between riders. Gender, however, proved a significant influence on conflict.

On Team Hamilton, women and men did not experience conflict in the same way. All

things being equal, women attracted more conflict than men. In the face of grievances, women

differed from men in three significant ways. First, women were much more acrimonious and

malicious when in conflict with other women than when in conflict with men, or than men were

when in conflict with other men. In general, women also made more personal character attacks

on other women than they did on men. The second way women differed from men was that

women more often invoked third parties in their disputes. This is not to say that men never did

so, but that women did so more often. The third way women differed from men was that lower

status women were hostile towards higher status women much more often than lower status

principals engaged in conflict with higher status others in general. Occasionally, exceptions to

these patterns arose and the rare high status woman attracted less conflict than most women.

Even in these cases, however, until their exceptional status was made apparent, these women,

too, were subject to and engaged in more conflict than the typical man in the same

circumstances.

<u>Constant Conflict</u>

Building on Simmel (1908), Baumgartner (1992) asserts that in any social relationship, the greater the degree of subordination that exists, the greater the degree of equality that is produced among those subordinated. In other words, when one social group is dramatically subordinated to another, great equality exists among those who are subordinated. And this proves the case between men and women in cycling: women as a group are subordinated to men as a group and women as a group are much less stratified as men are as a group. The organization of races exemplifies this hierarchy. As discussed in chapter four on organization, women as a single group – not broken into age groups like the men – started their race only after all men started. As pointed out, the empirical reality of this resulted in professional category women starting their race after men over the ages of 50 and men under the ages of 18 started their races. Another example of this comes from the Trace Point road race. In this race, the promoter organized the races so that the professional men's class raced 90 miles, the men's lowest race category (category five) raced 42 miles, the junior men under age 15 - 18 raced 31 miles, and the professional women's class raced only 29 miles. In another race, the winner of the men's professional category stood to win $600, the winner of the men's lowest ranked category stood to win $100, and the women's winner, along with the junior men under age 18's winner, stood to earn medals.

In addition to these practices that signal women's lowest position in the status hierarchy in the sport of cycling in general, the pattern of conflict involving women among Team Hamilton

members reflects women's low status on the team. For example, on road rides, men cut women off, merged in front of them without asking, ignored them, and spoke condescendingly to them more often than they did the same to men. This pattern held true between women as well. Women ignored one another and rode aggressively towards each other but rarely did so to men. In addition, riders often gossiped about women and women were frequently the object of ire. For example, Rick waited to enter a trail until Marc, Ben, and Sam passed but did not continue to wait for Megan and Joan to start. Instead, he aggressively jumped in front of them. In another case illustrating the conflict women attracted, Sam solicited volunteers to stop traffic during the finishing stretch of a group ride so that the cyclists on the ride could sprint without worrying about their safety. When no rider volunteered to do this task – which required the volunteer to miss riding in the finishing circuit – Sam turned to Susie, the only woman on the ride, and asked her if she would watch for traffic because she was not, as he put it, "in the hunt for glory anyway." In yet another instance of condescending behavior, a man Krista did not know turned to her during the last half hour of a long, strenuous group ride that only advanced cyclists finished and gave her unsolicited advice on cycling training that one might share with a beginner rider.

Gender, above all else, structured status on Team Hamilton. Riders assumed that women were weaker than men. In the words of one man, "Men are biologically stronger." He went on to say:

> I think by natural body type males make muscle easier, therefore, with less effort they can build, for the same body weight, a male can probably have more muscle and be in a little better condition.

He followed this observation with a discussion on how women might overcome their handicap if they worked hard. However, the organization of races (see chapter four) makes comparing athletic achievement impossible: men and women's races are rarely the same length and men and women rarely compete under the same circumstances. In other words, no single metric exists in Team Hamilton's member's lives by which to compare men and women as cyclists. Thus, assumed to have lower status by virtue of their biology, women attracted more conflict than men.

Men and women spoke both directly and indirectly about conflict and gender. They specifically mentioned that women experienced conflict differently than men in that women were not united, while men were, under the banner of their respective genders. According to Jason:

"There are lines drawn. And for whatever reason…I think a lot of times the females (laughs), that's where, and its not male and female as much as female and females bringing males into the whole drama, controversy, whatever."

Matt also noticed conflict among women. He suggested that:

"Women have a harder time getting along then men do, especially in sports. Men leave their competition on the field."

Though these casual observations that men experienced little conflict where as women experienced a lot of conflict is not supported, it was the case that women attracted more conflict than men and managed their conflict differently. This pattern is explained by the fact that women had the least status on Team Hamilton.

Primarily, it was the case that women were less tolerant of each other than then they were of men over similar issues. For example, Julie and Paula constantly found fault with one another. They often singled each other out over issues ubiquitous to all Team Members. For instance, at

the beginning of a racing season, almost every team member bought new bikes, including Julie and Paula. When Julie found out that Paula bought a new bike she singled out Paula and accused Paula of copying her, further citing that Paula, copied Julie in all things bike related. However, Julie made no mention of the other team members who had also purchased bikes at this point in time. In another case, Paula chastised Julie for forgetting a bike part when Julie asked to borrow this extra part from Paula. When Marc asked for the same part a short time later, Paula gave it to him without negative comment. In another case, Maggie told many people about how Morgan tried to pass Maggie at an unsafe point on the trail and Maggie blocked her from doing so. In the telling of her story, Maggie increased the conflict through use of inflammatory embellishments such as "can you believe that" and "what in the hell."

The multiple instances in which Susanne routinely went first, ahead of others, into trails is another example of a behavior for which no man received negative sanctions but a woman attracted conflict. Team members often gossiped about Susanne's behavior and consistently found fault with it as disruptive to "how things should go," as Michael put it. In other words, high status team members typically ascended or descended trails first and Susanne, as a low status member, violated this informal rule. This treatment of Susanne was inconsistent with the conflict management exerted on Alex in the many cases in which he violated the same rule and pushed onto the trail ahead of higher status riders. In these instances, other members rolled their eyes and once a rider groaned. Still, the conflict management techniques that ensued after Alex violated this etiquette were insubstantial in comparison to that evoked by Susanne. Overall, status differences between men and women – men higher and women lower – explain this pattern of conflict.

<u>Women as Competitors</u>

The pattern of malicious, backbiting conflict between women was particularly salient in the face of competition. In other words, women in competition with each other had the highest amount of cattiness and opprobrious conflict of any other subgroup on Team Hamilton. For example, I overheard women gossiping negatively and with great animosity about other women often before and after races. I heard men doing the same in race settings but much less frequently. Further, these comparatively less frequent cases between men often lacked the castigating quality found in women's conflict with other women. For example, in one case, while warming up on her bike before a race, Megan ignored all women but enthusiastically greeted the men she knew. In a similar case, no women greeted Krista when she arrived for a highly competitive Townie Bike Ride (TBR) but many men called hello to her. In another case, after checking the results of her race and finding Dana beat her by a substantial margin, Rachel disdainfully told others that Dana's performance was gained by virtue of the fact that she had nothing else in her life than cycling, unlike Rachel, and therefore must be leading an unfulfilling life. In another instance, before a TBR, Maggie pointed to a rider she did not know and asked Carol if she knew the women's name. Instead of simply telling Maggie the woman's name, Carol reported to Maggie that the woman in question was a bitch, that she recently married a lawyer for money, and that she occasionally cheated during races. In yet another case, Valerie turned to Krista on the start line and told her she was dressed like Barbie. In another case, Jackie maliciously gossiped to many other riders about Joan after they crashed into each other at the start of their race:

Case 8.1: Bike Entanglement

> I don't like her. I avoid her. She's a total bitch. Others have had issues with her,
> too. She has a sugar daddy and can go to all races without sponsors. She used to
> ride for [a bike team], but no more. Maybe they couldn't deal with her. Actually,
> they went bankrupt. Either way, she is so not nice. Oh, I had two run-ins with her!
> She dragged my bike at the start of a race: It was crazy! She yelled at me as if it
> was my fault.

In this gossip, Jackie personalized her attack on Joan, attempted to denigrate Joan by declaring that others also had conflict with Joan, defamed Joan's character with information about her personal life, and painted Joan as a crazy maniac. This contrasts to the case in which Pete crashed into Mark during a race and Mark tersely remarked that Pete needed to hone his bike handling skills.

Maria illustrated a similar pattern when she gossiped about her competitor Ellie:

> Did you hear that Trish was there? She rode all 34 miles while eight months
> pregnant. She's so fucking selfish. I bet she's still smoking pot, too, wouldn't you
> think? I cannot BELIEVE it. Supposedly Sam rode behind her the whole way.
> Not cool. She's psycho. I'm so glad she's out of my life. I bet she's fat.

In this case, Maria, like Jackie, gossiped about non-cycling elements in Trish's life: pregnancy, drugs, and weight gain. In addition, she called Trish's decision making into question, as well as her character. In contrast, Mike, too, reported that Trish attended the Six Gap race. Instead of gossiping to the same degree, Mike commented that he saw Trish and that she raced while pregnant. Noticeably missing from Mike's report when compared to Maria's is the general

weaving in of non-cycling related issues, with the exception of Trish's pregnancy, as they relate to Trish.

Exceptions to the Rule

Upon occasion, a woman's conflict pattern deviated from her peers and she attracted less conflict than her like-gendered counterparts. For example, when Maggie, Luke, Chris, and Scott were lost on a ride, Luke turned to Maggie for directions. This was unusual in that men and women riders did not typically ask woman for their ride or bicycle related opinions. In another case that breaks from the dominant pattern, Greg asked Sarah her opinion on which tires were most appropriate for the wet conditions they intended on riding in as opposed to soliciting an answer from one of the men present.

In yet another case notable as an exception to the pattern of conflict regarding women, Nicole challenged Marc. In this instance, a local paper interviewed Marc about an upcoming 24-hour event. In his account, Marc detailed his team's strategy for executing this event. In his description, Marc made the statement that while he and his teammates focused on their racing performances, "the girls will make sure we're fed and well-fueled, and make things comfortable so we can sleep in between laps." Nicole took exception to Marc's caricature of "the girls" and wrote a letter of her grievance to the newspaper who then published it. In the letter, Nicole pointed out that, "Many women would be racing in the 24-hour race and not catering to any men." Further, she accused the newspaper of printing sexist remarks and thereby being culpable in perpetuating sexism. She asserted that had Marc, "said something racist, [the newspaper] would not have printed his remarks. Failing to do the same for sexist remarks perpetuates prejudice and inequality."

Once published, the response to Nichole's letter by Team Hamilton's members was immediate and severe. Most team members – men and women alike – ignored Nicole, leaving her out of rides and social events. Those that did not ignore her berated and castigated her. Further, Sarah, Marc's girlfriend, wrote a letter in Marc's name to the newspaper in a response designed to discredit Nicole as a credible commentator for a cycling event, as well as to cast Nicole as the real sexist by listing the accomplishments of women cyclists who resided in Hamilton, leaving Nicole – a very accomplished woman rider – off the list. In reaction to the outcry, Nicole did not pursue the conflict by writing a letter defending her position, nor did she otherwise defend herself. Instead, Nicole fell silent on the issue, tolerated the recriminations, and ultimately apologized to Marc and asked for his forgiveness.

By publicly sanctioning Marc, Nicole departed from the normal pattern of conflict and gender takes on Team Hamilton. This particular anomaly is explained by taking into account the arena in which Nichole acted when writing this letter and her and Marc's status in that arena. In reacting to a community –wide newspaper article distributed throughout the town of Hamilton, Nicole behaved as a community member and not as a Team Hamilton member. In the community, Nicole's vertical status, as Black defines the vertical dimension, was higher than Marc's: Nichole's income was higher than Mark's and her professional occupation was of higher status than Mark's blue collar job. Thus, her actions, though anomalous to the patterns of women involved in conflict on Team Hamilton, were in keeping with patterns elucidated by pure sociology in general. However, the subsequent phases of the conflict in which team members ignored, avoided, and criticized Nicole while supporting Marc follows the pattern of women attracting conflict more than men on Team Hamilton. The shift in arenas from the initial stages

of the conflict to the latter stages – from the community to internal to Team Hamilton – explains the behavior of the principals in each phase of this conflict.

Two other sets of cases also stand out as anomalies to the dominant pattern of women and conflict, that of Tina and Rhia. Instances of conflict surrounding these women had two different patterns: On the one hand, in some incidents, these women attracted conflict and managed that conflict in a pattern much like any other woman. For example, on a casual road ride a man yelled at Rhia for cutting him off instead of tolerating her behavior or managing the conflict with a less confrontational method. In another case, Mike congratulated Chris and Jeff for winning their races but ignored Tina, who was standing with Chris and Jeff, despite the fact that she also won her race. In another instance, Greg won $500 dollars for winning the TBR overall. The following year Rhia won the same title and received no prize money. Rhia complained about this occurrence to her closest teammates but never addressed the issue with the TBR organizer, instead tolerating the inequitable treatment.

On the other hand, in most cases these women did not fit the dominant pattern of women and conflict. Instead, their conflict profile was similar to that of men. For example, upon seeing Tina, Christie whispered to Krista that Tina always talked about herself. Seconds later Christie enthusiastically greeted Tina and hugged her, instead of ignoring or continuing to maliciously gossip about her. In another incident, Ellie made a sudden move on her bike that made Tina squawk in surprise and displeasure. Ellie instantly apologized profusely to Tina for this inconvenience instead of ignoring the fact that her move negatively affected Tina. In yet another case, Richard tolerated Tina's behavior on a road ride – behavior that negatively impacted Richard because he was forced to compensate for Tina's riding style – instead of sabotaging her or resorting to a more aggressive form of conflict management.

Cases involving Rhia followed a similar pattern. For example, Marc did not attempt to help Rhia on a hard section of a ride but did offer to help Samantha and Justice though none of these women asked for help – a backhanded insult to Samantha and Justice because it indicated Marc felt they, but not Rhia, most likely needed help by virtue of their gender. In another case, Adam tried to squeeze between Rhia and the rider in front of her on a fast-paced road ride. Instead of making room for him as most women did for men who made similar requests, Rhia told him no. Adam tolerated this, did not respond aggressively – and in fact made no comment – but instead moved further back in the paceline to try to take a different position.

Overall, in comparison to each other's patterns of conflict, Tina's pattern was more like that of the men than Rhia's. Further, over the course of this study, Tina consistently fit into the pattern of conflict typical for men but Rhia's pattern changed over time. Earlier in her cycling career, Rhia attracted conflict in a way similar to other women, but after years of outperforming men and thus establishing herself as an exception, her pattern of conflict moved on the continuum closer to that of men. For example, in her past men almost always jumped in front of Rhia or tried to cut her off when on rides in order to position themselves ahead of her because her gender signaled that she was a weak rider. Over time, men recognized her as a strong cyclist and stopped trying to do this. In another example, Rhia previously tolerated when men, who could use the bathroom faster than women during breaks on rides, would not wait for women but would start pedaling onward down the road. This forced women to race to catch the group, a task that they often failed to do. Thus, the group often left women after bathroom breaks. Knowing this, many women opted not to use the bathroom during rides, which resulted in discomfort, particularly on long rides. Over time, Rhia no longer tolerated this behavior from men and instead preempted their behavior before the group stopped for a bathroom break by hollering at

them, en masse, to remember to wait. After the stops, Rhia often chastised men who ignored her command and instead took off the minute they finished.

The question to all these patterns is why? Why are there differences in these women's patterns in comparison to women in general? The pure sociological explanation is the same for each of these questions. Not only were both of these women unique in their conflict patterns, but Tina and Rhia were rare in the sense that they competed with men on a level that no other women on Team Hamilton did. In other words, these women were extraordinary for their athleticism. External to Team Hamilton, Tina was a reigning US champion in road cycling and Rhia was a former professional who raced on the national level. Both these women performed better than, and ultimately beat, most men on competitive rides, a unique accomplishment. As a result of this, they ranked highly and had greater status than most women. Accordingly, their patterns of conflict differed from that of low status woman. Still, despite their high rank, as women, Tina and Rhia encountered more conflict than men.

In this liminal social space, Tina and Rhia were often subject to a unique type of conflict management – that of the backhanded compliment. In most instances, both Tina and Rhia responded to these backhanded compliments moderately, resorting to gossip and mockery as opposed to toleration or severe confrontation. For example, Sam praised Rhia for finishing a particularly grueling ride but said nothing to the men who performed the same feat. Similarly, Tina won $25 for being the only women to finish with the group on a particularly hard ride, though men who also finished the ride did not win anything. She gossiped to her teammates about the ride organizer who offered this prize, pointing out to them how she felt this prize slighted instead of awarded her. In a different case, Larry complimented Rhia's technical skills on the mountain bike after a particularly technical section of trail but did not compliment any of

the men who successfully rode the same section. Rhia condescendingly complimented this man in return for his successful navigation of this same technical section. In yet another instance, a man turned to Tina during a ride and told her his buddies back home would not believe him when he told them about her riding abilities. Feigning bewilderment, Tina rhetorically asked if his friends would also be impressed that he, too, was able to keep the pace of the current ride. She later told two of her teammates about this incident and described the man who made the comment as "lame."

<p style="text-align:center">*****</p>

As the gender, feminist, and sport literatures attest, these findings of women as low status by virtue of their gender are not new. A variety of theories have been put forth to explain this disparate treatment of women and men. This theorizing includes speculation on the effects of culture, hegemony, patriarchy, socialization, gendered performances, and sexism on producing gender inequality.

However, pure sociology explains this pattern differently, without attention to any psychological factors. The pure sociology explanation for the high level of conflict directed towards women, as well as for the disparaging and unsympathetic tack these women took with one another, is that women are assumed to have lesser cycling ability than men, which gives them low social status within the team. As the lowest status members of the Team, women were in a position to attract the most conflict from all members, including from other women. Thus, this different treatment for women turns out to be not that different at all. Pure sociology asserts that women's low status position on Team Hamilton explains why they experience more conflict than any other category of individuals. It also explains why some women's patterns of conflict

were exceptions to the rule – they were the rare, high status women within Team Hamilton. As deviates, their conflict patterns also diverged from the norm.

CHAPTER 9

EVERY TIME I SEE AN ADULT ON A BICYCLE, I NO LONGER DESPAIR FOR THE

HUMAN RACE" – H.G. WELLS

CONCLUSION

The range of variation in conflict management across human groups is vast. In this study I explored and explained the patterns of conflict management among but one group – the cyclists of Team Hamilton. I found that moral moderation dominated Team Hamilton. Team members avoided, tolerated, gossiped, and mocked each other when faced with grievances. They did not usually resort to violence, never invoked legal authorities when disputes arose, and did not negotiate at any length with one another. Typically, these riders tended to keep tensions covert instead of publicly airing their disputes. When they did engage overt conflict management techniques, riders often did so with humor, sarcasm, and flippancy.

Conflict management on this team varied according to the status of the riders involved in a case. Of the statuses on Team Hamilton, rank was the most salient. Rank explained the direction of conflict as well as the cases involving the non-typical instance of violence. Interdependency explained the tempering of conflict in favor of toleration. The single stranded and deep intimacy on this team explained the gossip and mockery. The general low-level organization explained the instances of avoidance. Flux in levels of organization explained the ebb and flow in the frequency of conflict. Overall, riders tolerated objectionable behaviors.

However, regardless of the issue involved, status superiors gossiped and mocked subordinates more often than the converse occurred, though all riders engaged in this behavior to some degree. Status subordinates were more likely to tolerate tensions and, of all the riders, were most likely to avoid others with whom they had constant conflict. Status equals who were in conflict typically exhibited malice and rancor in their dealings with one another and did, though seldom, resort to violence. Status equals with the lowest status overall – women – engaged in the most conflict.

Unique and Notable Contributions

This work uniquely applies pure sociology to a social setting – a mountain biking team – hitherto now unexplored by social scientists.[4] Moreover, this research sheds light on a larger social type – the team – that is increasingly prominent in contemporary society. In investigating the significance of the team relationship among riders, this work provides the first systematic data on the effect of functional status and of organization on conflict at low overall levels of organization. Further, this work is the first description of moral moderation, a type of moral order that is likely to occur with some frequency in modern society. These elements situate this research as notable for its contributions to social science generally.

---

[4] A search on EBSCOhost database revealed two articles (Rosen 1993; Taysom 1998) related to the social construction of the technology of mountain bikes (both of the articles discussed gender), but no articles investigated mountain bikers as a team, community, organization, or other type of social group.

<u>Implications</u>

Theoretical Implications

In addition to implications for Team Hamilton itself, exploring and examining the patterns of conflict management among cyclists on Team Hamilton has more general implications. The theoretical implications from this study substantiate claims made by other studies grounded in the pure sociology paradigm that conflict is structured by social geometry. Thus, this analysis highlights the scientific analytical purchase gained by a pure sociology approach. Alternative approaches to the study of conflict, such as rational choice theory and new institutionalism among others, not only do not make social morphology central to their analyses, they often rely on unobservable, highly situated, and particularistic phenomena. This limits their scientific usefulness generally and their contribution to the study of conflict more specifically.

The theoretical implications of this study extend to the relationship between conflict, moral order, and morality in general. The way in which cyclists respond to grievances that arise – with moral moderation – is suggestive of a more general morality within the team. On Team Hamilton, the most basic component of this morality was to advance mountain biking as a lifestyle. Thus, the moral good was that of the cyclist who lives the lifestyle of a mountain biker and aids others pursuing this non-mainstream existence. This stands in opposition to the cyclists who merely *goes* for bicycle rides and does not sacrifice comforts, time, and even relationships in living as a mountain biker. Acknowledgement that this ideal stands in opposition to many society-wide conventional goals and even material necessity was not admitted.

The salience of a mountain biker's rank and the status garnered through functionally dependent roles, as opposed to more conventionally salient social statuses such as occupation, express this morality. In addition, the grievances themselves relate to this orientation, in that

190

issues of contention surround competition, weakness in body and mind while riding, and cycling

skill. These issues contrast to those that might arise in other, differently morally oriented groups.

For example, among animal lovers, a comment revealing that a community member would rather

walk his/her dog on a flat road instead of one with hills may never arise as a point of contention.

However, given the pattern on Team Hamilton, such a comment would very likely prove fodder

for mockery over such a "weak" person. Even over what may seem like quite small actions, such

as needing help carrying one's bicycle over an obtrusive and awkward barrier, Team Hamilton

cyclists were generally reluctant to offer or ask for help. In general, this morality was

unforgiving, and rarely generated sympathy for others. From the outside, this morality may

appear callous and, at times, self defeating.

Implications for Teams/Organizations

Moral moderation prevailed on Team Hamilton despite the fact that members voluntarily

worked together towards a common goal. The controversy and contentions teams often

experience contrasts to claims that teams engender synergy, esprit de corps, or, simply put,

teamwork. In fact, Team Hamilton's methods for dealing with conflict often discouraged

teamwork. Team Hamilton's team members did not spurn conflict: they do not avoid

confrontation nor do they tolerate any manner of offense that might arise.

Though often veiled and somewhat surreptitious, the constant barbs and low-level

criticisms team members subject each other to discouraged riders from broadening relationships

with each other. In other words, because their ties to each other were ultimately elective, riders

generally sustained their narrowly intimate relationships instead of integrating other aspects of

their lives. However, despite voluntarily associating, riders did not disband and avoid each other

over clashes because they depended upon each other in order to ensure the survival of, and their participation in, cycling. This interdependency affected the conflict management among riders, restraining excessive aggression and tempering violent outbursts in favor of more judicious and measured responses. This evidence suggests, then, that teams do not always facilitate teamwork and the characterization of teams as the organization of choice for achieving goals is not well founded, per se.

Implications for Developing Peace

Moral moderation, such as found on Team Hamilton, mixes features from peaceable communities and those that experience extreme violence. Social ties among members on team Hamilton are strong but truncated, riders are largely autonomous yet ultimately interdependent, all the while pursing the cross-functional goals of individual competition and team victory. Moral moderation reflects this hybrid morphology. The high level of interdependence made toleration attractive but total avoidance and unrestrained violence a non sequitur. Internal competition between riders increased the number of issues over which conflict ensued and heightened the response to these issues. It also discouraged partisanship. Therefore, instead of tranquility, gossip and mockery arose. As a result of these features, moral moderation thrived.

These features suggest that a few notable things with regard to peace and the interest of avoiding conflict in favor of peace. Foremost, interdependency among actors seems a leading aspect of promoting peace, but only if the actors are not in direct competition. This echoes existing assertions in the organization literature that find departments in a single organizations that have crossed-purposes which put them in direct competition for resources or other elements engage in conflict (Jackall 1988). Further, this study also implies that an increase in organization

192

– or a reduction in autonomy – increases conflict and thus decreases peace. This finding is supported in Baumgartner's (1989) work where she finds that in the peaceable world of suburbia, suburbanites rarely interact with each other in any organized capacity.

<div align="center">*****</div>

This analysis advances that moral moderation – and any normative order – stems from social structure. Undoubtedly, moral moderation is present in many teams across contemporary society. However, it is likely that particular features of other teams' social structures that are different from that of Team Hamilton dot the social landscape as well. It is reasonable to assume, then, that teams in which members are highly and broadly integrated into each other's lives, that are mandated by a coercive power to interact, or that are wedded by one unifying goal that is not mitigated by individual goals, would experience different moral orders. This suggests that those interested in engineering particular outcomes, such as managers, directors, CEOs, political heads, like peace, conflict, or a social environment in the middle of these extremes, pay attention to the social morphology of the organization at hand.

REFERENCES

Adler, P., and P. Adler.

    1991.   Stability and flexibility: Maintaining relations within organized and unorganized

           groups. In Experiencing fieldwork, edited by W. Shaffir and R. Stebbins.

           Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

    1994.   Observational techniques: In Denzin, NK & Lincoln, YS Eds. 1994: Handbook

    of qualitative research. Thousand Oaks: Sage, pp. 377 – 392.

Anderson, E. 1999. *Code of the Street: Decency, Violence, and the Moral Life of the Inner City.*

    New York: W.W. Norton.

Bar-Tal, D. 1998. Societal Beliefs In Times of Intractable Conflict: The Israeli Case.

    International Journal of Conflict Management, 9: 22-50.

Baumgartner, M.P. 1988. *The Moral Order of a Suburb*. New York: Oxford University.

    1998. "The Moral Voice of the Community." *Sociological Focus*. 31 2:

    1998. "Introduction: the Moral Voice of the Community." *Sociological Focus*. 31:105-

    117.

Beersma, B., Hollenbeck, J., Humphrey, S., Moon, H., Conlon, D., Ilgen, D. 2003. "Cooperation,

   Competition, And Team Performance: Toward A Contingency Approach." *Academy of*

   Management Journal. Vol. 46, No. 5, 572–590.

Black, Donald.

   1976.   *The Behavior of Law*. New York: Academic Press.

   1984.   "Social Control as a Dependent Variable." Pages 1-36 in *Toward a General*

   Theory of Social Control, Volume 1: Fundamentals, edited by Donald Black. Orlando:

   Academic Press.

   1989.   *Sociological Justice.* New York: Oxford University Press.

   1990. " The Elementary Forms of Conflict Management." Pp. 43– 69 in *New Directions*

   in the Study of Justice, Law, and Social Control, prepared by the School of Justice

   Studies, Arizona State University. New York: Plenum Press.

   1993. "Making Enemies." Chapter 8 in *The Social Structure of Right and Wrong*.

   Orlando: Academic Press.

   1998.   *The Social Structure of Right and Wrong*. Orlando: Academic Press.

   2000.   Dreams of Pure Sociology." *Sociological Theory* 18(3):343-367

Blake, R.R. and Mouton, J.S.

    1964. *The Managerial Grid*. Houston, Texas: Gulf Publishing.

    1970*. "The Fifth Achievement." Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 6: 413-426.

Bloch, Marc. 1961. *Feudal Society.* Vol. 2: *Social Classes and Political Organization.* Chicago:

    University of Chicago Press.

Borg, Marian J.

    1992. "Conflict Management In The Modern World System." *Sociological*

    Forum 7 2:261-282.

    1998. "Vicarious Homicide Victimization and Support for Capital Punishment:

    A Test of Black's Theory of Law." *Criminology* 36 3:537-567.

Brinton, MC. and Nee, V. 1998. *The New Institutionalism In sociology.* New York: Russell Sage

    Foundation

Buckle, L.G., and S.R. Thomas-Buckle. 1983. "Doing Unto Others: Dispute Processing in an

    Urban American Neighborhood. In *Neighborhood Justice: Assessment of an Emerging*

    Idea. R. Tomasic and M.M. Feeley, eds. Pp. 78-90. New York: Longman.

Campbell, Bradley, 2009. "Genocide As Social Control." *Sociological Theory.* 27 2: 150-172

Chagnon, N. 1996. *Yanomamo: Case Studies in Cultural Anthropology.* 5th ed. George and

    Louise Spindler eds. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Coleman, James. 1986. "Social Theory, Social Research, and a Theory of Action." *American*

    Journal of Sociology. 91 6: 1309-1335

    1990. *Foundations of Social Theory.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Colson, Elizabeth. 1953. "Social Control and Vengeance in Plateau Tonga Society." *Africa*

    23:199-212

Comte, A. [1855] 1974. *The Positive Philosophy.* Trans. And ed. Harriet Martineau. New York:

    AMS Press.

Cooney, Mark.

    1997. "From Warre to Tyranny: Lethal Conflict and the State." *American*

    Sociological Review. 62 2: 316-338

    1998. *Warriors and Peacemakers.* New York: New York University Press.

    2002. "The Privatization of Violence." *Criminology.* 41: 1377-1406.

197

2009a. "Ethnic Conflict Without Ethnic Groups: A Study in Pure

Sociology." *British Journal of Sociology.* Forthcoming.

2009b. <u>"Is Killing Wrong?" A Study In Pure Sociology.</u> Charlottesville: University

of Virginia Press.

De Dreu, Carsten K. W., and Bianca Beersma. 2005. "Conflict's Consequences: Effects of Social

motives on Post-Negotiation Creative and Convergent Group Functioning and

Performance." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 89:358-374.

Demos, John. 1970. *A Little Commonwealth: Family Life in Plymouth County.* New York:

Oxford University Press.

Dentan, Robert K.

1978. "Notes on Childhood in a Nonviolent Context: The Semai Case

(Malaysia). In *Learning Non-aggression.* A. Montague, ed. New York: Oxford

University Press.

1979. *The Semai: a Nonviolent People of Malaya.* Ventura, CA: Holt McDougal

1988. "Ambiguity, Synecdoche and Affect in Semai Medicine." *Social

Science and Medicine* 27: 857-877.

Dilthey W. [1883] 1976. Preface to *An Introduction to the Human Sciences.* In *W. Dilthey: Selected Writings,* ed. H.P. Rickman, 159-67. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

DiMaggio, Paul and Walter Powell 1983. "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality In Organizational Fields." *American Sociological Review.* 48 2: 147-160

Doyle, Michael W. 1997. *Ways of War and Peace: Realism, Liberalism, and Socialism.* New York: W.W. Norton.

Durkheim, Emile.

[1892] 1960. *Montesquieu and Rousseau: Forerunners of Sociology.* Forward by Henri Peyre. With "Durkheim, Montesquieu, and Rousseau," by Georges Davy and "Note," by A. Cuvillier. Translated by Ralph Manheim. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

[1893] 1964. *The Division of Labor in Society.* New York: Free Press.

[1897] 1951. *Suicide: A Study of Sociology.* New York: Free Press.

1899-1900. "Two Laws of Penal Evolution." *University of Cincinnati Law Review.* 38: 32-60

Estrich, S. 1987. *Real Rape.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Fine, G.A. 1987. *With the Boys: Little League Baseball and Preadolescent Culture.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fink, Clinton. 1968. "Some Conceptual Difficulties in the Theory of Social Conflict." *Journal of Conflict Resolution.* 12 4: 412-460

Fonow, M. M., and J. A. Cook. 1991. Back to the future: A look at the second wave of feminist epistemology and methodology. In Beyond methodology: Feminist scholarship as lived research, edited by M. M. Fonow and J. A. Cook. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Furer-Haimendorf, C. 1967. *Morals and Merit.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Furst, S., Blackburn, R. and Rosen, R. "Virtual Teams: A Proposed Research Agenda," presented at the National Academy of Management Meetings, Chicago, IL, 1999.

Gasiorowski, Mark, and Solomon W. Polachek. 1982. "Conflict and Interdependence." *Journal of Conflict Resolution.* 26 4: 709-721

Gibbs, James. L., Jr. 1963. "The Kpelle moot: a Therapeutic Model for the Informal Settlement of Disputes." *Africa* 33:1-10

Gluckman, Max.

    1956. *Custom and Conflict in Africa.* New York: Barnes & Nobel, 1969.

    1967. The Judicial Process Among the Barotse of Northern Rhodesia, second

    edition. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Gould, Roger. 2003. *Collision of Wills: How Ambiguity about Social Rank Breeds Conflict.*

    Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gramsci, A. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci.* Trans. and ed.

    Quentin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell smith. New York: International Publishers.

Guttmann, A. 1996. *The Erotic In Sports.* New York: Columbia University Press

Hager, Don, C.Y. Glock, and I. Chein. 1956. "Religious Conflict in the U.S." *Journal of Social*

    Issues. 12 3.

Harner, M. 1972. *The Jivaro: People of the Sacred Waterfalls.* Garden City: Anchor Books.

Harvey, Thomas R. and Bonnie Drolet. 1994. *Building Teams, Building People,* Lancaster:

    Technomic.

Hegel, G.W.F. [1891] 1991. *Elements of the Philosophy of Right*. Trans. H. B. Nisbett.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Herder, J. G. [1784-91] 1968. *Reflections on the Philosophy of the History of Mankind.* Chicago:

University of Chicago Press.

Hirschman, Albert O. 1977. *The Passions and the Interests: Political Arguments for Capitalism*

Before Its Triumph. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hobbes, Thomas. [1651] 1909. *Leviathon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hoffman, Heath. 2003. *Communal Individualism: Managing Conflict in Alcoholics Anonymous.*

Unpublished Dissertation.

Horwitz, Allan. V. 1982. *The Social Control of Mental Illness.* New York: Academic Press.

Jackall, R. 1988. *Moral Mazes: The World of Corporate Managers.* New York: Oxford

University Press.

Janowitz, M. 1957. "Military Elites and the Study of War." *Journal of Conflict Resolution.*

1:9-19.

Jassawalla, Avan R. and Hemant C. Shashittal. 1993. "Building Collaborative Cross-Functional

New Product Teams. *The Academy of Management Executive. 13 3: 50-63.*

Jehn, Karen A. and Elizabeth A. Mannix. 2001. "The Dynamic Nature of Conflict: A
Longitudinal Study of Intragroup Conflict and Group Performance." *The Academy of Management Journal.* 44 2: 238-251.

Jones, G.R. and George, J. M. 1988. "The Experience and Evolution of Trust: Implications for
Cooperation and Teamwork." *Academy of Management Review* 23 3: 531-546.

Kant, I. [1785] 1964. *Grundelgung zur Metaphysik der Sitten.* Translations include *Groundwork
of the Metaphysics of Morals.* Trans. H.J. Paton. New York: Harper & Row.

Koch, K. 1974. *War and Peace in Jalemo: The Management of Conflict in Highland New
Guinea.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Koelble, Thomas A. 1995. "Review: The New Institutionalism in Political Science and
Sociology." *Comparative Politics.* 27 2: 231-243.

Lawler, E.E. III, Mohrman, S.A., and Ledford, G.E. Jr. 1995. *Creating High Performance
Organizations: Practices and Results of Employee Involvement and Total Quality
Management in Fortune 1000 Companies.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lee, R. B. 1979. *The !Kung San: Men, Women and Work in a Foraging Society.* Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press.

Lee, R.B., and I. DeVore. 1968. *Man the Hunter*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Lincoln, Y., and E. Guba. 1985. *Naturalistic Inquiry*. New York: Sage.

Lovelace, Kay, Debra L. Shapiro, and Laurie R. Weingart. 2001. "Maximizing Cross-
Functional New Product Teams' Innovativeness and Constraint Adherence: A Conflict
Communications Perspective. *The Academy of Management Journal.* 44 4: 779-793.

Lundsgaarde, Henry P. 1977. "Murder in Space City: A Cultural Analysis of Houston Homicide
Patterns." Chapter 6 in *The Social Organization of Law,* edited by M. P. Baumgartner.

Marx, Karl.

[1845] 1965. *The German Ideology.* London: Lawrence & Wishart.

[1890] 1967. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy.* New York: International
Publishers.

McAleer, K. 1993. *Dueling: The Cult of Honor in Fin-de-Siecle Germany.* Princeton: Princeton
University Press.

Merry, S.E. 1979. "Going to Court: Strategies of Dispute Settlement in an American Urban
Neighborhood." *Law and Society Review* 13:891-925.

Michalski, Joseph H. 2005. "Explaining Intimate Partner Violence: The Sociological Limitations of Victimization Studies." *Sociological Forum.* 20 4: 613-640.

Molnar, Joseph J. and David L. Rogers.1979. "A Comparative Model of Interorganizational Conflict." *Administrative Science Quarterly.* 24 3: 405-425.

Morrill, Calvin.

1989. "The Management of Managers: Disputing in an Executive Hierarchy." *Sociological Forum* 4:387-409.

1995. *The Executive Way: Conflict Management in Corporations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Moskos, C.C. 1986. "Success Story: Blacks in the Army." *The Atlantic* 257: 64-72.

Mullis, Jeffrey. 1995. "Medical Malpractice, Social Structure, and Social Control." *Sociological Forum.* 10 1: 135-163.

Nader, L., and H.F. Todd, Jr. 1978. *The Disputing Process: Law in Ten Societies.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Nemeth, C.J. and B.M. Staw. 1989. "The Tradeoffs of Social Control and Innovation Within

>   Groups and Organizations. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Psychology*

>   (Vol. 22, pp 175-210O. New York: Academic Press.

Oakley, B., Felder, R., Brent, R., Elhajj, I. 2004. "Turning Student Groups into Effective

>   Teams." *Journal of Student-Centered Learning.* 2 1: 9-34.

Parsons, Talcott.

>   1951. *The Social System.* New York: Free Press.

>   1962. "The Law and Social Control," in *Toward a General Theory of Action*, ed.

>   T. Parsons and E. A. Shils. New York: Harper and Row.

Pelled, Lisa Hope. 1996. "Demographic Diversity, Conflict, and Work Group Outcomes: An

>   Intervening Process Theory." *Organizational Science.* 7 6: 615-632.

Phillips, Scott. 2008. "Racial Disparities in the Capital of Capital Punishment." *Houston Law*

>   *Review* 45

Robarchek, Clayton A. 1977. "Frustration, Aggression, and the Nonviolent Semai." *American*

>   *Ethnologist* 4: 762-779.

Robarchek, Clayton A., and Carole J. Roberchek. 1992. "Cultures of War and Peace: A
Comparative Study of Waorani and Semai." In James Silverberg and J. Patrick Gray,
eds., *Aggression and Peacefulness in Humans and other Primates,* 189-213. New York:
Oxford University Press.

Robarchek, Clayton A., and R.K. Denton. 1987. "Blood Drunkenness and the Bloodthirsty
Semai: Unmaking Another Anthropological Myth." *American Anthropologist.* 89: 356-
365.

Robson, J. 1980. *Food, Ecology and Culture: Readings in the Anthropology of Dietary
Practices.* New York: Gordon and Beach, Science Publishers. Inc.

Rosen, Paul. 1993. "The Social Construction of Mountain Bikes: Technology and Postmodernity
in the Cycling Industry." *Social Studies of Science.* 23 3: 479-513

Rousseau, J-J. [1762] 1987. *On the Social Contract.* Trans. Donald A. Cress. Indianapolis:
Hackett.

Schein, E. H. 1986. "What You Need to Know About Organizational Culture." *Training and
Development Journal.* 40 1:30-33.

Schneider, Benjamin. 1983. "Work Climates: An Interactionist Perspective." In Feimer NW.

Geller ES (Eds.) *Organizational Effectiveness: A Comparison of Multiple Models.* (pp.

27-54). New York: Academic Press.

Senechal de la Roche, Roberta.

1990. *The Sociogenesis of a Race Riot: Springfield, Illinois, in 1908.* Urbana: University

of Illinois Press.

1996. "Collective Violence as Social Control." *Sociological*

Forum. 11 1:97-128.

1997. "The Sociogenesis of Lynching." Pp. 48-76 in *Under Sentence of Death: Lynching*

in the South. Ed. By W. Fitzhugh Brundage. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina

Press.

2001. "Why Is Collective Violence Collective?" *Sociological Theory.* 19 2:126-144.

Shakur, Sanyika. 1993. *Monster: The Autobiography of an L.A. Gang Member.* New York:

First Grove Press.

Simmel, G. [1907] 1971. "The Metropolis and Mental Life." In *Georg Simmel on individuality*

and Social Forms, ed. Donald N. Levine, 324-39. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Smilde, D. 2007. *Reason To Believe: Cultural Agency in Latin American Evangelicalism.*
Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Snow, David A., Calvin Morrill, and Leon Anderson. 2003. "Elaborating Analytic
Ethnography." *Ethnography* 4 2: 181-200.

Stein, Arthur A. 1993., "Governments, Economic Independence, and International Cooperation.
In *Behavior, Society, and Nuclear War,* ed. Philip E. Tetlock, Jo L. Husbands, Robert
Jervis, Paul C. Stern, and Charles Tilly, 3:241-324. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sumner, W. G., [1906] 1960. *Folkways: A Study of the Sociological Importance of Usages,
Manners, Customs, Mores, and Morals.* New York: New American Library.

Suttles, Gerald D., 1968. *The Social Order of the Slum.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Taysom, Sophie, 1998. "Reading Mountain Bikes Through Technoscience and the Cyborg."
Social Alternatives. 17 4: 18-22.

Tiryakian, Edward A., 1964. "Durkheim's Two Laws of Penal Evolution." *Journal For The
Scientific Study of Religion.* 3 2:261-266.

Tjosvold, D., Hui, C., Yu, Z., 2003. "Conflict Management and Task Reflexivity for Team in-Role and Extra-Role Performance in China." *International Journal of Conflict Management* 14: 141-163.

Tocqueville, Alexis de. [1863]1984. *Democracy in America*. Trans. and ed. Francis Bowen. Cambridge: University Press.

Trachtman, Robert. 1999. "The Money Taboo: Its Effects in Everyday Life and in the Practice of Psychotherapy." *Clinical Social Work Journal.* 27: 275-288.

Tucker, James. 1999. *The Therapeutic Corporation.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Turnbull, C. M.1965. *Wayward Servants: The Two Worlds of the African Pygmies.* Garden City: Natural History Press.

Viner, Jacob. 1951. *International Economics.* Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Weber, Max.

 [1913] 1968. *The Methodology of the Social Sciences.* Trans. Edward Shils and Henry A Finch. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.

[1922a] 1958. "Bureaucracy." In *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, ed. By Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills. New York: Oxford University Press.

[1922b] 1964. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization,* ed. By Talcott Parsons. New York: Free Press.

Williams, J. 1980. *Dueling in the Old South: Vignettes of Social History.* College Station: Texas A&M University Press.

Wolfgang, M. 1958. *Patterns in Criminal Homicide.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Woodburn, James. 1979. "Minimal politics: the Political Organization of the Hadza of North Tanzania." Pages 244-266 in *Politics in Leadership: A Comparative Perspective,* edited by William A. Shack and Perry S. Cohen. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Yost, James A. 1981. "People of the Forest: the Waorani." In *Ecuador: Allombra dei Vulcani*, 95-115. Centro Studi Ricerche Ligabue. Venice, Italy: La Casa Editrice Erizzo.

Zillman, Dolf. 1990. "The Interplay of Cognition and excitation in Aggravated Conflict Among Intimates." Pp. 187-208 in *Intimates in Conflict: A Communication Perspective,* edited by Dudley D. Cahn. Hillsdale, NJ: Earlbaum.

APPENDIX A

HOW A PACELINE WORKS

The paceline is a formation in which cyclists ride behind one anther in order for the group to maintain a high rate of speed, typically higher than a single cyclist could maintain by him/herself. In a paceline, every rider drafts within inches of the rider in front and behind in order to conserve energy for his/her turn as the rider in the very front of the group. When the front rider fatigues and is unable to maintain a particular speed, he/she then rotates "off the front" and takes his/her place in the paceline. Placement in a paceline is socially and functionally important. Socially, a rider's position highlights his/her status. Functionally, pace-line position practically impacts riders and, consequently, riders vigilantly police their position.

Each rider in a paceline is affected by the riders in front of him/her. These effects are cumulatively magnified by the number of riders ahead. For example, if a rider ahead of another unexpectedly hits his/her brakes, all riders behind must also break. Likewise, all riders are affected if a rider creates a gap between him/her and the rider in front of him/her. If that gap becomes wider as the rider continues to fall back, riders behind the rider opening the gap are at risk for losing contact with the larger group or must use energy to surge around the rider in peril in order to reconnect with the paceline. In an effort to reduce the personal risk of this occurring, of "getting dropped" or having to compensate for a rider who opens a gap in the paceline, riders are vigilant about who is in front of them. The threat of this risk creates tension and invites potential conflict among riders.

The theoretical norm in pacelines is for the rider rotating off the front to rejoin the group as the last rider in the line. However, this typically does not happen. Instead, riders either rejoin the group further towards the front by asking another rider politely to make space for them, a rider in the paceline invites the rider that is moving off the front to rejoin the group in front of him/her and makes space, the rider coming off the front points to a place and moves into it as another rider in the paceline yields in accommodation, or the rider coming off the front forces his/herself into a space as a rider in the paceline yields or is otherwise pushed off the road or pushes back against the incoming rider. The likelihood that any of these practices occurs depends on the social geometry of the case, as well as the level of risk.

APPENDIX B

STAGING – THE BIKE RACE START-LINE

On start lines, all riders pack together at a given time and location before their race begins. Once the gun sounds indicating the race start, riders on or close to the start line enjoy many advantages in comparison to those positioned mid-pack or towards the back. These advantages include freedom to move forward as soon as the official signals the start, whereas the riders in the rear of the group must wait until riders ahead of them move in order to begin moving forward themselves. Starting in a position on or near the line also reduces the risk that a rider might fall victim to a crash: the less people in front of you, the less the probability exists for a crash to hinder your movement and the more open space available to maneuver away from a crash should one occur. Further, a rider on the line gains immediate yardage on the rider starting last, distances ranging from five to 15 feet depending on the number of racers.

Most importantly, start position influences a rider's chance to enter the trail, or singletrack, first. All these advantages to the front-of-the-pack position operate as independent advantages but they also culminate in the race within the race: the race to the hole-shot. All mountain bike races start in mass, typically in an open area. At some point during the race, the open area closes into singletrack. Position into the singletrack is very important for two clear reasons: one, a slower rider, or a rider with less technical skill in the singletrack, will slow riders behind him or her down while simultaneously allowing riders ahead to gain distance; second, passing in singletrack can be hard and precarious and typically results in lost time if not a crash.

Riders on or close to the start line are much better positioned to enter the singletrack ahead of any rider starting behind him or her.

Honoring the importance of start position, high-prestige races often engage in the ritual of "calling" riders to the line. In this ritual the official calls riders, or invites them, in a predetermined order to take a position behind the start line. The first rider called always takes the most advantageous position, some place with his or her front tire touching the line. Riders subsequently called to the line take the next advantageous position, and so forth. However, all races do not engage this ritual. Instead, riders "stage" or come to the line on a first-come first-serve basis. This method imposes no order on how racers line up except that they must remain behind the start line.