Invisible Elbows Nudging towards a Life’s Work

Barry Wellman
NetLab Network

Looking back, my life course seems inevitable. That’s an ex post facto mistake. I’m grateful to CITAMS to give me a chance to realize it was neither a random walk nor a dogged pursuit towards a single goal. In reflecting, I’ve been guided by the lovely essay that my mentor Charles Tilly wrote in 1996: “Invisible Elbows”. It’s about how slight nudges and course corrections affect our pathways. Here are some key ones about the route I’ve taken to study the intersection of community networks, communication networks, and computer networks.

Elbow 1: Towards Sociology. Like all NJBs of the 1950s-1960s, I was supposed to be a doctor—“or, at least a dentist” as my father would say. NJB-me had done ok in biology, chemistry, and the MCATs, but klutz-me knew I wasn’t cut out to be a doctor. In my junior year, my good friend Jack Marchalonis said, “Barry, you love to think about society, why don’t you become a sociologist?” The light bulb went off in my head, and I soon applied to every just about every decent sociology grad program. The benefits of a broad liberal arts education, captaincy of the undefeated Lafayette College Bowl team, good grades, and high GSEs meant I got into a bunch of programs. I boiled it down to Harvard or Columbia. I stumbled upon a key question, “How many students do you admit in the first year? How many are in your second year?” Columbia: 40 and 20; Harvard: 20 and 19. I immediately chose Harvard, with its sponsored rather than achieved mobility. I was scared enough going from my small college; who needed more tsuris?

Elbow 2: Towards the Networked Community: It was at Harvard, when two dynamic elbows nudged—nay, yanked—me onto my career path. On one arm, Chuck Tilly was legitimating for me what I had grown up knowing—but urban sociology had rejected—that communities were exciting supportive, places—and not the dystopias taught in the textbooks. It was great being his teaching assistant and learning how systematic evidence could question often-dystopian myths—a lesson I still insist on teaching every time someone insists that digital media have killed community.

Elbow 3: Towards the Networked Society: On the other arm, Harrison White yanked more publicly because he was the big new star attracting the hot new grad students away from the previous generation’s Talcott Parsons and George Homans. Beneath all of the fancy math, Harrison had one simple, basic message: “The world is made up of networks. We’re not sallying forth as individuals guided by a mega-injection of norms and values. Nor are we bound up in tight little groups, like families or neighborhoods.” At the time, the only networks people knew about were ABC, CBS and NBC broadcasters. I became Harrison’s TA, with the interesting job of translating his often-opaque writing and lecturing into undergraduate-understandable English. It was a great way of learning the stuff myself.

I pause for an interlude. In 1965, while a grad student, I fell in love with Beverly (Meyrowitz) Wellman, who has stood elbow-to-elbow with me for 50 years, almost always saying “Go for it!” but also urging me to clarify my ideas and editing my writing.

Elbow 4: The East York Study Puts Data Where My Mouth Is: In 1966, Chuck Tilly got elbowed out of tenure at Harvard and went straight to being a full professor at the University of Toronto. In 1967, he grabbed me by the elbow and got me a job at the same university, half in sociology and half in the Clarke Institute of Psychiatry. “You’ll help run the East York study” with psychiatrist Donald Coates. It’s all about how social networks intersect with mental health. And so, we asked East Yorkers (a fairly central area of Toronto) about which friends and relatives they were closest with—putting a ceiling on six after pre-tests.
Elbow 5: The Data Show that Communities Not Limited to Neighborhoods: The next elbow came from the SPSS print-out. Along with questions about each network member’s relationship and exchange of social support, we asked about what geographical area they lived in—from “same building” and neighborhood to “outside of Toronto”. The findings startled me: Rather than the tidy self-contained neighborhoods of standard-issue urban sociology, the East Yorkers’ “personal communities” (a term I had to invent) were far-flung. Most lived well beyond the neighborhood; many lived outside of East York. Moreover, they were supportive—unlike the alienation myth that permeated urban sociology then and internet sociology now. So, I went beyond thinking of communities-as-neighborhoods to thinking about the “community question”: how different social and technological regimes fostered different configurations of interpersonal relationships.

Elbow 6: The Evidence Shows that Personal Networks are Not Homogeneously Supportive: Not an elbow, but a gaping hole in our data led me to mount the second East York study a decade later. What kind of support did these ties provide? With it, Scot Wortley and I showed that people in different types of relationships provide different types of what we now call “social capital: “Different strokes from different folks” we called it—a title that the American Journal of Sociology almost censored, not realizing the importance of a variety of elbows for people’s lives.

Elbow 7: Networking the Networkers: Sometimes, you just elbow your own way in. Nick Mullins had noted in his Theories and Theory Groups book that social network analysis had an intellectual leader in Harrison White but no organizational leader. A gap to be filled! This became even more apparent when I went around the UK on sabbatical and noticed how the network scholars didn’t know what each other were doing. When Bev and I came back to Toronto we formed the interdisciplinary International Network for Social Network Analysis to be a committee of correspondence—where we would recognize and inform each other. The centerpiece was the deliberately informal journal, Connections, which supplied positive news, New Yorker style tidbits, and abstracts of our work. We started with 175 people in 1976-1977, and now have more than 2,000 on the listserv. Over the past four decades, network analysis (and INSNA) has become institutionalized in sociology, but I still have to tell the mass media, “No, it didn’t start with Facebook”.

Elbow 8: Computer Networks Meet Community Networks: Roxanne Hiltz and Murray Turoff title-elbowed me when they wrote The Network Nation in 1978 named after Paul Craven and my 1973 paper, “The Network City”. They linked the new field of computer mediated communication to the turn towards social networks. I eagerly joined them, Lin Freeman, and others in building experimental scientific communities of correspondence—just like the Royal Society in the 1600s used visits and letters. My childhood fascination with science-fiction led me to new directions in my intellectual life. Yet, I still saw myself as a community sociologist well into the 1980s, arguing (along with Claude Fischer) that it was time for my comrades to stop their fixating on neighborhoods and to focus on social relationships of community.

Elbow 9: Hanging Out with Computer Scientists: In 1988, an enormous elbow shoved me through a magic door into the internet, well before it became the internet. Marilyn Mantei, Ron Baecker and Bill Buxton asked me to join them in studying “telepresence”: a hardware/software solution to people working together at a distance. Mantei said, “You’ve been studying personal communities that extend in space; let’s study work communities.” This has become more obvious now, but it was revolutionary at the time. Most importantly, it transported me into working with computer scientists and thinking about how connected computers intersect with social phenomena.

Elbow 10: The Sepulveda Revelation: In 2000, the elbow came from Bev Wellman in the car seat next to me while driving between the San Fernando Valley and downtown LA. We had to deal with a family illness in NY while being in LA and dealing with research issues in Toronto. Bev and I said to each other, “Look, we’re networked individuals. We’re neither isolated individuals or entombed in one neighborhood.” We got on the newfangled cellphone and dealt with the issues. And I got the integrative insight for my 2001 paper, “Physical Place and Cyber Place: The Rise of Networked Individualism.” This was followed up when I spent a month with Jeff Cole’s invitation at the Center for the Digital Future. There, I met Helen Wang Hua, and we went on to use their U.S. data to show in “Social Connectivity in America” that internet users had more in-person contact than non-users—they synergistically reinforce each other.
Elbow 11: Lee Rainie’s Embrace: Sometimes the elbow comes as an embrace. I’d met Lee Rainie briefly in 2000 when he was just starting the sorely-needed Pew Internet studies. Then, Jeff Boase, Wenhong Chen, Keith Hampton and I had collaborated on some Pew studies. In 2007 he emailed that he’d like to come to Toronto, meet NetLabbers, and see the East York we had studied. Great! Over coffee on the Danforth, he told me he’d like to write a book about the internet and society, and use my networked individualism approach. Would that be OK? It would be more than OK, because I’d been thinking of the same thing myself. “Let’s do a joint book!” Lee loved the idea of linking network analysis with internet analysis, and he insisted that the network revolution chapter come before the ones on the internet and mobile revolutions. Many phone calls, many more emails, and my writers’ blocks later, Networked came out in 2012 and is still being read. Yet it is being outsold by other books that proclaim—without systematic evidence—that the internet is an alienating place: oy vey pop sociology similar to how urbanists wrongly proclaimed without evidence that cities were alienating.

Elbow 12: From Community Networks to Scholarly Networks: Since I started INSNA, I’d believed strongly in scholarly networks, so I leapt at the chance when Don Brookes wandered into my office in the mid-2000s and offered a chance to study a Canadian network of scholars studying water quality. It was confidential stuff, so we didn’t publish, but it provided good financial support and research experience to NetLab member Dimitrina Dimitrova. And it gave us confidence and experience when Kelly Booth invited us to study the large scholarly network of Canadian computer and social scientists he was to lead for five years: how do they interact within and across disciplines, universities, and provinces. Dima, Guang Ying Mo, Tsahi Hayat, Anatoliy Gruzd and I have published a bunch of papers and edited two special issues of the American Behavioral Scientist.

Elbow 13: Networked Individualism—East Asian Style: I was elbowed to the side early in 2015 while a visiting prof in Singapore. My students pointed out Asian variations in kinship and hierarchical deference within the “networked individualism” concept. For example, the Lunar New Year is a major bonding event for many kinship and friendship networks. I realized how American-centric was the research on the internet, social networks, and to a lesser extent, community. To address this, Vincent Chua and I edited two issues of American Behavioral Scientist on the subject and are finishing a long review article now.

The Fourteenth Elbow: From Scholarly Networks to Networked Work: The scholarly network stuff has excited me to think about how much of work has become networked: either in organizations when employees are simultaneously partial members of multiple teams or when self-employed people use their networks to assemble teams for specific jobs. In some ways, this builds on my lifelong commitment to studying multiple community networks. Studying this, should occupy me for the next decade.

Finally, I practice what I preach as a networked individual. I’ve learned so much and done so much with wonderful collaborators. I’ve coauthored with more than 80, and have had scores more research assistants. I kvell about them all as we have elbowed through life.

Recent Publications


“Taking Root: Animal Advocacy and the Regulation of Science”
Activists rarely get everything they want from policy demands. During the policy reform process movement demands are tempered into political compromises. Do these policy concessions co-opt movements or do they provide activists a foothold for further change? This question is fundamental to democracy: Can activists promote the change they want through democratic processes like policy reform? The animal advocacy movement’s on-going work to protect animals in research provides a good case for examining this topic. I explore the impact of federal regulation at the laboratory level by interviewing scientists, bioethicists, veterinarians, and other professionals involved in research with animals. I also use ethnographic observation, archival data, and content analysis of newspaper data to capture overtime changes. Broadly, I argue that the outcomes of activist challenges depend largely on characteristics of the institution being targeted. I argue that science, as a targeted institution, is structured such that even seemingly modest policy reforms have embedded activists’ interests inside the institution. My research is distinct in two ways. First, I examine how activists affect change in institutions that are not explicitly political, like science and mass media. Second, I explore how activists affect institutional change in cross-cultural contexts. I use media data as a proxy for these cross-cultural contexts as one measure of social change over time.

“Dreaming the Future: The Gendered Technopolitics of Development”
Across the globe, national and supranational institutions are emphasizing the need for women to achieve development gains through their integration into the “network society.” Closely aligned with traditional development discourses, these gendered technological discourses resonate with neoliberal rhetoric that focuses on entrepreneurship. But far from being passive consumers, grassroots organizations in Latin America are defining a “feminist politics of technology.” This project examines the kinds of practices that emerge amidst local and transnational discourses that focus on gender, development, and digital information technologies, and fills an important need for understanding the ways in which women’s insertion in the network society is being framed and practiced. I argue that grassroots organizations working on these issues are negotiating their place within the network society in fluid, networked, and evolving ways. In-depth interviews, textual analysis, and participant observation are employed to understand the discourses on gender and technology, and the practices of grassroots organizational actors in Latin America. Data has also been collected from experts at key global agencies, international funding entities, and major technology corporations. This research will advance theoretical debates on gender, technology and development, and inform policy by providing insights on how national and international prescriptions are interpreted and transformed on the ground.
Kristi Brownfield, Assistant Professor of Sociology
Year of Graduation: August 2015
Department of Sociology, Northern State University
kristi.brownfield@northern.edu

“Veni, Vidi, Vids: Transforming Cultural Narratives Through the Art of Audiovisual Storytelling”

Using qualitative content analysis methods, I sampled from the television show Supernatural and the 2009 film Star Trek as well as seven different fanvid communities, collecting a total of 105 vids and 6509 comments as the second part of my sample. My analysis centered on the following research questions: a) What are the cultural narratives present in the canon sources and how are those narratives rejected, accepted, replaced, or otherwise transformed within fanvids? (b) How do the narratives present within the canon source and within the vids reflect the ideologies and spirit of the culture that produces those narratives? (c) Are these vids and discussions a sign of potential change in cultural ideologies and narratives and, if so, what change is taking place? My findings within the two canons include an emphasis on a masculinity that maintains control through violence and aggression; in contrast vids reject this type of masculinity and the larger cultural narratives that support it, except when that violent masculinity is sexualized in the context of homosexual relationships. Further, vids predominantly reject the heteronormativity found in both Supernatural and Star Trek. The differences and similarities between canon and vid point to deficiencies both in narrative and in representation in the media we are producing in the U.S. as well as narratives that are stable and enduring, so much so that fans add them even when they are not present in canon. These are the stories our culture, right now, is built on.

Laura Loeb, Ph.D. Candidate | Year of Graduation: 2016
Department of Sociology, University of California, Los Angeles
laura.a.loeb@gmail.com | www.lauraloeb.com

“Talk Show Talk: The Practices of Interviewing on Daytime and Late-Night”

In the last twenty-five years campaigning politicians have increasingly become frequent guests on talk shows whose typical guests are entertainment celebrities, such as The Tonight Show or The View. These interviews are commonly understood to be less challenging than news interviews, but previous research has shown that these programs inform audiences in meaningful ways that shape voting. First, this dissertation maps the practices of interaction on typical talk show interviews using conversation analysis. Next a quantitative coding scheme was used to build on these findings, as well as previous findings on news interview practices, to determine how political guests re-shape the talk show context. Political guests bring more challenging questions with them, but leave the personalized context of the talk show unchanged. As a result political interviews on talk shows represent a blend of genres, which works to inform the viewer in a markedly different manner than news interviews. In the final part of the project these findings are applied to CNN, showing that the talk show norms have begun to drift into some news contexts. These findings chart current changes in the media landscape, as well as the political sphere.
Announcements

Theorizing the Web 2015
April 15–16 in New York City
Venue: the Museum of the Moving Image, in Queens

Abstract submission deadline: 11:59 pm (EST), January 24, 2016
Theorizing the Web is an annual event featuring critical, conceptual discussions about technology and society. We began in 2011 to advance a different kind of conversation about the Web, one which recognizes that to theorize technology is also to theorize the self and the social world. Given that technology is inseparable from society, the ideas and approaches that have historically been used to describe social reality must not be abandoned. Instead, these historical approaches must be applied, reworked, and reassessed in light of the developing digitization of social life.

We are now seeking presentations for our sixth annual event, which will take place on April 15 and 16 at the Museum of the Moving Image in New York City. We invite submissions that engage with issues of social power, inequality, vulnerability, and justice from a diverse range of perspectives. Theorizing the Web is not an event just for academics or “tech” thinkers: activists, journalists, technologists, writers, artists, and folks who don’t identify as any of the above are all encouraged to submit a presentation abstract.

We are looking for abstracts that feature clear conceptual arguments and that avoid jargon in favor of more broadly accessible critical insight. Submissions on any topic are welcome, but some specific topics we’d like to address this year include:

--moving images, gifs, video, live streaming, copcams
--social photography, filters, selfies, posing
--race, racism, race posturing, ethnicity, #BlackLivesMatter
--sex, gender, feminism, queer and trans* politics
--sexuality, sexting, sex work, consent
--mental health, illness, neurodiversity
--(dis)ability and ableism
--non-Western Web(s), language barriers, hegemony, globalization
--social movements, protest, revolution, social control, censorship
--hate, harassment, intimidation, trolling, bullying, resistance
--pain, sickness, loss, death and dying
--parenting, birth, life course
--bodies, cyborgs, wearables, trans/post-humanism, bots
--the self, identity, subjectivity, (in)authenticity, impression management
--privacy, publicity, surveillance
--encryption, anonymity, pseudonymity
--presence, proximity, face-to-face, (dis)connection, loneliness
--capitalism, Silicon Valley, venture capital
--crowd funding, micro currencies, crypto currencies, blockchains
Successful abstracts will address intersections of gender, race, class, age, sexual orientation, disability, and other forms of inequality as they pertain to any of the topics above. Abstract submissions should be 300 to 500 words (only the first 500 words will be reviewed). Arguments should be scaled to fit 12-minute panel presentations, and titles should appeal to a general audience. Your submission should not only describe your topic and question but also summarize your thinking and your conclusions. Good abstracts will provide a specific, original argument with clear stakes. Please do not ask questions in your abstract without answering them, or state “I will make an argument about X” without making the argument.

Note that, because Theorizing the Web deeply values public engagement, we expect all TtW16 presentations to be both comprehensible and rewarding to people from outside the presenter’s specific areas of expertise.

Abstract submissions are due by 11:59 EST on January 24, 2016, and can be submitted through our form located at theorizingtheweb.org/submit. The TtW16 selection committee will blindly review all submissions. Space is limited, and selection is competitive. Our acceptance rate is typically 20% to 35%.

Please note that we have a separate submissions process for art and alternative-format presentations. If you would like to participate in some way that isn’t giving a spoken presentation (e.g., displaying a piece of art; giving a performance; doing something else entirely), please use this separate submission form: http://tinyurl.com/ttw16alt.

Registration for Theorizing the Web remains “pay what you can,” and we ask that you donate whatever amount you deem fair or can afford (minimum $1). More information (including the registration form) can be found at theorizingtheweb.tumblr.com/2016/registration.

Stay tuned to theorizingtheweb.org for announcements about invited panels, and mail us at theorizingtheweb@gmail.com if you would like to help out with our all-volunteer event in any way.

The conference hashtag is #TtW16.
2) Call for Submissions: Emerald Studies in Media and Communication:
Deadline: February 1st 2016

Emerald Studies in Media and Communication is delighted to announce the call for 2016. We are inviting submission of original, unpublished papers for two volumes to be published on Latin America with guest editors from Argentina and Brazil. Thanks to a short publication cycle, authors will see their work in print within 12 months of submission by the deadline.

**VOLUME 12: ICTs and the Politics of Inclusion in Latin America**

Guest Editors: Hernan Galperin, Alejandro Artopoulos, and Jason Beech

This volume assembles relevant research focusing on ICTs in Latin America. The mobile broadband revolution is taking place in Latin America. Despite various constraints faced by Latin American countries, the spread of mobile telephony and broadband Internet has reached very high levels even among low-income populations. However, about half of the continent’s population remains unconnected, and the benefits of connectivity have been slow to materialize. Submissions may examine any aspect of the theme of digital divide in Latin America and the politics of digital inclusion. We welcome submissions on different dimensions of the theme such as mobile youth identities, technology affordability, school transformation by digital media, the diffusion of e-commerce platforms and digital technology in SMEs. We are interested in submissions that address theoretical and/or methodological issues on the topic.

**VOLUME 13: Brazil: Media from the Country of the Future**

Guest Editors: Sonia Virginia Moreira, Monica Martinez, Joseph D. Straubhaar, Antonio C. La Pastina, and Samantha Nogueira Joyce

This volume assembles research on any aspect of Brazilian media and communication in its various forms. The parameters are set as broadly as possible as long as the research speaks to a facet of the topic as defined in the call for submissions. Submissions may be empirical, theoretical, or methodological—using any method or approach. The volume aims to encompass research on emergent phenomena, as well as studies with a historical or longitudinal dimension. Comparative studies are welcome as long as Brazil is one of the central case studies.

For more information, see [http://www.emeraldmediastudies.com](http://www.emeraldmediastudies.com).
CITAMS (CITASA) wishes to thank our generous sponsors:

Information, Communication & Society

Since 1997, the journal Information, Communication & Society (iCS) has been charting the global diffusion and implications of digital media, communication and information technologies for individuals, households and society at large. The ubiquity of such media is a striking testimony to their influence in the contemporary world. This rich interdependence and inseparability of social and technical manifestations is well represented in the titles of articles published in iCS covering almost every facet of our lifestyles including patterns of work and leisure, entertainment, consumption, education, environmentalism, political activity, domestic life and individual identity. A defining objective of iCS is the publication of the highest quality material and to provide an international forum for accessible but critical analyses of the social shaping and implications of technological change. It has always avoided the more hyperbolic claims of technological futurists and has instead sought to ground our knowledge and understanding on high quality empirical and theoretic studies of media, communication and information technologies and society. Published articles in iCS have all been subjected to rigorous peer review comprising initial editorial screening and anonymous refereeing by at least two referees. According to the 2014 Journal Citations Reports, Information, Communication, and Society is ranked Quartile 1 in sociology journals: 18th of 142 sociology journals with an Impact Factor of 1.676. For more information on the journal, please see about iCS. Click here for the current issue.

PMI

Project Management Institute is the world’s leading not-for-profit professional membership association for the project, program and portfolio management profession. The PMI Academic and Educational Programs Group is devoted to building and advancing the future of the project management profession through knowledge creation, dissemination and education of the next generation of project managers and project management scholars. The group is committed to delivering value to its stakeholders by investing in new academic research-driven project management knowledge, curriculum development, program accreditation and academic outreach. Visit PMITeach.org for more on project management curriculum, research grants, publications, awards, and upcoming educational events. For more information, please see http://www.pmi.org/.

Emerald Group Publishing

Emerald is a global publisher linking research and practice to the benefit of society. The company manages a portfolio of over 290 journals and over 2,500 books and book series volumes. It also provides an extensive range of value-added products, resources and services to support its customers’ needs. Among these publications, Emerald Studies in Media and Communications publishes two annual volumes that capitalize on the series’ sponsorship by the Communication and Information Technologies Section of the American Sociological Association (CITASA). The annual volumes are highlighted at the CITASA business meeting. For more information about Emerald Group Publishing, please see http://www.emeraldgrouppublishing.com/index.htm. For more information on Emerald Studies in Media and Communications, please see http://www.emeraldmediastudies.com/.

RTI

RTI International is one of the world’s leading research institutes, dedicated to improving the human condition by turning knowledge into practice. Our staff of more than 3,700 provides research and technical services to governments and businesses in more than 75 countries in the areas of health and pharmaceuticals, education and training, surveys and statistics, advanced technology, international development, economic and social policy, energy and the environment, and laboratory testing and chemical analysis. For more information, please see http://www.rti.org/.
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