Harman begins, arguing how social media are changing how we think, affecting our ability to focus

Hi, I’m Greg Harman, a professor in the School of Education, where we’re supposed to know stuff about learning and thinking.

How often have you heard, or thought yourself, that any given content in a class didn’t really matter because you could always look it up? Schools agree with you – they emphasize skills over content - from the idea of ‘what you know’ to the idea of ‘skills you have.’

You might think this is an improvement on the assumptions that came before. Here’s the big question: Why do you think you think that?

Imagine yourself transported suddenly to 1963. Someone asks you what’s happening fifty years forward. You pull forth your iPhone and proudly announce that this device you keep in your pocket can access all of the information possessed by the entirety of humanity. When she asks you what you use it for -- “Most of the time, looking at pictures of kittens.”

We do this instead of solving global warming with it because the way of thinking it brings us is not naturally aligned to persistent contemplation or action. It sure can help real life things in many instrumental ways, but the sort of thinking and doing required for committed engagement is unnatural to digital communication.

Let me put forth some definitions, so we know what it is we’re talking about. A MEDIUM is a means – a way of getting something done. A clock is a medium of recording time, as is a calendar. The plural of MEDIUM is MEDIA. We are so accustomed to shorthanding categories of life using the word “media” that we tend to forget its origin.

A SOCIAL MEDIUM is any medium that people use primarily to communicate. Speaking is a social medium. Writing is a social medium. Telegraph, telephone, radio, television, and the internet are all social media.

INTERACTIVE SOCIAL MEDIUM is used to discern broadcasted media, like radio and television, from ones where the receiver participates back directly, like email or texting. Letter-
writing, by the way, qualifies as an interactive social medium. There are some scholars of
literacy who count reading as interactive even though the interaction is between the message, the
book, and the reader, rather than between the author and the reader. They argue that any reading
that is not interactive, a sort of conversation between the reader and the propositions s/he is
reading, is not actually reading. But that’s getting into quite fine distinctions.

DIGITAL SOCIAL MEDIA we use to mean email, chatrooms, blogs, online journals,
Facebooking, texting, tweeting, and I’m sure I’m leaving some out. But it’s generally used to
mean all the means of communicating that have arrived on the scene post-television. We tend to
use “digital” “interactive” and other words loosely and interchangeably, and we might for the
purposes of efficiency in our debate. By them we mean the post-TV media. While they are new,
they are likely to alter the same kinds of things in cultures and individuals that every other
medium has once it became widespread – normal.

Marshall McLuhan observed, way back in 1963, “The medium is the message.” That means that
the most profound effect of a medium of communication is how it alters the concepts available to
us in our culture. Elaborating on this in the age of TV, Neil Postman proposed that every
dominant medium generates the structure of thinking that we experience as normal in our own
time and place.

A person in a world in which the written word on paper is primary thinks in typographic ways –
typographic meaning the mass representation of the written word. Typography demands linear
presentation and reception of propositions. The kind of thinking it promotes is therefore usually
described as analyzing, examining, synthesizing, and evaluating.
A person in a world in which digital are the media of choice thinks in digital ways. This means
multiple, fast-moving, and thus casual encounters - rapid transition between ideas expressed as
aphorisms, usually along with images.

This might be fine. In his time, Socrates railed against the new-fangled medium of writing,
claiming that it would ruin thinking. Well, as well as enabling mass democracy, modern science,
and the industrial revolution, typography meant that we can read his rants against writing, thanks
to his student, Plato, writing them down.
So perhaps digital thinking will carry us forward in huge leaps in a similar way.
But I doubt it. Mark Bauerlein is already asking where the improvements are in this world where things are supposed to be happening so much faster. Technophiles have been extolling the digital revolution’s beneficence for over thirty years now, claiming that it will give us people who are better informed and educated, plus more motivated by their interactivity to solve all our problems. Okay, it’s been thirty years - where are all the supergeniuses and their solutions? They have made a million apps for my iPhone, but even all together, the benefits of those hardly stand up to the benefits of germ theory, Locke’s social contract, or steam power.

And at odds with technophiles’ predictions, journals keep reporting that many of the digital generation seem unequipped for real life. They tend to assume privilege and are fragile creatures who fall apart when asked to do work involving sustained focus and effort or to do things that they might not immediately like doing.

Nicholas Carr reviewed research on the effects of digital living on thinking processes:
Digital thinking means constant distraction & re-direction. Doing this kind of thinking in our daily life actually re-wires our brain to this mode of thinking. So not only do we cease to want to think the way people used to, with sustained, involved attention to increasingly complex propositions, we become less capable of doing so.

Oh, we are fast and flexible, moving rapidly between stimuli in ways that the pondering thinker of yesteryear could not. But we are always sipping from the surface of ideas, never diving deeply into them, struggling to comprehend their value, complexity, nuance, or difficulties. In application in the outside world, this gets reflected in a lack of sustained willpower applied to difficult thinking or effort.

And here’s the kicker – since our thinking has changed, our own comprehension of what it is to think has changed. We can’t even compare for ourselves, since the older way is hard for us to do – it’s so unpracticed that it hurts, or at worst, it’s so gone we can’t even imagine it.
So what?, right? Here’s my concern: Our nation was designed with the assumption that every citizen could be a rational, thinking being in the typographic sense of those terms. Our political and economic structure demands complex comprehension and sustained attention and effort to our civic and work lives.

Can a society of shallow, digital thinkers really maintain, much less improve, a society so conceived? If we look at the developing state of political dialogue and democratic action in our republic, there are strong reasons to doubt that they could.

Even if you choose to prefer the new way of thinking, what I implore you to do is understand that it is a choice, and that your views on it come largely from your experiences in your culture – once you see this, you are better able to explore possible alternatives for yourself.

**First Cross Examination – Reinhard Asks Questions:**

1. The comments you have made about how people were able to think during eras when other communication technologies were dominant: are those based on actual social scientific studies of those individuals that are generalizable, or are they based on assumptions?

2. Part of technological determinism is to make assumptions about people based on the technology they engage with – is that something you are advocating?

**Harman Replies:**

1. Of course there aren’t such individual studies coming from “a time without”, since it was “without” – there was no alternative for them to say “let’s compare…” So there’s no baseline in the way you’re asking, but that’s not the end of the story. Let me take two steps:

   (1) That media are transformative to cultures is a narrative that has been so well validated by studies that it has become a truism over the past fifty years in sociology, anthropology, psychology, history, and cultural studies. It is such a truism that we are BOTH taking it for granted - or there would be no point in arguing over effects.
(2) The idea that people’s *deep conceptions* – assumptions, beliefs, and understandings -- depend upon their culture is another truism throughout scholarship. It is supported by everything over the past fifty years or so categorized as structuralist, postmodern, new historicist, social constructivist, and/or deconstructivist.

So, connecting the dots: media to culture change and culture change to people’s conceptual capacities, it is reasonable to make my argument, media to conceptual capacities.

For validation of this kind of argument, I can refer you to Thomas Kuhn’s *Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, or Dohrn-van Rossum’s *History of the Hour*. You can also find similar “history of concepts” work regarding the printing press, radio, and television. More recently and in other fields, I can direct you to sample articles that I’ve got in the References.

2. The second part of my previous answer addresses this – the form of a culture does determine the assumptions, values, and attitudes, the conceptual horizons, of people living in that culture.

That effect is variable on ‘individual persons,’ because each of us has a unique personality, combination of experiences, etc. But for ‘people’ in a Gaussian bell-curve, average sense, yes, culture determines, and no matter the variation, everyone in a culture is affected.

Can I make the assumption that any one person will be intellectually shallow because she lives in a culture dominated by digital social media? Certainly not! But I feel safe in the asserting that the *average* person in such a culture will be shallower than the average person in a typographic culture looking at the two bell curves tracking each of their populations for the phenomenon. I’m comfortable enough with the ‘determinism’ of it to advise my own children and my students to read more books at the expense of some computer-time for the benefits that I believe will accrue to them.

**Reinhard: Seven minute statement of negative stance:**
My name is Dr. CarrieLynn D. Reinhard, and since I am the director of our new social media minor program, I am taking the negative stance on the resolution “Social media is harmful to the intellectual and emotional development of young people”.

According to media and cultural historians Carolyn Marvin, Lisa Gitelman and Geoffrey B. Pingree, we should not take a technologically determinist, artifactual, instrument-centered approach to understanding the interplay between communication technology and people. Instead, we should understand the people’s relating to each other, and how the technology’s introduction impacts these relationships.

When we look at the technologies this way, Gitelman and Pingree argue that they seem to have a common pattern: every introduction of a new communication technology seems to undergo a phase of “identity crisis” as the meanings and use of the technology are negotiated over time. And part of this pattern is how they are met with same two polarized positions: risk and potential. Risk is the reactionary position, which sees the introduction as a detriment to the current and future status of civilization – this is the position my friend here is espousing. Potential is the revolutionary position, which sees the introduction as the long-awaited arrival of the savior of civilization. Neither side, it appears, is completely wrong, or completely right – there are always benefits and drawbacks to any new technology, and how that technology will ultimately be used by the civilization is determined by years of use, until ultimately what results can be very unlike what the reactionaries and the revolutionaries worried about and dreamt of respectively.

My stance is the pragmatic one: to see the technology as neither the end all nor be all for civilization, but as another tool we have developed that we can use to help ourselves. The point is to learn about the tool, how it can and cannot be used, how it should and should not be used, rather than to give into unfounded fears or impossible hopes.

All of this applies to social media, as it represents one of the most recent technologies. My friend here defines social media in a more philosophical way. A pragmatic approach to defining social media would be to focus on those technologies that have been developed and raised to prominence via the Internet over the past decade, and coming to the forefront of public attention
with the 2006 Time magazine touting “You” as the Person of the Year due to this new technology.

The Internet, which was designed to be a decentralized communication network, has permitted communication by multiple parties for interpersonal and mass communication purposes, and people have taken advantage of this design by creating specific Internet-based technologies and platforms that provide for and permit more voices to be heard through the process of producing messages. These technologies and platforms, such as social networks, blogs, and podcasts, tend to be what we envision with the term “social media”.

My esteemed colleague is right in presenting a cautionary tale of how social media is changing how we think. But what he presents as detriments to our society could be indications of changes that are for the good of civilization.

There is value in social knowledge – the idea that knowledge is created through collaboration and dialogue rather than individualized contemplation -- because we are social creatures; we would not have the civilization we have now were it not for our social nature. Our ability to learn from others, to allow some to focus on knowledge in one field over the other and to share that knowledge, has been the fundamental mechanism in science and scholarship that has allowed us to get to where we are now.

The ability to tap into this social knowledge means that people do not have to memorize trivial facts from fields of which they have no personal interest to develop expertise. Reducing the need for memorization allows for individuals to more fully develop their knowledge of the fields they are interested in. This does not mean that expertise will disappear – only that people are empowered to develop their own personalized expertise, and to share it with the world. This also means that we no longer need demoralize those who have not the capacity to memorize, as such capacity has long been associated with intelligence. Rather than create and elevate an ideal only a select can master, we should embrace and explore the multiplicity that represents reality.

As argued by futurist, inventor and education advocate Ray Kurzweil, a reduced need on memorization allows us to focus on developing skills that will be and maybe always have been important to our civilization but have been treated as lessor or as unimportant as memorization; skills such as creativity, problem solving, critical thinking, communication. Instead of telling
you about the importance of the Battle of Hastings, I can pose you the problem of solving the question, encourage you to be critical of the sources of information you find, communicate with others to share and learn this importance, and then even be creative in how you express your knowledge acquisition. All of these skills will be more important to your life than memorizing what happened during the Battle of Hastings – and should you find it interesting in your pursuit of this knowledge, then you have the ability to go further, to find out more, to develop your own personalized expertise on the topic. A reduced focus on memorization means an increase in developing your agency, your empowerment, your interest in learning.

Yet, at the same time that I espouse these possibilities, I would also seek to temper any revolutionary thought with the pragmatic realities we face in using social media to change ourselves and our world. These pragmatic realities are of economic uncertainty and unequal distribution of wealth hindering what revenue is available to use social media for revolutionary pursuits. These pragmatic realities are of the imbalances of power that exist that could be a threat to net neutrality, to open sharing via social media, and to the ability to translate what happens in social media to the world.

These pragmatic realities do not mean social media cannot help with revolution. But in order to get to the revolution, we have to be smart with how we use the tool – we cannot rely on its mere existence being enough; we have to know how to use it by being educated, by being pragmatic. We have examples of people using these social media to impact the world. Examples such as the Arab Spring that spurred political change, the game on protein sequencing that could help cure AIDS, and the social media backlash that changed the policy of organizations like Susan G. Komen for the Cure. Through analysis and discussion these examples and others can help us understand how we should interact with the social media, and how the social media can impact the world.

The pragmatic power of these examples, and thus of social media, is the ability to create community – to organize people to share – and to utilize these people for the achievement of some goal in the world. There is the possibility to create revolution through social media, but it must be done in a smart, strategic use of the tools. It must be done through the creation and utilization of communities that can span the globe.
2nd Cross Examination – Harman questions Reinhard:

You said, “There is value in social knowledge,” which led to “the possibility to create revolution.” I believe all knowledge is social, but in the context that you’re using it, ‘knowledge that is couriered by digital social media’, where is the actual revolution? What has been the value – not the potential, but in actual outcomes, that you can cite today from any of your examples: The Arab Spring, the cure for AIDS, or Family Planning? And is it really revolutionary – paradigm changing?

Answers & Rebuttal from Reinhard

I come from the social sciences, where we had to read Thomas Kuhn’s work on paradigm shifts in science. For Kuhn, a paradigm shift is the change in the basic assumptions about science, about how things are, that changes how we do science. We can see the current and potential impact of social media as a paradigm shift in the sense that it is changing our assumptions about how people relate to one another.

Traditionally, the assumptions about how people relate to others, communicate with others, and impact the world tends to be one of top-down: the rich and powerful transmitting information to the lower echelons while having the most impact on the world around them. I hate to say this, but even in our democracy, we find this arrangement to be true, and it was an arrangement that was ingrained in the communication models of old media like film, television, radio.

The social media have the potential to bring power -- whether political, economic, social or cultural -- to those who have traditionally been powerless, or at least at the lower echelons of power. I am not saying that social media is always already revolutionary – such would be a technologically determinist approach to these online tools. Social media only has the potential for being revolutionary, for creating the paradigm shift, by giving more people more voice – by giving more people more control over their communication.

Rebuttal – Harman
Dr Reinhard ended with the assertion that the positive power of social media is the creation of effective communities. I don’t see the proof that they have been terribly effective, and I think that is because they tend not even to qualify as communities. And that’s because digital social media are not fora that invite genuine interdependence.

Let’s step back a second and define community.
If I say to you [put on the board] that community is: “the people with common interests living in a particular area” (Merriam Webster dictionary), and you’re thinking of online communities, you’ll say that the interest part is right, but you don’t have to live in a particular area to be part of a community.

But that living in common is what people used to hold as the most vital element of defining community, which is why it’s still the first clause in dictionary definitions out there.

Also, because of online communities, you would likely focus on the common interests. But this did not used to mean that they all loved “Hello Kitty” in common, or even something more old-fashioned, like bowling. The meaning could be extended to something like that, but the taken-for-granted context of ‘common interest’ was more like our common interest in having clean water. The folks down the street may like Scrabble while I like downhill skiing, but what makes us community is that we necessarily share space and an interest in what happens to that space and how we treat one another within it.

So I ask you to really think deeply about how social media has an impact on community for you in two ways: (1) are you really in community with your online “communities?” What are you willing to do for them, and them for you because of a NEED to get along? What are the dialogues that you MUST engage in to come to solutions, whether you like it or not? (2) What about your own neighborhood community? How much are you inclined to be engaged in mutual dialogue and even sacrifice in your township, school district, state, etc. – how well do you know your neighbors so as to engage as part of the community with them?
If your answer to number two was “not a lot,” I’m not surprised. We have the much nicer option of online “communities,” and we retreat to them for the very reason that we get to choose them. This is the nature of pointcasting. Instead of broadcast media, where we project the same thing to everyone, part of the internet’s brilliance is that it’s pointcast -- people get everything and everyone exactly the way they want them. You never have to spend one moment of time with anything that you don’t agree with or prefer.

And yet, even so, all that solidarity we can choose doesn’t tend to fill us. Be honest, now: How many of you ever feel lonely? Let’s add in: Misunderstood or somehow isolated? How many of you actually have these feelings a lot? How many of you have Twitter feeds? Let’s add in Facebook accounts? Cell phones with which you can text? Email accounts? So you are swimming in a deep pool of constant connectedness, yet you are vulnerable to feeling isolated. What gives?

I recommend to you Sherry Turkle’s book, *Alone Together*. She suggests pretty convincingly that the greater people’s involvement with digital media, the greater their sense of isolation. The reason is unclear, but it is likely that the reduction of people to space on a screen, the fact of that screen as our object, may be a big culprit.

What we put out there and how we engage and disengage is always more vital, more in the space of the subject, than anything that we get back from others. We are always primary, the other person/people are always secondary. We can turn them off, put them away, switch to someone else – just like they were an internet search or a TV channel.

The world of pointcasted digital social media is one of easy agreement and solidarity without the need for actual intimacy or acknowledgement of others or of coming to compromise or consensus. This is not a recipe for problem solving in the real world. In fact, it is the opposite of what real community is there for.
Rebuttal, Reinhard

As part of the tensions I discussed earlier, the fear of the introduction of a new technology dissolving communal ties is nothing new. Such have been the concerns of sociology for over a century, such as Emile Durkheim’s concept of anomie from the 19th century, or more recently Robert Putnam’s concern over social capital. At the same time such theorists are decrying the decline of civil participation and community, other researchers are showing not a decline so much as a shift: traditional ideations of community may be declining, but people are still participating in different groups, groups that perhaps are better suited for the modern world. Community as a concept is flexible and adapts as our lives and the demands on them change.

Early on in the discussion of social networks, in a 1999 book on communities in cyberspace, Barry Wellman and Milena Gulia discuss the conceptualization of community as not having to exist solely in geographic terms such as neighborhoods, but via online connections between kin, friends, and workmates, connections that can span continents. Such conceptualization would be an example of the flexibility of community, and it would be the definition with which I agree. Community is, at its core, about people grouping together based on an affinity for something. With online tools like social media, we have the ability to transcend the geographical to become truly global, to become truly inclusive and find like-minded individuals.

When I say that the pragmatic power of social media is through community, it is because of the importance such communities of affinity can have for individuals. Sure, you may be a member of an online community that you have weak ties with – but then there is probably another community you have stronger ties with because of the importance of those connections. This reality is perhaps no different than what we experience here in the physical: some things are just more relevant, more interesting, more important to us than other things, and we attend to those that we deem to be so.

The pragmatic power of a community is in organizing people around that which we care about, and having us act in accordance with that. If the anti-war protesters of the 1960s did not care about the draft and the Vietnam War, then no amount of community there would have led to them marching on Washington. Community is a way to connect and organize, whether in person
or online – and, increasingly, through a combination thereof. Thus, we can say that the pragmatic power of social media is through the community it can foster and utilize for some form of activism.

Here I am not defining activism merely by the acts of public protest, demonstration and civil disobedience; while undoubtedly important methods for any activist, they are not the only methods. As researchers Melissa Brough and Sangita Shresthova have pointed out, today’s youth are organized now more around “culturally defined solidarity” that involves different types of civic and political participation – activism through different acts. With the range of methods possible as activism, we have a number of examples that involve the use of organizing and deploying community through social media. The examples I mentioned previously are from when communities formed via social media were organized into action.

First, the Arab Spring: Beginning in December of 2010, we saw how the people’s use of social media can lead to protests and even revolution across the Middle East, with rulers being forced from power due to the people’s actions in Tunisia, Egypt, Libya and Yemen. Those peoples came together by sharing information over social media to inform, to organize, to rally, to promote.

Second, HIV protein sequencing: Using a social game Foldit, players from around the world helped AIDS researchers how to understand the structure of a particular protein in HIV. Researchers had been trying to understand this particular protein for 15 years; the game players solved the puzzle within days – and doing so could help us combat this horrific ailment.

Third, Susan G. Komen: Social media backlash can cause corporations to change their directions in policies and products they have announced, from the fashion industry, the food industry, and the charity industry. Susan G. Komen for the Cure in January of 2012 announced they would no longer support funding of Planned Parenthood; social media backlash was quick and overwhelming, leading to the February reversal of this policy and a public apology.

I would like to conclude with this, a cycle of which social media play a part. Social media are a new tool that allow for new ways to communicate with one another that allows for new ways to
think individually and collectively that allows for new ways to organize into communities that allow for new ways to get active in the world, which could further lead to new ways to communicate, new ways to think, new ways to organize, new ways to get active – and so on and so on. None of this is new. We have been engaging in such a cycle for generations, centuries, millennia. This cycle is how we shape and reshape our civilization, our relationships with one another, our power dynamics, our world.

Social media are just another tool that, through our use of it, is becoming a part of this cycle. This is not a revolutionary approach; I am not saying social media is causing this cycle, only that it has potential to be involved in this cycle based on how we use it. Thus my approach is a pragmatic one – an approach that is aware of the benefits and drawbacks, but is not afraid to help people move from being media consumer to media producer in a worldwide, world-wise community. But it all depends on what we – each one of us here and out there -- do with it.

Rebuttal – Harman

To be active for social change, meaning taking actions, means making sacrifices. For whom and for what will you sacrifice, and what are you willing to sacrifice? That’s the key to successful activism.

David Karpf writes that “Digital activism is not a replacement for the Freedom Riders. It is a replacement for the armchair activism that arose in the 1970’s.” Notably, that form of activism, called “slactivism” for it’s lack of actual personal sacrifice, was inspired largely by television, the dominant medium of the time. “Oh, look at that poor, starving child – here’s five dollars a year – now, back to Charlie’s Angels.” Today, it’s “Oh, look at those poor people in Syria – here’s an outraged email petition to the UN plus ten dollars – now, back to “Key of Awesome.”
This is why Malcolm Gladwell wrote the New Yorker article, “The Revolution Will Not be Tweeted:” Relationships made by social media are indeed unprecedented in their breadth and their speed. But they are paltry in their depth.

Despite a lot of response on the internet arguing against Gladwell’s assertion, serious scholars exploring the effects are finding it hard to disagree with him. Papic and Noonan, exploring the effects of digital social media in the Arab Spring, conclude that social media can be a fine tool for training, recruiting, and organizing, but that they are simply not capable of causing revolution. People just aren’t enthusiastic to radically redefine their views or to sacrifice much for others whose only connection to them is an online one. The sacrifices of people for one another in the Arab Spring have been shown to be ones of more traditional relationship. The text they received may have gotten them to walk over to Tahrir Square. But when soldiers started using tear gas and shooting, what caused the people to stay (who did) were their associations of family, clan, previous friendship, religious association (Muslim Brotherhood, etc.).

In our own society, Benkler asks how political public opinion, as gathered and mobilized by social media, is turned into action. So far, it usually is not. Like with armchair activism of any kind, the only demonstrated success in changing public policy comes from getting and spending money. If the cause on your social media outlet raises enough money, then something is done. Thus, the Obama’s campaign’s claim that they “won on the internet.” No, they won by getting money – the internet was just a great way to get money. The internet has done nothing to change how opinion is for sale in America. It is faster and more effective than the TV or snailmail version, but it is nothing new.
Want a digital-age mobilization of public voice to change policy? Say hello to Occupy Wall Street, whose general views I completely support. But its new mode of operation, made to match the digital age, made it an utter flop. The one percent, or more precisely, the one percent of the one percent, where the real trouble is, are still running roughshod over the rest of us with complete impunity, and will be for the foreseeable future.

This is because the digital social media model of a leaderless mass with a vague, “big-tent” general agreement on what is wrong, and even less precise agreement on how to change it, will not change anything for the better, now or ever. But in the social media sphere, there is no better alternative.

Digital social media are indeed wondrous as new instruments for communicating, and provide very real advantages. But there is nothing that gives without taking away, no panacea, no advantages without disadvantages. To realize net progress, we would be wisest to choose a course that employs some the benefits, but diminishes the losses. We can only do this if we are willing to acknowledge what we might lose, before we lose even a memory of what we had.

Thank You. [reduce by thirty seconds]
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