



## Follow Me on academia.edu: Analysis of a Distraction Online and of Its Consequences on Daily Life

Gevisa la Rocca<sup>1</sup>

### Abstract

*The narration of a story is a work half-way between the real and the virtual, the factual and the functional. The request to join a social network sent to 281 people is a pretext to reflect on what happens in the world online and its consequences on life offline. To analyse this “incident” raises two questions: first, how to tell the event happened, second how to interpret the unexpected consequences of intentional action that is work half-way between the online and offline. In this work we choose to use as a method the auto-ethnography, and try to interpret the event through: Merton’s concept of the unexpected consequences of a social action and literature on SNS. Our story offers a further point of reflection, that is, what happens when the virtual, and all that takes place in it, becomes part of daily life.*

### Keywords

*Everyday stories, auto-ethnography, social action, unexpected consequences, daily life*

### The Distraction of a Moment

Caselle Airport of Turin, on the way back home from the Conference 2060: What sources will we use to make the history of our present? Techniques, practices and social sciences in comparison.

We are in front of the gate waiting for the boarding call.

My friend and colleague is busy with her Mac as I am with my Asus notebook: I am waiting for a webpage to open and in the meanwhile I am looking at her desktop. She has just found a message in her mail box “Someone just searched for you on Google...”

---

<sup>1</sup>Researcher at the Kore, University of Enna, [gevisa.larocca@unipa.it](mailto:gevisa.larocca@unipa.it)

and she tells me that someone has looked her up. I ask what is it about and she reads me the entire text of the message.

Hi Laura<sup>2</sup>,  
Someone just searched for you on Google, and found your page on Academia.edu.  
To see the search query they used, what rank you are on Google for this query, and what country the search came from, follow the link below:  
<http://www.academia.edu/keypass/.../Notification/ymv4h>

Thanks,  
The Academia.edu team

She opens academia.edu and I ask her to know something more on the matter. She retorts me that it is a thematic social network – after all this is what she works on – dedicated to the academic world. She suggests me to join, to look for her and to follow her work. It works the same as Facebook, in which we look for friends.

And that is what I do. But my pc is slow, and meanwhile, we are called to board. Finally the academia.edu webpage opens up and I can log in. I try to check how many of my contacts are already part of the social network; I start excluding some of them, because I don't want to be found by or be visible to everyone. I believe in privacy on the Web and I try to defend myself from spamming. I don't give my friendship immediately on Facebook and I have always refused to put my photo.

In the meantime I continue excluding the unwanted. My friend asks me if I have already found her and I reply "Not yet for I am on the first page of contacts", the only one I have been able to view.

I look down, the arrow indicates that there are more pages and that overall the number amounts to 281.

I have the feeling I see a yellow button saying "follow me" on the the bottom right, underneath the page numbers. Meanwhile the boarding is taking place. My friend tells me to hurry up and in fact, I notice that we are the last.

I spring to my feet. In my left hand I have the notebook open and connected to the Internet. There is a moment of agitation. I click "follow me". I place the pc on the chair and I put on my jacket. I take my boarding card out of my bag and my identity card out of my purse. I grab my pc and I notice that exactly under the indication of the number of pages and near to the number 281 there are three small spheres which alternate a light grey with a dark grey and then with a grey even more intense.

The message is clear: it is loading. But what is loading? The pages? Or the 281 contacts which I have in my post box?

I show my boarding card and my identity card and I move on. In the tunnel I put the pc into my bag.

And I take my plane.

---

<sup>2</sup> The names of persons are a pure invention.

The evening after, I meet another colleague of mine in the street. She asks me what I had invited her to join into. I ask her to explain better what she was talking about and she tells me with a certain perplexity that she had received an invitation to join a social network. The email message contained more or less what follows:

Hi Cristina,

Gevisa added your name to Academia.edu, the global directory of academics and graduate students. We checked your department directory, and it looks like you are an academic/graduate student. You are currently listed as an 'unknown' academic/graduate student: resolve your 'unknown' status by following one of the links below:

Yes, I am an academic/graduate student:

<http://academia.edu/Yes-Cristina-com-is-an-academic-or-graduate-student>

No, I am not an academic/graduate student:

<http://academia.edu/Remove-Cristina-from-the-directory-of-academics>

Stephen Hawking, Richard Dawkins, Paul Krugman, Noam Chomsky and Steven Pinker have all recently confirmed their membership of their departments on Academia.edu.

Many thanks,

The Academia.edu Team

The idea that those three spheres were sending to 281 people – with whom I could or not still have personal relationships – the same message that my friend Cristina had received, immediately king shape. After a moment of confusion, I answer with the same words my “notorious” friend had used when she introduced me to academia.edu.

“You know Cristina, academia.edu is a social network for all those who work at University. You decide whether to join or not. I just thought that you might be interested”.

What else could I have said? That the email had been sent by mistake? The damage had already been done.

Rather, I had to run home and check my mail to see what was happening because it was nearly a full day that I hadn't checked it.

Going home I thought about all my mail contacts, people who had simply had the misfortune to be inserted with me in a mailing list on gmail.com and had now received a message in which was written “Gevisa added your name to the Academia.edu directory of academics”. I thought about all the professors with whom I had collaborated or was collaborating and that I would have invaded their mail boxes with a message containing in the subject my name and surname. I felt deeply embarrassed.

I then tried to think rationally about the thing. I thought about the number of emails I received daily asking me for help or announcing that I had won the lottery or something else. When I receive such mail, I usually throw it into the waste basket, that is

when my anti-spam doesn't filter it as it should. I never even ask myself where the emails come from.

Thinking about the solitary scholar in front of his/her computer, I calmed down. Then, I thought however that my name would have been associated with academia.edu. And I thought about all those solitary scholars who were not in reality so solitary.

All the relationships between the people I knew, who were in my mail box and who knew each other appeared in front of my eyes. My friends and colleagues were connected in a mental network of mine. It was inevitable that they would have talked. They would have said: "She has gone mad". And then: "What is academia.edu?"

My "known" friend and colleague, expert in the field of social networks, kept on reassuring me, telling me that it wasn't the end of the world, I hadn't invited them to subscribe to a hardcore website.

On the contrary, in her opinion, and quoting her word for word, they would have said: "See how cool Gevisa is? She has invited me to join a university social network".

Her words meant little comfort when opening my mail I found a message saying that "Luigi has just accepted your invitation to join Academia.edu".

Luigi? My ex-boyfriend? The one with whom I had used the escape strategy, not answering to his calls or emails? That Luigi?

Well yes. Imagine *that* Luigi receiving a message in which I not only invited him to join the social network, but also said: "follow me".

Destroyed. I had simply destroyed my image of a woman who never had to ask!

I saw myself as the protagonist of one of those more or less invented stories about the world of the Internet; one of those that trainers tell during their courses to company managers to explain them the potential impact of a medium. My life and I become the subject of a fantasy story...

I thought about the obsolete net-etiquette and if there were any suggestions on how to behave in such cases. What could I have done? Send other 281 e-mails in which I apologized for what had happened?

I had to resign myself to the fact that I had accidentally performed an act of viral marketing.

The people contacted could have proceeded in various ways after receiving the email:

accepting to join,  
throwing away the email,  
contacting me for explanations.

I hypothesized that their reaction would have been determined by some variables: a first group linked to me as opinion leader and "seller" of academia.edu; a second

group about the specificity of the social networks; a last group, equally important, determined by the personal inclinations of the receivers.

I started receiving emails of this kind:  
“is it you who sent me this link, or is it spam?  
What is it about?  
thanks”

But I was also contacted by more suspicious teachers, who did not know me personally and who wrote this kind of message:

“hi, before I join, I would like to know more about Academia, about at what weblink you found me and why your email is not yourname@academia.edu but a very generic Gmail address.  
best regards”

Now I really had to know more about this social network, because I had inevitably linked my name to it. Even a Polish researcher answered the message “Gevisa added your name to the Academia.edu directory of academics” writing directly to me, what reported below:

“I’m not student but researcher and PhD...  
If you need these data”.

I started searching on Google for some more information. On the page “about” I found the photos of its creators and information as to “who’s researching what”.

“Academia.edu helps academics answer the question “Who’s researching what?”:

- You can find people with similar research interests to yours
- You can keep track of the latest developments in your research area - the latest papers, talks, blog posts and status updates
- You can create an easy-to-maintain academic webpage, listing your research interests and any papers you have written”.

Although at first my reaction was to never enter again this social network, when – after giving a first look at the emails I had received – I saw that people were joining and were following my work, I felt that it was necessary to develop my profile.

A teacher wrote to me:

“I would also be grateful if you could facilitate the development of my profile on academia.edu  
Thank you and best regards”

At present, out of 281, 42 have joined, belonging to the academic world and not, and everyday I receive at least one email about academia.edu.

### **Looking to Involuntary Act**

This is what happened to me *that time*.

As Jedlowski affirms (2000) *that time is one time* and to tell a story is to open our world to imagination.

A story and its narration, Jedlowski adds (2000), can be considered as the representation of a factual reality – therefore as something that really happened to somebody – or of a fictional reality – that is as something which has been invented and which takes place only in fantasy. Paraphrasing: real or virtual. It is not easy to undo if we follow what Baudrillard's (2000) statement: the real world is created, is produced and therefore it is nothing else but a simulation. As a consequence, the virtual world is nothing else but a hyperbole produced by the continuous passing from symbolism to reality.

A first overview on the event brings two distinct orders of reflection:

- the first of methodology, how to tell/report what happened *at that time*,
- the second on how to interpret what has happened *at that time*.

Looking at the way as the story has been told we can talk about auto-ethnography.

Looking at possible interpretations of the phenomenon that we can find a link to the lesson Merton's concept of the unexpected consequences of a social action, but taking in mind that this is an online world that uses a specific communication medium, in our case: Social Network Sites.

### **(Auto)Ethnography online**

In a recent article Sade-Beck (2004) says which are the main contributions regarding the study of ethnography online. But we know that the Internet is a constantly evolving and so the methods to study it. Although many authors has been written on studies conducted on the Internet, there have been very few analyses of the integration of the Internet into qualitative research approaches. Jones's (1999) book, *Doing Internet Research*, was one of the ground-breaking works exploring both theoretical and practical issues involved in Internet research; another was *Virtual Ethnography* by Hine (2000), which emphasized just how strong the need to study the Internet both as a cultural product as well as in its cultural context is a third important work is *Internet Communication and Qualitative Research* (Mann & Stewart, 2000), which defined the Internet not only as a research field, but also as a data-gathering instrument in qualitative research.

In our case, we have a “story” that becomes the excuse to develop an ethnographic approach to study the consequences of what happens online in everyday life.

It’s important to specify that in this work we use the auto-ethnography instead of ethnography. The reason is that while ethnography is a method of qualitative social science research that describes human social phenomena based on fieldwork, in auto-ethnography the researcher becomes the primary participant/subject of the research in the process of writing personal stories and narratives.

In fact, in our work the researcher becomes the main actor and the narrator of his/her observations.

The importance of auto-ethnography method on online studies it was clarified by N. Poart (2004) in the article *CMA Methodology: Autoethnography*. In that article she begins quoting the work of Ellis and Bochner (2000), now we quote again these authors and what they write, because what they say is well connected to what happened to us at *that* time.

Ellis and Bochner (2000) advocate authoethnography, a form of writing that “make[s] the researcher’s own experience a topic of investigation in its own right (p. 733)” rather than seeming “as if they’re written from nowhere by nobody (p. 734)”. Autoethnography is “an autobiographical genre of writing that displays multiple layers of consciousness, connecting the personal to the cultural (p. 739)”; autoethnographers “ask their readers to feel the truth of their stories and to become coparticipants, engaging the storyline morally, emotionally, aesthetically, and intellectually (p. 745)”.

In fact, as Ellis (2004) describes it, autoethnography uses the conventions of literary writing: “research, writing, story, and method that connect the autobiographical and personal to the cultural, social, and political. Autoethnographic forms feature concrete action, emotion, embodiment, self-consciousness, and introspection portrayed in dialogue, scenes, characterization, and plot. Thus, autoethnography claims the conventions of literary writing and expression (xix)”.

At this point, it seems clear that it is impossible to divide the not intentional event (i.e., the invitation to join the social network site) by those who lived and try to interpret it.

Because, without the knowledge of the researcher, this event would be interpreted in its consequences in this way? And without the knowledge of the researcher, this event would become material for an article about life online?

I think no.

These are the same questions that Poart (2004) writes at the beginning of her article and to strengthen her position – in order to explain the phenomena using the personal culture of the researcher – she refers Sherry Turkle’s discussion (1995) of her

first personal computer<sup>3</sup> as an example of auto-ethnography and contribution to the Computer Mediated Anthropology.

Although, using this method we have clear in mind the Krizek's critical (2003), that speaks about the possibility for auto-ethnography to devolve into narcissism, we cannot ignore what Poart (2004) says: "a researcher may then be inspired to look into how common or unique her individual story is through other methods of inquiry".

The benefits of auto-ethnography – in our case – are the ways in which research of such a personal nature might give us insight into problems often overlooked in culture.

In our case we use the auto-ethnography as the ground that allows us "to tell" a story that is important from the point of view of "the unexpected consequences" that an action online has on the researcher's everyday life. For this reason, we hope to have saved this work by the critics of narcissism.

### **Analyse the Unexpected Consequences**

I leave, hence, a doubt in the reader. In other words, I leave it up to him/her to decide if it is really true that I sent 281 emails. Unless, your email address is not, unfortunately, among the 281 and, in that case, you are involved in first person in the story.

In a serendipity way this story allows us, however, to reflect on how what happens in the virtual world can then produce consequences in real life.

Serendipity, in fact, can mean finding something precious while you are looking for something else, or finding something you were looking for but in a totally unexpected place, that is by pure luck (Merton & Barber, 1992).

The act of sending those 281 e-mails has brought - the author - to reflect upon the *unexpected* consequences of a social action.

If we want to work on the unintended consequences of this "forwarding" can be used in the first instance to the Merton's concept; that we can consider as our first literary reference.

At the same time, we cannot forget that we are talking about communication and how we can persuade someone to follow through a medium.

In this sense, our literary reference will be found in communication studies and social networks sites.

We're building a way to watch and explain an event, or rather what happened that time.

So we have an event - the invitation to join a social network - a way to look at it and to tell what happened by the researcher - through auto-ethnography - and then there are the consequences of the act to be analysed.

---

<sup>3</sup> The quotation refers to the story that S. Turkle tells of her first computer, an Apple II in 1979, and at the difficulties and benefits of early writing programs, but also at the emotions that she felt in those situations.



## Merton's concept

In 1936 Merton publishes in the American Sociological Review an article entitled *The Unanticipated Consequences of Purposive Social Action*, in which he considers the “the unanticipated consequences of intentional action”, placing attention more on the isolated intentional actions than on those inserted in a system of coherent actions. In the same article he focuses on the *unexpected* consequences of the action, explaining how their being unexpected does not mean that they produce negative or undesirable effects, but simply that they represent those elements without which the action would not have occurred.

The factors producing unanticipated consequences are:

- ignorance, that is the knowledge currently available on human behaviour;
- the error, that is the mistake committed in any phase of the intentional action;
- the pressing need to satisfy an interest; we refer to the cases in which a person concentrates on the expected consequences and tends to exclude other types of consequences.
- fundamental values, that is when no consideration is given to the consequences which are different from the ones we are trying to produce. This depends on the pressing need to perform an action imposed by one's fundamental values.

If I had not sent by mistake 281 e-mails from my electronic mail account, would those users have joined academia.edu? And is this *unexpected* action – the act of clicking “follow me” - *undesirable*?

Let's follow Merton's lesson and let's apply it to our case. First of all we must take into account the fact that the consequences are the result of the relationship between action and the objective situation. According to Merton, the consequences produced in concrete are: a) consequences for the actor/s and e b) consequences for all the others; these are, in turn, mediated by 1) the social structure, 2) by culture and 3) by the civilization.

Table 1 – Application of Merton's consequences to our story

The consequences according to Merton	The consequences in our case
For the actor	Viral marketing, association of a real name to a virtual product
For all the others users	The receiving of an invitation via email to join a social network
Mediated by...	
Social structure	Role
Culture	The idea one has of the web
Civilization	Knowledge of the Web

To distinguish between civilization and culture Merton recalls Alfred Weber (1942), according to whom civilization is simply a *corpus* of practical and intellectual knowledge and a series of technical means to exert a control over nature. Culture, instead, includes the configurations of values, normative principles and ideals, which considered from a historical point of view, are unique.

Placed inside our example, the “role” is the position one occupies within the academic world; the invitation was sent to teachers and students, but also to technical-administrative personnel. In turn, these “receivers” made their decision using the idea they have of the Web and of how they can be part of it with their identity (not avatar or nickname).

In front of this message the “receivers” were asked to choose what to do, even to ignore it.

About Merton’s argumentations (1936) we can divide this action into two types: a) not organized and b) formally organized. The first is typical of a group of individuals who act in a certain way separately. In our case, the receivers of the invitation “separately” decide to join the social network or to throw away the email. The case is different for an organized action. For example, all the professors of a certain department who have received the invitation, decide jointly to enrol and to develop the profile of their department, in order to increase the visibility of their organization and of their scientific work. Already Merton (1936) puts us on our guard against the possible methodological traps which these kinds of argumentations contain. The first is to be able to really verify to what extent the consequences can be attributed to that action. For example, to what extent can the increase of subscriptions to academia.edu be attributed to the work of viral marketing carried out by who is writing?

There is then the difficulty, Merton adds, to verify the real intentions of a certain action. Was it an initial intention of mine to link my name to an academic social network? Or perhaps, my intention was simply to find argumentations for this article?

### ***The online side***

A totally unexpected event invites us to reflect on the consequences – determined jointly by an individual mistake and an organizational marketing strategy, who, among others, also capitalizes on individual mistakes (or the limited rationality of its users) – of a non-intentional action, which occurs in a virtual place but produces effects on real life.

Our story offers us a further point of reflection: It asks us to think about what happens when the virtual, and what it contains, becomes part of daily life. However, we must specify here, that these unexpected consequences which took place online have further implications for the actor who produces them in the reality off line and which have an effect on his/her daily life. For example, along the corridors of the faculty colleagues and students ask for explanations which make the actor study more in depth his/her knowledge of social networks. But what is more important, his/her real identity and not an avatar or a nickname is linked to a virtual product. The fundamental element

to consider is that the actor does not move in the online world using an *alias*, he/she acts as a physical person. He/she is not living a *second life*. In the same way the receivers of the emails are asked to join the social network providing their identity and indicating their role.

The interest for the construction and representation of the self online is already being studied by many researches on social networks sites (SNS). Early studies focused on Friendster, one of the first SNS in which identity was constructed through personal information that the user chose to show, for example: his photos, his lists of friends and the testimony of these friends. From these early studies (boyd, 2004; boyd, Heer 2005, 2006) reveals the difficulties that the early users have on SNS in the negotiation of boundaries between public and private sectors and in experimenting with unexpected audience (colleagues, bosses, parents). In these first moments of performative interpretation of the digital environment, many individuals assumed false identities, often referring to famous people, cartoons, concepts, affiliations and the construction of which users invest a lot of time: the Fakers were important catalysts for conversation and put into connect people with common interests (Iannelli 2010).

Social networking software has been defined as ‘online spaces that allow individuals to present themselves, articulate their social networks, and establish or maintain connections with others’ (Ellison et al. 2006). While there are numerous types and variations of social networking web sites, the 2 most common are Facebook (<http://www.facebook.com>) and MySpace (<http://www.myspace.com>).

What emerges here is similar to what Fogg (2008) has defined “mass interpersonal persuasion”, a new form of persuasion (MIP). This phenomenon brings together the power of interpersonal persuasion with the reach of mass media. Fogg believes this new way to change attitudes and behaviour is the most significant advance in persuasion since radio was invented in the 1890s.

Fogg’ study goes expands research on the construction of identity online. The author is interested in how an application can be spread more or less rapidly on a social network. And it differs, however, from the case presented here because of its intent.

Fogg (2008) worked with other Facebook Developer Partners for the Platform launch event in San Francisco. “Within a few days after Facebook Platform launch, public metrics showed how quickly some of the third-party applications grew. Day after day, I saw how Facebook’s innovation would allow persuasion to take place, from one friend to another, on a massive scale never before possible. Most Facebook app developers were acquiring thousands of users each day. This was exciting” (Fogg, 2008).

MIP has six components, described below. All of them existed before Facebook launched, as an Internet, Platform. But the six components had never been bundled together in one place:

1. Persuasive Experience: An experience that is created to change attitudes, behaviours, or both.
2. Automated Structure: Digital technology structures the persuasive experience.

3. Social Distribution: The persuasive experience is shared from one friend to another.

4. Rapid Cycle: The persuasive experience can be distributed quickly from one person to another.

5. Huge Social Graph: The persuasive experience can potentially reach millions of people connected through social ties or structured interactions.

6. Measured Impact: The effect of the persuasive experience is observable by users and creators.

MIP emerged because six components came together for the first time in a single system. The individual components are not new. In fact, some of the most successful persuasion modes have combined some of the components.

*Table 2 - Various genres include components of MIP*

	<b>Persuasive Experience</b>	<b>Automated Structure</b>	<b>Social Distribution</b>	<b>Rapid Cycle</b>	<b>Huge Social Graph</b>	<b>Measured Impact</b>
<b>Gossip &amp; Urban Legends</b>	Yes	No	Yes	Yes, sometimes	Sometimes	No
<b>Chain Letters via Postal Mail</b>	Sometimes	No. But prescribed steps give structure.	Yes	No	Yes	No
<b>Networking Marketing</b>	Yes	No. But prescribed steps give structure.	Yes	Sometimes	Yes	Partially
<b>Forwarding to Email Lists</b>	Often yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
<b>Software Virus</b>	Usually no	No	Yes, but not intentionally	Sometimes	Yes	Not typically

Source: Fogg, 2008.

Moving from gossip to spread viruses, Fogg (2008) shows the consistency of the MIP.

If we evaluate our case study on the light of Fogg's pattern we can see the lack of "persuasive experience" and objective measurement of the impact of accession to academia.edu.

Better estimates would require an investigation and this is not our objective, yet. Nevertheless this can be a possible way

### **About "No Sense of Place" and How to Look at It**

The media effects on daily life has been studied since the idea McLuhan's global village (1964); the contraction of space and time and rapprochement of events before distant or never experienced can be considered as the consequence of a reality that goes

changing as a result of media (McLuhan, 1964): individuals can have and have experience of events far from their “situational geography”. Consider, for example, the story told by O. Wells (1938)<sup>4</sup> about invasion from Mars and how the result of its on real life was a general effect of panic that has seen flooding in the streets much of the population had taken for “real” a radio story.

Nonetheless, in contrast to other media, the Internet integrates personal and mass media. It has, in fact, created a new mode of human communication, enabling participants to take part in two-way mass communication. Users of the World Wide Web are no longer passive audiences of data consumers, as in media such as television and radio, but are active participants controlling the content of the information. They shape the quality of the data and respond to them. For this reason, M. Castells (2009) this new form of communication auto-communication of mass.

The effects of media on daily life are then studied sociology and mass communication from long ago.

According to Berger and Luckmann (1966) the reality of daily life is organized around the *hic* of the body and the *nunc* of the present.

In our story, the first step is the unintentional sending of the invitation to join a social network.



Figure 1 - First Step “The involuntary act”

What is *hic et nunc* in daily life becomes the real object of our conscience.



Figure 2 - Second Step “The Moment of Reflection”

<sup>4</sup> The quote is at the *War of the Worlds*, it was a famous radio drama broadcast October 30, 1938 in the United States by CBS and narrated by Orson Welles. It was based on the science fiction novel of H.G. Wells. It was known to have triggered the panic, among the population, describing an alien invasion.

Now the “receivers” and the “sender” begin to ask themselves what to do.

In their argumentations Berger and Luckmann (1966) add that it is through these two criteria that we live our experiences in daily life. In other words, through different degrees of closeness and of distance, both spatial and temporal. It is obvious that daily life is very near to the individual because it is accessible to corporeal manipulation and it includes a world inside which one can act. The reality of daily life is an intersubjective reality, shared with others, where we must consider that my *hic et nunc* does not correspond to that of anybody else. There are also some areas of our daily life in which it is impossible to act this way. For example, when we dream, we are alone. Daily life – the two authors continue – is divided into different sectors, some of which are perceived as routines, while others place in front of us problems of a different kind and degree. Let’s think about theatre plays and shows in general: for the spectator they are routines, in the sense that they do not require a new interpretation and they do not present themselves as problems. An argument in a theatre is a stage effect, nothing else. In the interpretation of the moment we are assisting to, we are helped by certain elements, such as a curtain that opens and closes informing us when the fiction is starting and ending. Paraphrasing we can say that in the online world it is the access, the log in or the log out to indicate the beginning or the end of a representation. If the massive number of emails had already been sent within a social network – think about the invitations we receive on Facebook, would the effect have been the same? Certainly not.

We are here on a new ground. The act of receiving from a physical person an invitation to join a social network, with a message indicating his/her name and surname and addressed to another name and surname, changes our routine on line and off line; It asks us to face a problem of knowledge that needs to be deepened.

In the senders raises the question of how to observe/interpret the event, because she is social researcher, who wonders about the social phenomena around her. It’ at this point that the method that she understands that the best way can tell her experience is auto-ethnography.



Figure 3 - Third Step “The Choice of Method”

And once found a way to look at the phenomenon does it take to find a way to assess the consequences.



Figure 4 - Fourth Step “Lines of Interpretation for Unexpected Consequences”

In this work the lines of interpretation of what happened at that time are looking at first time in Merton’s concept of unexpected consequences of a social action, secondly we point out as a possible way - but not yet examined - the Fogg’s concept (2008).

## REFERENCES

- Baudrillard, J. (2000) *Mots de passe, Pauvert*, département des Éditions Fayard.
- Berger, P. L. Luckmann, T. (1966) *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise its the Sociology of Knowledge*, Garden City, New York: Anchor Books.
- Boyd, d. (2004) Friendster and publicly articulated social networks, in *Proceedings of ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, New York: ACM Press, pp. 1279-1282.
- Boyd, D. (2008) *Taken Out of Context. American Teen Sociality in Networked*, PHD dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Boyd, D. & Heer, J. (2006) Profiles as Conversation: Networked Identity Performance on Friendster, in *Proceedings of the Hawai’i International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS-39)*, Kauai, HI: IEEE Computer Society, January 4 – 7.
- Boyd, D. & Ellison, N. (2007) Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship, *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*, 13(1), 210-30.
- Castells, M. (2009) *Communication Power*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Ellis, C. (2004) *The Ethnographic I: A Methodological Novel about Autoethnography*, AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek.
- Ellis, C. & Bochner, A.P. (2004) Autoethnography, Personal Narrative, Reflexivity: Researcher As Subject, in Denzin, N & Lincoln, Y. (eds.) *The Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd Edition), Sage, Thousand Oaks, Ca., pp. 733-768.
- Ellison, N Steinfeld, C & Lampe, C. (2006) Spatially bounded online social networks and social capital: The role of Facebook. Paper presented at: *Annual Conference of the International Communication Association*; June 19–23, 2006; Dresden Germany.
- Ellison, N. Steinfeld, C. & Lampe, C. (2007) The Benefits of Facebook ‘Friends’: Social Capital and College Students’ Use of Online Social Network Sites, *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 12, 1143–1168.
- Fogg, B. J. (2008) Mass interpersonal persuasion: An early view of a new phenomenon. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Persuasive Technology*. Berlin: Springer.
- Hine, C. M. (2000). *Virtual ethnography*, Sage, London.

- Jedlowski, P. (2000) *Storie comuni*, Mondadori, Milano.
- Jones, S. (ed.) (1999) *Doing internet research*, Sage, London.
- Krizek, R. (2003) Expressions of Ethnography, in Clair, R.C. (ed.) *Expressions of Ethnography. Novel Approaches to Qualitative Methods*, Paperback, New York.
- Iannelli, L. (2010) I primi studi sui social network site, Paper presented at: 2060: *Con quali fonti si farà la storia del nostro presente?* Convegno Fondazione Telecom Italia, Torino, 8/04/2010. Available: <http://www.fondazionetelecomitalia.it/doc/programma/Iannelli.pdf>
- Mann, C., & Stewart, F. (2000). *Internet communication and qualitative research*, Sage, London.
- McLuhan, M. (1964) *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*, Paperback, New York.
- Merton, R.K. (1936) The Unanticipated Consequences of Purposive Social Action, *American Sociological Review*, December, vol.I, 894-904.
- Poart, N. (2004) CMA Methodology: Autoethnography, in *Computer-Mediated Anthropology*. Available: <http://anthropology.usf.edu/cma/CMAMethodology-ae.htm>
- Sade-Beck, L. (2004) Internet Ethnography: Online and Offline, *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 3 (2) June, 2004.
- Turkle, S. (1995) *Life on the Screen: Identity in the Age of the Internet*, Touchstone, New York.
- Weber, A. (1920) Prinzipielles zur Kulturosoziologie, *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik*, 47

---

**Gevisa La Rocca** was Research Fellow at the University of Palermo 2008-2010, where she has taught Sociology and Cultural Process. In the same University, she achieved her Ph.D. in the field of Sociology. She works on Youth Culture, Media Studies, New media and on the Techniques of Qualitative Analysis with reference to CAQDAS, textual lexicon analysis, ethnography. She is currently Researcher at the Kore, University of Enna.