

Social Isolation in America

Paolo Parigi*
Stanford University

Warner Henson II
Stanford University

~10,200 words

1 Figure

* We thank Mario Small, Dan Lainer-Vos and the participants of the Network Workshop at Stanford University for their comments. Please direct all correspondence to Paolo Parigi, 450 Serra Mall, Building 120, Room 160. Stanford, CA 94305-2047 or pparigi@stanford.edu

Abstract: In this paper we offer a new measure for social isolation for the contemporary society where opportunities for making connections with others have become ubiquitous. We develop this measure after reviewing previous research on social isolation that we segment into two perspectives. On the one side, isolation has been studied as a negative outcome of processes related to modernization; on the other side, isolation has been studied as a structural position potentially capable of delivering positive returns. Although academic interest in isolation is longstanding, recent years have seen an outburst of research on the topic. The paper explores the connection this outburst and new social media and highlights a division within the literature between researchers who see new social media as creating more feelings of isolation and others who think that the jury is still out. In the final section of the paper we offer our novel conceptual framework for studying isolation.

Keywords: Social Isolation, New Social Media, Social Networks.

A question for our time

Are contemporary Americans more isolated than ever before? American sociologists have returned to this question repeatedly over the past century. At the heart of the enduring interest in isolation lie two interrelated approaches, (a) the connection that many social scientists have drawn between modernity and the American experience and (b) the role of technology as a disruptive social force. Social isolation is a topic where the creed of American exceptionalism (Bellah 2007, Riesman et al. 2001, Lipset 1997) and theoretical considerations about modernity (Schmidt 2012, Eisenstadt 2003, Giddens 1990) have historically met to produce a successful research niche. An example of such a marriage comes from Richard Sennett's (1992) argument that time dedicated to private life in America has in large part replaced what in 18th-century Europe used to be called public life, i.e., time dedicated to interactions with people outside the immediate circles of one's family and friends. This has made Americans potentially more isolated compared to Europeans (Olds 2010, Pappano 2001). As the next sections will make clear, Sennett's argument is one in a long line of theories and research that have linked modernity to isolation focusing, in particular, on the American experience.

Notwithstanding this abiding interest in isolation, recent years have seen an explosion of research on the topic. Indeed, social scientists (Klinenberg 2012; Conley 2010) and other writers have published several popular books on isolation with a particular focus on loneliness (e.g. Slade 2012, Joiner 2011, White 2010). To some degree, technological innovation is at the heart of the latest surge of studies on isolation and loneliness. One of the most influential scholars of social isolation, Claude Fischer, writes: "The most visible development of the last forty years has been technological innovation. Modern cars and planes, email, cell phones, text messaging, video links, and social networking sites have vastly expanded, sped up, and lowered the cost of social interaction" (2009:4). Technology and new social media (NSM, hereafter) in particular have profoundly reshaped the ways in which Americans relate to each other and the meaning they

derive from such relationships. As we shall see, competing views about the effects of technological innovation and its resulting impact on Americans will provide the basis for a rich debate on the relationship between social isolation to the fragmentation of society along the fault lines of race, politics, and immigration. A more fragmented society does not necessarily imply the creation of more social isolation (Fischer & Mattson 2009).

Seeing technology as a disruptive social process has a long tradition that predates the invention of the Internet (Segal 1994) and it is part and parcel of the American exception (Pursell 1981). This perspective was demonstrated by Thomas Jefferson through his role in the development of the United States patent office (see for example Bedini 1990, Martin 1952). The scope of the argument transitioned into politics during the period of Jacksonian democracy, when technology was seen as a way to reduce inequality and ameliorate living conditions (Barber 1990, Ashworth 1983). Today, many see NSM as powerful tools profoundly reshaping the ways we conduct our lives and establish relationships (Wellman et al. 2002, Marche 2012). Technology, some argue, is making us feeling more isolated. By using an historical approach, we can explain not only the persistent interest in isolation among American social scientists but also the role that technology plays in the recent appeal of the topic to wider audiences (Marvin 2009).

Placing the current interest in social isolation within a larger historical context linked to technological innovation allows us to reformulate the initial question of our essay: “Are NSM making Americans more isolated?” Or as Sherry Turkle puts it: “Technology reshapes the landscape of our emotional lives, but is it offering us the lives we want to lead? (2011, p. 17). As Michel Foucault pointed out in response to the discussion of human nature, the questions we ask and the answers we provide depend heavily on the intellectual climate we live in (Chomsky & Foucault 2006, see also Wilkin 2011). Part of the goal of this paper is to provide a novel answer to such a question that reflects a contemporary social world where the opportunities to make connections with others have become ubiquitous. We have moved from living in a world where social connections required considerable investment of time to a world where connections are

widely available and cheap to establish. We think that the image of an individual's networks made by few strong ties and several weak ties does not fully capture the multiple social contexts we live in and therefore a new concept and measure of isolation is needed. As we elaborate below, our approach is based on combining two perspectives on isolation—one that considers structural characteristics of individual networks and another that considers subjective feelings (see for example, Wilkening 1951 for the effects of social isolation on policy adoption). The underlying assumption is that social ties are important because they generate *meaning* for the two people that share a connection (White 1995a, White 1995b) and that keeping disparate meanings together, i.e., ties from diverse social contexts, can create a dissonance (Bearman & Moody 2004) that produces feelings of loneliness.

Before presenting our thoughts on isolation in contemporary society we review in detail what others have written on the topic. We organize our review in the following fashion: we divide researchers that see isolation as a (negative) byproduct of modernity from researchers that have interpreted isolation from a structural approach. Here, we amplify the distinctions that separate the two approaches in order to make our analytical argument more straightforward. In practice, many researchers in the two camps have crossed lines and have interpreted the structural position of the isolate through the lenses of history.¹ Yet a key difference remains: whereas researchers in one camp conceptualize isolation as a historical phenomenon linked to the bundle of processes that compose modernity—secularization, democratization, capitalism, mass society, urbanism, etc.—the other perspective sees isolation as a position within many societies, including pre-modern ones (Simmel 1951), capable of producing positive as well as negative effects.

We use the above analytical distinction as the theoretical basis for studying the impact of NSM. Among researchers that study NSM a similar split to the one outlined above emerges between researchers that see online interactions as a historical process that is creating less bonding interactions, i.e., more isolation, and those that argue the NSM are re-structuring the

¹ We thank the anonymous reviewer for helping us seeing this point more clearly.

social space, opening the doors to new and increasing forms of interactions as other technologies have done in the past. In the concluding sections of this review, we reconcile the two approaches on NSM and to a certain degree, the two larger approaches on social isolation, by proposing that a more appropriate image of the social isolate is no longer (exclusively) a person with no friends but rather a person with so many friends that her resulting cognitive cost of navigating the social space generates feeling of loneliness.

Isolation as a byproduct of modernity

Modernity has been characterized as the weakening of the traditional bonds that used to connect people to their communities and extended kinship groups (Tonnie 1887 [1988]). As George Homans (1941) noted, villagers of all statuses in 13th-century England had obligations to the overall community that reduced their freedom in how to pray, what to plant, when and what to eat, and even whom to marry (Luhmann 1998). Before the modern period, society had peasants, lords, kings, queens, priests, popes, etc. but not single individuals. Communities came before persons and defined them. Without the concept of the individual—which implies a certain degree of freedom in the private sphere—the malaise of social isolation could not take hold. Social isolation is seen from this perspective as an undesirable and (almost) inevitable byproduct of modernity (Useem 1980).

Several social scientists linked social isolation with the notion that modern life was anomic and alienating (see Seeman 1975 for a review). Known as the “lost community hypothesis” (Wellman 1979) it has been a theme in American sociology since its early days. Writing in the 1930s, Luis Wirth for instance argued that the population density, specialization and cultural heterogeneity of modern urban life undermined community and family bonds, thereby producing isolation (1938). Theoretical constructs about modernity have served as the main vehicle for the steady interest in community and its opposite, i.e., social isolation (Mirande 1973, Martison 1976). For instance, at the height of Talcott Parson’s influence on American

sociology, Jesse Pitts wrote: "A crucial aspect of ...functional analysis is the diagnosis of the American family as having reached the maximum level of isolation, just as American society has reached the maximum level of industrialization and general role differentiation" (1964, p.88; see also Yamane & Nonoyama 1967). As Doug McAdam and Ronnelle Paulsen (1993) noticed, social isolation was an essential part of the theory of mobilization in the sense that isolated members of society were theorized to be *more likely* to protest (see also Leighley 1990, Snow et al. 1980)

In this vein, scholars also made the connection between modernity and **for** societies outside of the United States (Saith 2001). Writing about the industrial development of Japan, for example, Yamane and Nonoyama (1967) argued that modernity facilitated the weakening of the Japanese traditional extended kinship group, the *Dozuko*, which resulted in an increase in anomie. Gerald Larkin (1974) made a similar argument for the case of the Netherlands but focused on the link between modernity and secularization. Zygmunt Bauman (1999) compared the modern individual to a pilgrim. Building on Weber's (1905 [2001]) work on the Protestant ethic, Bauman suggested that the motivation behind the pilgrimage of the modern man lies in choices that delay gratification. The walk toward the *magnificent future*, Bauman argued, is what uniquely identifies the modern man and is what separates him from others. The modern man walks alone. The idea that dislocation from one's community produced isolation or that social mobility severed social ties were both generated from seeing modernity as a threat to community and bonds (Gillmore 1936, Muhlin 1979, Qualls et al. 1980).

In more recent years, the lost community hypothesis was reinvigorated by the work of Robert Putnam (2000) and the research of McPherson, Smith-Lovin, and Brashear on the shrinking discussion networks of Americans (2006). In *Bowling Alone*, Putnam argues that contemporary Americans are participating less frequently in associational life, thereby undermining their connections with their neighbors and communities. The byproduct of less participation is a decrease in the social capital circulating in the community and a weakening of

trust relations among citizens. Individuals are becoming more isolated and inward looking, Putnam argued. Consistent with this line of research, McPherson et al. published a paper in the *American Sociological Review* analyzing 20 years of social network data collected using the General Social Survey (McPherson et al. 2006). Their most intriguing findings, which gained traction in the popular media, were that from the mid-1980s to the mid-2000s, the average size of American's immediate conversational network shrunk by a third and the number of people who reported having nobody to talk to tripled. A healthy scientific debate has since developed between two camps, roughly defined as those who think that the findings of the GSS are a methodological artifact and those who, on the contrary, see the contraction in the size of core conversational network as real (Fischer 2009; see McPherson, Smith-Lovin, & Brashears 2009, for a response to Fischer).

Among the researchers that have linked isolation to modernity, the theme of urban life emerged as a power subtopic. In the late 1960s and 1970s, social isolation was a theme in studies of alienation (Neal and Seeman 1964, Seeman 1967). In keeping with the underlying Marxist framework of much of this literature (see for example Martison 1976, which focuses on Marxian production processes), sociologists tied isolation to the capitalistic mass society, epitomized by the concept of the 'city,' with its atomization of relationships, instrumental use of others, and detachment. A review of alienation by Seeman (1975), reiterated the theoretical and empirical importance of alienation while emphasizing the diffuse definitions and approaches this concept elicited. He noted that empirical research on social isolation up to that time had shown little evidence for the contention that with respect to "the absence of membership or friendship (i.e. organizational involvement, integration in an occupational community, or a network of other friends)... evidence is not at all persuasive that these types of social engagements are either (a) in short supply, or (b) of very great significance in producing the alienative consequences attributed to them" (1975, p.109).

If social isolation is thus a malaise of modernity and of urban life, it has often received another qualifier—that of being a typically American problem (Joiner 2011). While a considerable amount of popular literature is now connecting isolation to contemporary America and to Americans use of NSM in particular (see section below), the idea that life in the United States leads to more loneliness dates back to Alexis de Tocqueville. In his masterpiece, the French aristocrat wrote:

“Thus not only does democracy make every man forget his ancestors, but it hides his descendants and separates his contemporaries from him; it throws him back forever upon himself alone and threatens in the end to confine him entirely within the solitude of his own heart” (1840 [1945]: vol.2 p.99).

It is key to point out that the connection between America and isolation rests, according to Tocqueville, not directly on modernity but on democracy, that is, on the dissolution of all the intermediate bodies (corporations and guilds) that previously characterized European regimes and that constrained individuals choices and freedom. Democracy made Americans more free compared to their European counterparts, Tocqueville noticed, but also more lonely (1840 [1945]).

The link between modernity and the negative effects of social isolation on life chances have also been extensively investigated (Cohen 2004, House et al. 1988). The pioneer of this approach was Durkheim’s (1897 [1951) work on suicide in 19th-century France where he famously identified social integration as the main “pathogen current” running through society and effecting suicides. Other classic studies on the impact of relationships on life chances include Muriel Hammer’s research on the social networks of the mentally ill (1983) and Lisa Berkman and Leonard Syme’s study on mortality rate of almost 7,000 adults living in Alameda County, California. This latter study consisted of two waves, conducted in 1965 and 1974, and it revealed a strong association between isolation and higher mortality rate. The authors suggested two mechanisms to explain such association, one based on the development of poor practices and the other on the psychological consequences of isolation (1979). These classic studies established

social network analysis as an important tool for studying the impact of isolation on life chances (for other examples see, Wahler 1980, Witvliet et al. 2010).

Recent studies on isolation and health have however applied the tools and metaphors of network analysis in a different manner from the one highlighted above. Several studies separate feeling of loneliness from the structural position of isolation. That is, feeling lonely is to some degree independent of the number of connections one has (Akerlind & Hornquist 1992) and of the type of support these connections are able to generate (Cacioppo & Hawkley 2009). The indirect nature of the relationship between isolation and loneliness is exemplified in the idea that loneliness can diffuse. Cacioppo et al. (2009), for instance, traced the topography of loneliness in people's social networks and the path through which feelings of loneliness spreads through these networks. Using network linkage data from the population-based Framingham Heart Study they showed that loneliness occurs in clusters, extends up to 3 degrees of separation, is disproportionately represented at the periphery of social networks (people with fewer connections), and spreads through a contagious process. The spread of loneliness was found to be stronger than the spread of perceived social connections, stronger for friends than family members, and stronger for women than for men.

In sum, recent research on loneliness has developed an approach for relating subjective feelings about isolation to structural positions. As we argue in greater detail below, this is the foundation on which we build our new theoretical argument that isolation has acquired a new form in contemporary America. We think that by making social relationships easy to establish and maintain, NSM have transformed isolation from a pure structural position such as having no friends, to a process in which relationships are created that carry little or conflicting meaning (see Emirbayer 1997).

Isolation as a structural position

In contrast to the interpretation of isolation as a negative byproduct of modernity, other social scientists have seen isolation largely as a structural position (Wellman & Wortley 1990, Burt 1984) capable of producing positive as well as negative outcomes. George Simmel (1908) describes an historical example of the benefits and costs that can flow from isolation in a famous essay in which he defines the position of "the stranger" in structural terms. According to Simmel, the stranger is someone who is embedded in a social environment but is not completely attached to it. The stranger is in a position of enjoying greater freedom but he is also precluded from truly intimate relationships with others. It was from a structural position of isolation that the *podesta*, the chief magistrate of Medieval Italian city-states, ruled over the different factions, for example (Simmel 1951). The larger theoretical point that Simmel makes is that isolation is sociologically relevant to the extent that it is a relation: "The whole joy and the whole bitterness of isolation are only different reactions to socially experienced influences." (1951, p. 119).

Simmel's argument that isolation is a relation directly implies that isolation is a structural position presents in several roles within society. The position of modern judges, as isolated from the contending parties, is institutionally constructed to create objectivity and impartiality in a way quite similar to what Simmel argued was the role of the *podesta*. Indeed, structural approaches to social isolation have given rise to several areas of inquiry not exclusively within the domain of sociology (Lesch 1975). Further, as a structural position, isolation is no longer the exclusive negative byproduct of modernity. Isolated were the patrician women of ancient Rome, used often as pawns in the political games of their husbands and fathers (Pomeroy 2007). Social isolation was an important factor in the religious ferment of the 13th-century that produced several new monastic orders and in the rediscovering of classic texts that occurred within the solitary confinements of monasteries (Stark 1966).

The independence that the position of isolation affords has been related to the production of innovative ideas. Philips (2011) argues that in markets that value innovation, being disconnected can become a resource. Jazz players are identified by their lack of connections; their

outputs are interpreted as more authentic and original the less they seem to be connected to contemporaries and predecessors. Uzzi and Spiro (2005) used artist participation in musicals on Broadway between 1945 and 1985 to show that being part of a small-world network provides benefits but only up to a certain threshold. The authors noticed an inverted ‘U’ relationship between success and artistic innovation based on the level of network embeddedness—too much of the latter stifles creativity. Here, again, a structural position of isolation generates positive returns.

Others have attached a *cost* to connectivity, implicitly arguing for the structural benefits that come from isolation—or at least from a separation from certain networks. For example, Flache and Macy (1996) argue that dyadic exchanges in cohesive groups can generate a second-order free-rider problem, where the actors use sanctions to build their relationship at the expense of the overall group. Friendship networks can then grow against the interests of the larger group. Beyond the impact of friendship networks on individuals, Ruef et al. (2003) have shown how homophily among entrepreneurs produces closed networks that reduce access for minorities and women entrepreneurs, in particular. In this case, strong connectivity within the group limited access to individuals who were not in the group.

Focusing on the positive returns that can accrue from isolation highlights the contrast between structural approaches to social isolation and those researchers that have conceptualized isolation almost exclusively as a negative byproduct of modernity. For instance, reacting to the literature that characterized urban living as an alienating experience because of the severing bonds and the weakening of social relationships (see previous section), Mark Granovetter (1973) argued that having weak ties could generate positive returns when searching for jobs or looking for a spouse (on the benefits of weak ties see also: Levin & Cross 2004, Centola & Macy 2007). If the reference to Granovetter’s work shows how the two camps differ on how to interpret urban life, they also differ with respect to the “lost community hypothesis” mentioned before (Paik & Sanchagrin 2012). Contrasting Putnam’s argument about the decline of social capital in America

for instance, Theda Skocpol has observed that less community participation has gone hand in hand with an increase in the joining of causes and campaigns, particularly online, an observation which further highlights the multidimensionality of participation (Smadja 2012, see also Campbell & Kwak 2011, Gil de Zuniga et al. 2010 on the impact of technology on political participation).

In time, Claude Fischer's research agenda has articulated the most sophisticated response to the "lost community hypothesis" by contributing decisively toward a structural interpretation of isolation (Fischer 2009, Fischer and Mattson 2009). In *To Dwell Among Friends* (1982), Fischer rejected the view of modern cities as places that manufactured social isolation. Fischer presented evidence that the emergence of homogeneous pockets within cities created rich social networks that were less inwardly centered on kinship ties and more tolerant compared to rural life (Bott 1964). Furthermore, in response to McPherson, Smith-Lovin, and Brashear's findings about the shrinking social networks of Americans (2006), Fischer and his collaborators argued that (a) some changes in the ordering of questions in different waves of the General Social Survey were driving the findings, i.e., that the detected change in core networks in America was partially a methodological artifact; (b) other social processes were deeply restructuring individual social networks and that, at this point in time, it was too early to understand their impact on individual's networks. These processes were: (1) demographic changes: contemporary Americans marry later in life compared to previous periods, the overall population has aged compared to 1970, and most people live in urban areas; (2) economic changes: a great number of women have entered into the workforce and there is greater wage inequality between CEOs and wage earners; (3) cultural changes: greater gender equality and greater identification with distant people, such as AIDS victims in South Africa. The fourth process that Fischer highlighted is the lowering of the costs of social relations that technological innovation has produced in the last 40 or so years.

A tension then arises between the structural advantages of having connections—in terms of resources that flow to a connected individual (e.g. Lin et al. 1981, Poldolny & Baron 1997),

access to social support (Portes & Sensenbrenner 1993, Wellman & Wortley 1990, Hurlbert et al. 2000 and Granovetter 1995, DiMaggio & Louch 1998, Lin & Dumin 1986, Plickert et al. 2007), socialization to norms and values (e.g. Lyon 2000, Heckathorn 1988, Warren 1975), topics of conversation (Bearman & Parigi 2004, Marsden 1987), and reciprocity of social support—and the costs of maintaining these connections, in terms of impartiality for instance (see Simmel above), creativity (see Philips), freedom (see Tocqueville) or access to information. We take this tension to be characteristic of contemporary societies, where opportunities to join social circles have multiplied exponentially (Mollenhorst 2008). A novel concept of isolation for the contemporary social world must therefore take into account the fact that one of the advantages of having fewer connections is in a decrease in the cognitive dissonance of constructing social identities across multiple social circles.

Peter Bearman (1991) illustrated this point in a structural rendering of Durkheim's *Suicide*. Bearman considered the position of the teenager as inherently fragile, because of the teenager's multiplex role as a member of non-overlapping circles. The multiplex position of the teenager makes him highly regulated but rather poorly integrated in each circle. Multiplexity of ties, in such a case, produces a dissonance that can become difficult to navigate and could lead to suicide. In his analysis, Bearman exploits the discrepancy between the two projections of a bipartite graph to structurally differentiate between the four cases of suicide that Durkheim's study identified.

If the idea of isolation denotes a lack of social interaction with others, does social fragmentation play a role in increasing social isolation (e.g. Bishop 2009)? If the answer were yes, that would likely mean a fragmented society decreases the potential likelihood for social interaction across relevant boundaries. However, if the answer were no, then that would suggest that fragmentation could lead to an increase in interaction under a homophilous process where people would feel more comfortable around—and thus more likely to interact with—smaller and more isolated groups of people who are more similar to themselves (Brashears 2010). This is of

course not a novel idea. In his study of the Louisiana Cajun population of the early 1930s, H. W. Gilmore wrote that social isolation “[...] produced in the Acadians a provincial outlook, a resistance to social change, and a devotion to time honored customs is the consensus of opinions of those who know them” (1936, p.84). Cohesion and isolation were two sides of the same coin.

These divergent interpretations of fragmentation, and their contrasting implications, are nonetheless reconcilable in our approach, which considers isolation as having both structural and interpretive qualities. Under certain specifications it may be the case that structural isolation increases due to fragmentation, depending on the number of fragmentary groups, social contexts under consideration, and the types of network structures. The Internet and the exponential diffusion of NSM have significantly increased the number of contexts and groups an individual can join, thus possibly contributing to the overall fragmentation of society. On the other hand, NSM may have created more finely-tuned, self-selecting homophilous groups than ever before (Vela-McConnell 2010).

Technology and Social Isolation

Technological changes have been one of the most significant social processes to take place in the industrialized world in the last twenty years. The development of the Internet and, more recently, of NSM, have greatly increased the means by which people communicate with each other (Ling 2008). In many respects, NSM appears closer to traditional media than to mass media in the sense that they are used as personal communication platforms. While mass media, like television, seems to be primarily consumed for the sake of personal gratification, engagement in NSM is often driven by the desire for interpersonal relationships. For example, Haridakis and Hanson (2009) demonstrate how the exponential growth of YouTube videos is in part driven by the social needs of people wanting to share content for the sake of communicating with their friends (see also Hanson 2008, Hollenbaugh 2011).

While few doubt that technology has greatly expanded our capacity to connect with others (Hampton et al. 2009; Casilli 2011), the impact of technology on the perception of being connected is more controversial. Sherry Turkle coined the expression of “alone together” to indicate how technology has greatly expanded connectivity at the price of “depth.” She writes:

“Online, we easily find company but are exhausted by the pressures of performance. We enjoy continual connection but rarely have each other’s full attention. We can have instant audiences but flatten out what we say to each other... The ties we form through the Internet are not, in the end, the ties that bind” (2011:280).

Turkle’s analysis suggests a tradeoff between the capacity to connect with others and the potential decrease in meaning that each connection carries (Shklovski et al. 2006). A similar tradeoff between number of ties and depth is also uncovered in Gustavo Mesch and Ilan Talmud’s (2006) analysis of Israeli adolescents. They found that friendships originating online are perceived as less supportive because they involve fewer joint activities and fewer topics of discussion.

What is apparent from the debate sketched above is that technology either promotes connectivity, according to some, or it promotes feelings of being isolated, according to others. Nevertheless, the common assumption of both positions is that the Internet and NSM have had a disruptive effect on the social life. So, for example, Barry Wellman and colleagues have argued that the Internet liberated people from neighborhood and kinship solidarities thus making networks the correct analytical approach for understanding social life rather than group memberships (Wellman 1996; Wellman et al. 2002). Proximity and kinship remained relevant, in the sense that individual’s ego networks were made prevalently of ties of this type, but intimacy with others stretched further geographically.

NSM are considered disruptive for two reasons that are relevant for a study of isolation. First, they reduce or counteract the impact of geography on structuring opportunities for social interactions, and second, they take time away from other face-to-face activities (e.g. Stern 2008). Mok and Wellman (2007) investigated the declining importance of geographical proximity in contemporary life by way of a comparison with the 1970s. Their research showed how distance

impacted the frequency of contact and the provision of support in strong, socially close ties before the rise of the Internet. They found that face-to-face interactions declined drastically at about 5 miles distance and that telephone contact dropped at about 100 miles. Conversely, the Internet increased the volume of communication to every member of the network and, in particular, people living further away.

The other mechanism through which NSM create disruption is through the allocation of time. Not surprisingly—considering the importance of technology in the American public discourse—a similar argument was once used in studying the effects of television (on this point and others, see DiMaggio et al. 2001, for an excellent review of the Internet’s impact on society). Thus, before the advent of the Internet, it was television that was identified as promoting isolation because the time dedicated to watching it was taking away from other social activities (however, see Perloff 1983). Time is indeed a finite resource and the so the contemporary version of this thesis is that the Internet and NSM in particular are taking time away from socializing with others. Norman Nie (2001) found that being online reduced the time dedicated to interpersonal interaction and communication. Kraut et al. (1998) found that greater Internet use was associated with decreased communication among family members in the household, declines in the size of the respondent's social circle, and increased feelings of loneliness and depression.

However, it is important to note that not all research has considered the impact of these disruptions as negative. DiMaggio et al., for instance, argued that social and cultural contexts need to be taken into account to evaluate the ultimate implications of the Internet (2001). Jessica Feezell and colleagues (2009) studied whether or not online groups can foster political engagement among citizens. They employed a multi-method design incorporating content analysis of political group web pages and original survey research of 455 university undergraduates to assess the quality of online political group discussion and the effects of online group membership on political engagement which they measured by assessing political knowledge and political participation surrounding the 2008 election. They found that

participation in online political groups strongly predicted offline political participation. Yet, online participation did not have positive effect on political knowledge, likely due to the low quality of online group discussion (see also Kirk and Schill 2011, for the effects of NSM on political media, and Boulianne 2009 for a meta-analysis of studies linking civic engagement to internet use).

Other researchers have disconnected isolation from the axis of negative / positive effects of NSM by adopting a network perspective. David Constant et al. (1996) show that emails allow for the maintenance of contact with people that are different from us and with whom “ego” has very few overlapping friends. Emails become the vehicle for the creation (and maintenance) of weak ties. Caroline Haythornthwaite (2002) followed up on this finding by arguing that NSM may have beneficial effects on weak ties by increasing chances for communication. However NSM may have negative effects on weak ties if they replace a preexisting medium. From this perspective, NSM create isolation in the sense that they embed individuals in networks largely consisting of weak ties.

Isolation in the contemporary world

Attempts to measure social isolation have been difficult. Part of the difficulty stems from defining isolation in a purely structural manner. Is isolation the lack of social connection or lack of meaningful relationships? Leo and Sharon Reeder (1969) articulated this duality as objective and subjective isolation, respectively, and tested the hypothesis that unwed women were more isolated (both objectively and subjectively) than wedded women. Their findings showed no differences between the two groups when isolation was defined objectively as a lack of contacts but found some inconsistent results when isolation was defined subjectively as a lack of meaning. Although somewhat dated, this study suggests that meaning-based measures of structural isolation are potentially more useful than measures based on a simple count of ties between individuals. A structurally isolated individual may certainly be somebody without connections (a

node with degree zero, to use network terminology) but she may also be somebody who *feels* less connected to others.

In this section we offer a conceptual framework for studying isolation in a world where relationships have become easy to establish and where the strength of ties has become less relevant to understanding access to certain resources (Small 2009, Gennero & Dutton 2007). Our aim is to provide a basic framework for simultaneously considering both objective and subjective aspects of isolation. We follow Harrison White and see ties as stories, i.e., the subjective representation of objective relationships (1995a, 1995b). From this perspective, ties provide meanings that reflect the contexts, i.e., the network domains, within which stories originate and ties are maintained. We claim that with the greater ability to create relationships comes a multiplication of contexts and a potential increase in the cost of negotiating conflicting cognitive demands. To further illustrate our theoretical point we use an example taken from *The New Yorker* a few years ago, when the number of users of Facebook and other social network media was a pale fraction of what it is today. When asked about his experiences living in a college dorm, an N.Y.U freshman that reported having nine hundred Facebook friends at the school said the following:

“In the elevator, people who I’m friends with will say hi to me and I’ll have no idea who they are. Don’t get me wrong, I think it [i.e., Facebook] is useful. I met two girls on Facebook who came over to our room once we got to N.Y.U. We hung out with them, we drank with them, we watched a movie. But for every situation where it helped me there’ve been, like, five or six that have just been really awkward” (Schulman 2007).

Having many ties does not necessarily produce more meaning and can potentially increase the cognitive costs of maintaining relationships to a point of creating a sense of isolation, i.e., of having no friends with whom "talking about important things matters" (Bearman & Parigi 2004). This links directly to the current debate surrounding the issue of whether being connected, say through NSM, makes one more or less isolated. Our approach suggests that it is not simply the fact that NSM have expanded the number of ties we have to other people, but also the number of

contexts, to which we belong. In order to capture this intuition we introduce an analytical distinction between two fundamentally interrelated concepts: 1) the increase in ties across many different contexts and 2) the effort required to maintain increasingly broad networks, that is, networks with fewer overlapping contexts. While acknowledging that there are many ways to address the impact of NSM on social relationships we consider the proliferation of friends and the resulting time spent maintaining these relationships as central to understanding how NSM has influenced social isolation.

Broadly construed, we see social isolation as a *ratio of non-overlapping contexts to the average time spent per relationship*. As the number of non-overlapping contexts increases we argue that this increases the amount of subjective isolation experienced by an individual. This is different from the rather obvious calculation of social isolation based purely on the number of social ties an individual maintains. Nevertheless, the rationale behind this construction is quite intuitive—a person that maintains many ‘friendships’ across many social activities may leave their computer after a day of ‘connecting’ and still feel that they have not helped themselves sustain a meaningful relationship.

The meaningfulness of social relationships plays a central role in our analysis of social isolation because it is precisely the *thing* which bridges the gap between a person who is well integrated structurally but still feels lonely. It is in fact the meaningfulness of social relationships that the puzzle of NSM (are we more or less isolated as a result of the proliferation of NSM?) rests upon. Meaningful relationships are those that allow individuals to express subjectively determined aspects of their personality, goals and desires. As a result, it seems reasonable to assume that social relationships that are actively maintained yet fail to achieve a requisite amount of salience for the individual are costly.

Our measure of isolation as a ratio of non-overlapping contexts to the average time spent per ‘friend’, places the structural insights of Georg Simmel into a contemporary mold. One of the primary arguments that Simmel makes in “The Web of Group-Affiliations” (1955) is that the

modern individual belongs to multiple non-overlapping circles. This is in contrast to the pre-modern individual whose social circles are arranged ‘concentrically.’ This means that given a social context, for example, kinship, it is highly likely that in the pre-modern world this meant also memberships in guilds, churches, manors, etc. For the modern individual, it is not necessarily the case that the myriad of social circles he inhabits overlap. Instead, each new social context may involve new members completely disconnected from members in other social contexts. NSM have further decreased the chances that social circles overlap not only with respect to pre-modern times but also with respect to modernity. This type of disconnection or lack of overlap between the many contexts creates tension for the individual (Pescosolido & Rubin 2000).

One way this tension can be expressed is with respect to triadic closure, q . From the insights of balance theory, it is known that there is a tendency towards triadic closure when possible (e.g. Heider 1958). It is this observation that leads us to consider a measure of social isolation where the amount of non-overlapping social contexts is defined by the number of open triads present in ego’s network. In other words, the number of friends who are not friends with friends is used as a basis for the measure of the number of social contexts an individual participates in. Triads that remain unclosed become costly in terms of time and also because of their potential to increase cognitive dissonance by placing contradictory demands on the individual.

One of the most profound changes wrought by NSM is the ability to form “cheap” social relationships. While previous forms of communication from letter writing to telephone conversation required at least some minimal personal information (e.g. address or telephone number), the introduction of popular social media such as YouTube, Facebook, and Twitter allows people to connect with as little as the click of a button in an Internet browser. The sheer simplicity of forming relationships through NSM has led to the inevitable result that people have ‘friends’ whom they do not actually consider friends.

We consider the *cost* of maintaining networks of social media ties, as a measure of what we term *network maintenance*. Network maintenance is the average time a person spends dedicated to each social connection, u . As the number of social connections increases, the amount of time one can spend per person decreases because time is a finite resource. As a result, network maintenance corresponds to the fact that social connections mediated through NSM makes it possible to increase the number of friends in a way that “cheapens” the relationships formed by decreasing the average amount of time that can be spent per connection.

Our measure of isolation is a function of both the number of non-overlapping contexts and the costs of network maintenance. More formally and considering an individual z with at least one tie:

$$u_z = \frac{degree_z}{time}$$

$$q_z = OpenTriads_z$$

$$i_z = \frac{q_z}{u_z} = q_z * \frac{time}{degree_z}$$

Time can be measured in hours for instance over a day, as in the average amount of hours in a day that person z dedicates to maintain relationships, or hours over a week. The measure of isolation comports with our original intention to consider the case of isolation in a world where ties are easy to create. A person can create virtually endless amounts of social connections, however this does not mean that they do not feel lonely. Each additional tie created adds a cost in terms of maintaining that tie especially if the tie is to a person who is not friends with ego’s friends. Furthermore, each tie may have the effect of diminishing an individuals’ quality of life as they find themselves increasingly and virtually surrounded by people that are not their ‘real’ friends. There is no better way to encapsulate this concept of isolation than to consider the situation where one is surrounded by “strangers”.

The burdens brought on by increases in the number of friends and membership in non-overlapping contexts suggests that as the number of friends and non-overlapping contexts

increases, the average time spent per social relationship decreases. We demonstrate an example of this relationship utilizing a decay function,²

$$u_z = e^{\left(c - \frac{c}{1 + \frac{q_z}{L^2}}\right)}$$

...where, c and L are shaping constants.

The motivation behind this choice is that as the number of non-overlapping contexts increases network maintenance, i.e., average time dedicated to friends, decreases. In the initial stages of friendship acquisition, the cost of maintaining the network are small but as the number of non-overlapping contexts increases the average amount of time spent per social connection decreases dramatically.

 Figure 1: Relationships between isolation (i), contexts (q) and network maintenance (u)

Less time spent with a social connection is an imperfect but useful measure of the meaningfulness of a relationship. If it is the case, as we argue, that decreases in the amount of time spent per person tends to occur as an individual gains more friends, then it is reasonable to conclude that an abundance of non-meaningful relationships leads to a sense of subjective isolation and thus loneliness. In a recent article in *The Atlantic*, Stephen Marche captured such an tension: "In a world consumed by ever more novel modes of socializing, we have less and less actual society. We live in an accelerating contradiction: the more connected we become, the lonelier we are" (2012).

² The use of a decay function is one way of modeling what we would expect to be the empirical relationship between non-overlapping contexts and network maintenance however other functional forms are available including a strictly linear decreasing function which imposes the same cost of network maintenance to each additional context.

Conclusion

The previous sections of this paper have dealt with the many and varied treatments of social isolation in both the past and the present. We argue that a historical orientation to social isolation helps elucidate the interests and research agendas of scholars across time. To this end, we segmented this constant interest in isolation into two perspectives. On the one side, isolation has been studied as an outcome of processes related to modernization; on the other side, isolation has been studied as a structural position present in several societies. While the researchers we located in the two traditions have often crossed the above division in their works, we think that the distinction we introduced in this paper has analytical validity in that it made possible separating those that conceptualized isolation as a negative byproduct of other processes from those that thought of isolation as a position potentially capable of delivering positive returns.

Although academic interest in isolation is longstanding, recent years have seen an outburst of research on the topic. We think that part of this explosion is tightly connected to broad concerns about the disruptive role of technology and, in particular, of NSM. We explored this connection further and highlighted a division within the literature between researchers who see NSM as creating more feelings of isolation and others who think that the jury is still out. In the final section of the paper we offered a novel conceptual framework for studying isolation in the contemporary society, where opportunities to meet others have been greatly enhanced. In the world we live, forming relationships has become cheap, so much so, that having many friends from disparate corners of the social space is now a common experience. An isolate is no longer (simply) a person without connections but is now somebody who creates connections that carry little meaning. This is the contemporary face of isolation.

Literature Cited

- Åkerlind I and Hörnquist JO. 1992. Loneliness and alcohol abuse: A review of evidences of an interplay. *Social Science & Medicine* 34(4):405–414.
- Ashworth J. 1983. *Agriarians and Aristocrats*. London: Royal Historical Society.
- Barber J. 1990. *Old Hickory. A Life Sketch of Andrew Jackson*. Washington, D.C.: National Portrait Gallery Smithsonian Institution.
- Bauman Z. 1999. *La Societa' dell'Incertezza*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Bearman P and Parigi P. 2004. Cloning headless frogs and other important matters: Conversation topics and network structure. *Social Forces* 83(2):535–557.
- Bearman PS. 1991. The social structure of suicide. *Sociological Forum* 6(3):501–524.
- Bearman PS and Moody J. 2004. Suicide and friendships among American adolescents. *American Journal of Public Health* 94(1):89–95.
- Bedini SA. 1990. *Thomas Jefferson: Statesman of Science*. Macmillan Pub Co.
- Bellah RN. 2007. *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life*. University of California Press.
- Berkman LF and Syme LS. 1979. Social networks, host resistance, and mortality. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 109(2):186–204.
- Bishop B. 2009. *The Big Sort: Why the Clustering of Like-Minded American Is Tearing Us Apart*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Boulianne S. 2009. Does internet use affect engagement? A meta-analysis of research. *Political Communication* 26(2):193–211.
- Bott E. 1964. *Family and Social Structure*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Brashears ME. 2010. Anomia and the sacred canopy: Testing a network theory. *Social Networks* 32(3):187–196.
- Burt RS. 1987. A note on strangers, friends and happiness. *Social Networks* 9(4):311–331.
- Cacioppo JT, Fowler JH, and Christakis NA. 2009. Alone in the crowd: The structure and spread of loneliness in a large social network. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 97(6):977–991.
- Cacioppo JT and Hawkey LC. 2009. Perceived social isolation and cognition. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 13(10):447–454.

- Campbell SW and Kwak N. 2011. Political involvement in “mobilized” society: The interactive relationships among mobile communication, network characteristics, and political participation. *Journal of Communication* 61(6):1005–1024.
- Casilli AA. 2011. Bums, bridges, and primates: Some elements for a sociology of online interactions. *SSRN eLibrary*: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1940773
- Centola D and Macy M. 2007. Complex contagions and the weakness of long ties. *Am J Sociol* 113(3):702–734.
- Chomsky N and Foucault M. 2006. *The Chomsky-Foucault Debate: On Human Nature*. The New Press.
- Cohen S. 2004. Social relationships and health. *American Psychologist* 59(8):676–684.
- Conley D. 2010. *Elsewhere, U.S.A: How We Got from the Company Man, Family Dinners, and the Affluent Society to the Home Office, BlackBerry Moms, and Economic Anxiety*. New York: Vintage.
- Constant D, Sproull L, and Kiesler S. 1996. The kindness of strangers: The usefulness of electronic weak ties for technical advice. *Organization Science* 7(2):119–135.
- DiMaggio P, Hargittai E, Neuman WR, and Robinson JP. 2001. Social implications of the internet. *Annual Review of Sociology* 27: 307-336.
- DiMaggio P and Louch H. 1998. Socially embedded consumer transactions: For what kinds of purchases do people most often use networks? *American Sociological Review* 63(5): 619–637.
- Donati P. 2011. *Relational Sociology: A New Paradigm for the Social Sciences*. Taylor & Francis.
- Durkheim E. 1951. *Suicide*. New York: The Free Press.
- Emirbayer M. 1997. Manifesto for a relational sociology. *The American Journal of Sociology* 103(2):281–317.
- Eisenstadt SN. 2003. *Comparative Civilizations and Multiple Modernities*. Boston: Brill.
- Feezell JT, Conroy M, and Guerrero M. 2009. Facebook is... Fostering political engagement: A study of online social networking groups and offline participation. *SSRN eLibrary*: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1451456&rec=1&srcabs=1331029
- Fischer CS. 2009. The 2004 GSS finding of shrunken social networks: An artifact? *American Sociological Review* 74(4):657–669.
- Fischer CS and Mattson G. 2009. Is America fragmenting? *Annual Review of Sociology*. 35(1):435–455.
- Flache A and Macy M. 1996. The weakness of strong ties: Collective action failure in a highly cohesive group. *The J. of Math. Sociology* 21(1):3–28.
- Gennero CD and Dutton WH. 2007. Reconfiguring friendships: Social relationships and the Internet. *Information, Communication & Society* 10(5):591–618.

- Giddens A. 1990. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Gil de Zúñiga H, Veenstra A, Vraga E, and Shah D. 2010. Digital democracy: Reimagining pathways to political participation. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics* 7(1):36–51.
- Gilmore HW. 1936. Family-capitalism in a community of rural Louisiana. *Soc. F.* 15:71.
- Granovetter MS. 1973. The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology* 78(6):1360–1380.
- Granovetter MS. 1995. *Getting a Job: A Study of Contacts and Careers*. University of Chicago Press.
- Hammer M. 1983. “Core” and “extended” social networks in relation to health and illness. *Social Science & Medicine* 17(7):405–411.
- Hampton K, Sessions L, Her E, and Rainie L. 2009. *Social Isolation and New Technology: How the Internet and Mobile Phones Impact Americans’ Social Networks*:
<http://www.pewinternet.org/Reports/2009/18--Social-Isolation-and-New-Technology/Executive-Summary.aspx>
- Hanson GH. 2008. YouTube Users Watching and Sharing the News: A Uses and Gratifications Approach. *Journal of Electronic Publishing* 11(3):
- Haridakis P and Hanson G. 2009. Social interaction and co-viewing with YouTube: Blending mass communication reception and social connection. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 53(2):317–335.
- Haythornthwaite C. 2002. Strong, weak, and latent ties and the impact of new media. *The Info. Soc.* 18(5):385–401.
- Heckathorn DD. 1988. Collective sanctions and the creation of prisoner’s dilemma norms. *American Journal of Sociology* 94(3):535–562.
- Hollenbaugh EE. 2011. Motives for maintaining personal journal blogs. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking* 14(1-2):13–20.
- Homans GC. 1941. *English Villagers of the Thirteenth Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- House, JS, Landis KR, and Umberson, D. 1988. Social relationships and health. *Science*, 241(4865): 540–545.
- Joiner T. 2011. *Lonely at the Top: The High Cost of Men’s Success*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kavanaugh AL and Patterson SJ. 2001. The impact of community computer networks on social capital and community involvement. *American Behavioral Scientist* 45(3):496–509.
- Kirk R and Schill D. 2011. A digital agora: Citizen participation in the 2008 presidential debates. *American Behavioral Scientist* 55(3):325–347.

- Klinenberg E. 2012. *Going Solo: The Extraordinary Rise and Surprising Appeal of Living Alone*. New York: Penguin Press.
- Kraut R, Patterson M, Lundmark V, Kiesler S, Mukophadhyay T, and Scherlis W. 1998. Internet paradox: A social technology that reduces social involvement and psychological well-being? *American Psychologist* 53(9):1017–1031.
- Larkin G. 1974. Isolation, integration and secularization: a case study of the Netherlands. *Sociological Review* 22:401–418.
- Leighley JE. 1990. Social interaction and contextual influences on political participation. *American Politics Research* 18(4):459–475.
- Lesche JE. 1975. Role of isolation in evolution: George J. Romanes and John T. Gulick. *Isis* 66:483–503.
- Levin DZ and Cross R. 2004. The strength of weak ties you can trust: The mediating role of trust in effective knowledge transfer. *Management Science* 50(11):1477–1490.
- Lin N, Ensel WM, and Vaughn JC. 1981. Social resources and strength of ties: Structural factors in occupational status attainment. *American Sociological Review* 46(4):393–405.
- Lin N and Dumin M. 1986. Access to occupations through social ties. *Social Networks* 8:365–383.
- Ling RS. 2008. *New Tech, New Ties*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Lipset SM. 1997. *American Exceptionalism: A Double-Edged Sword*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Luhmann N. 1998. *Love as Passion: The Codification of Intimacy*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Lyon F. 2000. Trust, networks and norms: The creation of social capital in agricultural economies in Ghana. *World Development* 28(4):663–681.
- Marche S. 2012. Is Facebook making us lonely? *The Atlantic*.
- Marsden PV. 1987. Core discussion networks of Americans. *American Sociological Review* 52(1):122–131.
- Martin ET. 1952. *Thomas Jefferson: Scientist*. H. Schuman.
- Martinson OB. 1976. Feelings of powerlessness and social isolation among large-scale farm personnel. *Rural Sociology* 41:452–472.
- Marvin C. 2009. *When Old Technologies Were New*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- McAdam D and Paulsen R. 1993. Specifying the relationship between social ties and activism. *American Journal of Sociology* 99(3):640–667.
- McPherson M, Smith-Lovin L, and Brashears ME. 2006. Social isolation in America: Changes in core discussion networks over two decades. *American Sociological Review* 71(3):353–375.


- McPherson M, Smith-Lovin L, and Brashears ME. 2009. Models and marginals: Using survey evidence to study social networks. *American Sociological Review* 74(4):670–681.
- Mesch G and Talmud I. 2006. The quality of online and offline relationships: The role of multiplexity and duration of social relationships. *The Information Society* 22(3):137–148.
- Mirande AM. 1973. Social mobility and participation: the dissociative and socialization hypotheses. *Sociological Quarterly* 14:19–31.
- Mok D and Wellman B. 2007. Did distance matter before the Internet?: Interpersonal contact and support in the 1970s. *Social Networks* 29(3):430–461.
- Mollenhorst G. 2008. Context overlap and multiplexity in personal relationships. In *Why Context Matters*, ed. TN Friemel, pp. 55–77. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Muhlin GL. 1979. Mental hospitalization of the foreign-born and the role of cultural isolation. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry* 25:258–266.
- Neal AG and Seeman M. 1964. Organizations and powerlessness: a test of the mediation hypothesis. *American Sociological Review* 29:216–226.
- Nie NH. 2001. Sociability, interpersonal relations, and the Internet. *American Behavioral Scientist* 45(3):420–435.
- Olds J. 2010. *The Lonely American: Drifting Apart in the Twenty-first Century*. Beacon Press.
- Paik A and Sanchagrin K. 2012. Social isolation in America: An artifact. *SSRN eLibrary*: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2019008
- Pappano L. 2001. *The Connection Gap: Why Americans Feel so Alone*. Rutgers University Press.
- Perloff RM. 1983. Loneliness, depression and the uses of television. *Journalism Quarterly* 60:352–356.
- Pescosolido BA and Rubin BA. 2000. The web of group affiliations revisited: Social life, postmodernism, and sociology. *American Sociological Review* 65:52–76.
- Phillips DJ. 2011. Structural disconnectedness and the emergence of a jazz canon. *American Journal of Sociology* 117(2):420–483.
- Pitts JR. The structural-functional approach. In *Handbook of Marriage and the Family*, ed. HT Christensen, p. 1964. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Plickert G, Côté RR, and Wellman B. 2007. It's not who you know, it's how you know them: Who exchanges what with whom? *Social Networks* 29(3):405–429.
- Podolny JM and Baron JN. 1997. Resources and relationships: Social networks and mobility in the workplace. *American Sociological Review* 62(5):673–693.

- Pomeroy S. 2007. *The Murder of Regilla*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Portes A and Sensenbrenner J. 1993. Embeddedness and immigration: Notes on the social determinants of economic action. *American Journal of Sociology* 98(6):1320–1350.
- Pursell CWJ, ed. 1981. *Technology in America*. Cambridge, MA: MIT.
- Putnam R. 2000. *Bowling Alone*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Qualls PE, Justice B, and Allen R. 1980. Isolation and psychosocial functioning. *Psychological Reports* 46:279–285.
- Reeder LG and Reeder SJ. 1969. Social isolation and illegitimacy. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 31:451–461.
- Riesman D, Glazer N, and Denney R. 2001. *The Lonely Crowd, Revised edition: A Study of the Changing American Character*. Yale University Press.
- Ruef M, Aldrich HE, and Carter NM. 2003. The structure of founding teams: Homophily, strong Ties, and isolation among U.S. entrepreneurs. *American Sociological Review* 68(2):195–222.
- Saith R. 2001. *Social Exclusion: the Concept and Application to Developing Countries*. Queen Elizabeth House, University of Oxford.
- Schmidt KA. 2012. Alienational normlessness, isolation, and estrangement: A Neo-Thomistic approach. *Journal for the Sociological Integration of Religion and Society* 2(1):36-54.
- Schulman M. 2007. Icebreaker Dept. *The New Yorker*, Sep. 17.
- Seeman M. 1967. On the personal consequences of alienation in work. *American Sociological Review* 32(2):273.
- Seeman M. 1975. Alienation studies. *Annual Review of Sociology* 1:91–123.
- Segal HP. 1994. *Future Imperfect: The Mixed Blessings of Technology in America*. Univ of Massachusetts Press.
- Sennett R. 1992. *The Fall of Public Man*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Small ML. 2009. *Unanticipated Gains: Origins of Network Inequality in Everyday Life*. Oxford University Press US.
- Shklovski I, Kiesler S, and Kraut R. 2006. The Internet and social interaction: A meta-analysis and critique of studies, 1995-2003. *PCS, PHONES, AND THE INTERNET*:
<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.125.6035>
- Simmel G. 1908. The Stranger. In *On Individuality and Social Forms*, pp. 143–149.

- Simmel G and Wolff KH. 1950. *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*. Simon and Schuster.
- Simmel G. 1955. *Conflict and The Web of Group Affiliations*. New York, NY, US: Free Press.
- Slade G. 2012. *Big Disconnect: The Story of Technology and Loneliness*. Prometheus Books.
- *Smajda J. 2012 *Theda Skocpol on Civiv Participation*. Podcast:
<http://thesocietypages.org/officehours/2012/01/31/theda-skocpol-on-civic-participation/>
- Snow DA, Zurcher LA, and Sheldon Ekland-Olson. 1980. Social networks and social movements: A microstructural approach to differential recruitment. *American Sociological Review* 45(5):787–801.
- Stark W. 1966. *The Sociology of Religion: A Study of Christendom*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Stern MJ. 2008. How locality, frequency of communication and internet usage affect modes of communication within core social networks. *Information, Communication & Society* 11(5):591–616.
- Tocqueville A de and Frohnen B. 2003. *Democracy in America*. Regnery Gateway.
- Tonnies F. 1988. *Community and Society*: Transaction Publishers.
- Turkle S. 2011. *Alone Together: Why We Expect More from Technology and Less from Each Other*. Basic Books.
- Useem B. 1980. Solidarity model, breakdown model, and the Boston antibusing movement. *American Sociological Review* 45:357–369.
- Uzzi B and Spiro J. 2005. Collaboration and creativity: The small world problem. *American Journal of Sociology* 111(2):447–504.
- Vela-McConnell JA. 2010. *Unlikely Friends: Bridging Ties and Diverse Friendships*. Lexington Books.
- Wahler RG. 1980. Insular mother: her problems in parent-child treatment. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis* 13:207–219.
- Warburton J and Lui CW. 2007. Social isolation and loneliness in older people: A literature review.
<http://espace.library.uq.edu.au/view/UQ:160390>
- Warren RL. 1975. Context and isolation: the teaching experience in an elementary school. *Human Organization* 34:139–148.
- Weber M and Kalberg S. 2001. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, Third Edition*. Roxbury Publishing Company.
- Wellman B. 1979. The community question: The intemate networks of East Yorkers. *The American Journal of Sociology* 84(5):1201–1231.

- Wellman B. 1996. Are personal communities local? A Dumptarian reconsideration. *Social Networks* 18(4):347–354.
- Wellman B, Boase J, and Chen W. 2002. The networked nature of community: Online and offline. *It & Society* 1(1):151–165.
- Wellman B and Wortley S. 1990. Different strokes from different folks: Community ties and social support. *American Journal of Sociology* 96(3):558–588.
- White E. 2010. *Lonely: A Memoir*. Harper.
- White HC. 1995a. *Where Do Languages Come From?* New York.
- White HC. 1995b. *Times From Reflexive Talk*. New York.
- Wilkening EA. 1951. Social isolation and response of farmers to agricultural programs. *American Sociological Review* 16:836–837.
- Wilkin P. 2011. Chomsky and Foucault on Human Nature and Politics. *Social Theory and Practice* 25(2):177–210.
- Wirth L. 1938. Urbanism as a way of life. *American Journal of Sociology* 44:3–24.
- Witvliet M, Brendgen M, Lier PAC, Koot HM, and Vitaro F. 2010. Early adolescent depressive symptoms: Prediction from clique isolation, loneliness, and perceived social acceptance. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology* 38(8):1045–1056.
- Yamane T and Nonoyama H. 1967. Isolation of the nuclear family and kinship organization in Japan: a hypothetical approach to the relationships between the family and society. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 29:783–796.

Figure 1: Relationships between isolation (i), contexts (q) and network maintenance (u)*



* For Panel A, the shape parameters of the decay function are $L = 20$ and $c = .1$. In Panel B, we rescaled the function in order to constrain the measure of isolation between 0 and 1.