

Networking Network Analysts: How INSNA (the International Network for Social Network Analysis) Came to Be

Barry Wellman⁽¹⁾

Centre for Urban and Community Studies University of Toronto

Network Analysts Need Networks to Communicate: A Personal Account⁽²⁾

Some time ago, Steve Borgatti — then INSNA coordinator and Connections editor — asked me to write a twentieth-anniversary account of the founding of INSNA. He wanted it from my perspective as the guy who started it. However, current diversions kept delaying reminiscing about the past. I finally found time at the paradisaical Italian Rockefeller Center retreat in Bellagio (Italy, not Las Vegas) to do this. The timing is good, as INSNA approaches its twenty-fifth anniversary in 2002.

In 1974-1975, Bev Wellman and I were eager to live in England during my first sabbatical. Based at the University of Surrey (me) and the Laban Art of Movement Centre (Bev), we traveled throughout Britain. A curious thing happened when we visited scholars we had heard about and corresponded with.⁽³⁾ We found ourselves to be giving each person news about what other British and North American networkers were doing. Social network analysis was just getting under way as a self-conscious discipline, and there had been little contact between mainly-sociological North Americans and mainly-anthropological Britons. Our travels formed frail but important threads of connectivity.

There had to be a better way than depending on the semi-random walks of itinerant sabbatarians. Soon after we returned home, in 1976 I began canvassing interest in starting a network of networkers. There was enthusiasm. I decided the best way to start something was to actually start something. I asked many of my North American and European connections to form a legitimating, recruiting Advisory Board, with a balance between American and nonAmerican scholars and between disciplines. (In practice, this meant that American sociologists were proportionately under represented in comparison to their membership numbers.) I think everyone I asked said "Yes."⁽⁴⁾

Expectancy was in the air: a feeling that we were onto something new and important, and that our time had come. Working with the Advisory Board, we used our Rolodexes, networks, and newsletters to circulate membership forms widely. The resulting International Network for Social Network Analysis began in the Summer of 1977 (the date of Connections' first issue), with the express purpose of spreading news about research and people. I tried to keep things loose and informal: I called it a "Network" (instead of a "Society" or "Association"), I styled myself "Coordinator" rather than

"President" or "Chairman," and *Connections* was most definitely not a journal and much more than a newsletter.

Networking Torontonians

Our Toronto base may have made it more of a hospitable home for scholars outside of the U.S. I believe that thinking structurally is easier if one is based outside of the U.S. imperium. Dominant states, people and organizations tend to evaluate the world in social psychological terms: "Do they like us? Have we won their hearts and minds?" By contrast, those in dependent situations are more apt to see the world as composed of linked chains of asymmetric relationships — who influences/controls whom? — rather than seeing the world as a set of voluntarily-chosen, egalitarian, symmetrical relationships.

The Toronto Department of Sociology was a hotbed of network analysis then. (We called it "structural analysis" to be more intellectually inclusive, reaching out especially to the social movements, world systems, and international/interregional dependency folks.) In 1965 Toronto had grabbed Chuck Tilly, who soon brought Bill Michelson and myself to join him. As a result of chain migration, a pride of Harvard graduate student missionaries soon migrated north from the then-center of network thought. In a short while, Toronto had a diverse, smart, and mutually supportive set of faculty members: Bonnie Erickson, Harriet Friedmann, Nancy Howell (all from Harvard), Janet Salaff (from Berkeley) and Bev Wellman (Univ. of Toronto) are still at Toronto. Michel Bodemann (Brandeis) and Lorne Tepperman (Harvard) are still at Toronto, but have turned to other pursuits. Two early Toronto stalwarts have moved elsewhere: Leslie Howard (also from Harvard) is at Whittier College, and Brandeis-born S.D. (Steve) Berkowitz (my co-editor of *Social Structures*, 1988, 1997) is at the University of Vermont. Much of our success came from enthusiastic graduate students, excited to be "Associate/Assistant Editors" and to be participating in a leading-edge intellectual movement. They did much unpaid and smart labor, especially on publishing *Connections*.⁽⁵⁾ Karen Anderson, Peter Carrington, Walter Carroll, Barry Leighton, and Jack Richardson. were especially key players. Most crucially, Bev Wellman has always been enthusiastically, actively and reliably there.

The Department of Sociology, University of Toronto was a hospitable early home. INSNA also received an organizational bonanza in the late 1970s - early 1980s when I founded and led the department's Structural Analysis Programme, a research centre with INSNA as one of its proudest jewels. After the department faced budgetary constraints and an unenthusiastic chairman, INSNA moved to the university's Centre for Urban and Community Studies where it thrived until I handed it over to my successors in 1988.

An Informal Network

Wanting to give INSNA quick momentum, I just started it without a constitution or a structure. It had an informally-recruited advisory board and a small checking account. Legally, I owned it as a small business. No muss, no fuss. In practice, we were non-profit. I eventually passed the \$8,000 surplus treasury on to my successors and never took a

salary. I kept dues low (US\$7/Cdn\$7 including a subscription to *Connections*) and cadged volunteer labour from graduate students and colleagues to find (and in those days, type!) abstracts, do *Connections* layout, and stuff envelopes. For each issue, Bev Wellman and I *schlepped* four big mail bags to the post office.

In hindsight, just doing it is a great way to start a scholarly network and a more difficult way to keep it going. At the outset, starting INSNA successfully was most important. I have seen several other scholarly networks spend years attempt to write perfect constitutions, and in the process losing so much enthusiasm and momentum that they never get off the ground. My thought at the start was that once we got started and people were having a good time, we could formalize our procedures. (Of course, this depends on having a founding caudillo willing to step down voluntarily.)

The difficulties? Without an elaborate structure, it was hard to get others to do any organizational work (other than the Sunbelt conference, which always ran well and autonomously). There was a tendency to "leave it to Barry". As I liked doing it, this was OK for a while. But it meant that things didn't get done, and diverse opinions didn't get offered. I also realized when I wanted to step down and it took me several years to find successors, that there was no means for institutionalized succession short of revolt (never a glimmer), a constitutional convention (too cumbersome before email), or abdication (the strategy I adopted at the end). In short, we had the same structural problems that many successful small enterprises have when they get past their start-up state (Metcalf 1999).

An International, Interdisciplinary Network

From the outset, INSNA was international and interdisciplinary, although it had more Americans and sociologists than any other nationality and discipline. Approximately half of the members were Americans, with Canadians comprising the second largest group, and western Europeans almost all of the rest (France, [West] Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden). There were nine members from Asia-Pacific (Australia, Japan, Israel, India) and four from Latin America (Argentina, Mexico, Peru).⁽⁶⁾ Membership rates were reduced for students in the western world and free for all members working in developing countries (and later, eastern European countries with blocked currencies).

We started with approximately 175 members and rose within two years to about 300. It now has nearly 500, with perhaps 1,000 more interested hangers-on (judging by the many non-members who go to the annual Sunbelt Social Network Conference or who ask questions at its website (now "<http://www.heinz.cmu.edu/project/INSNA/>" but soon to be changed, most likely to "www.insna.org"). For over a decade, about 40 newbies a year have taken my "Networks for Newbies" workshop at the Sunbelt conference.

Sociologists were the largest block then as now, comprising about 40% of the total. Five to ten percent each came from anthropology, psychology, communication science, social work and political science, with one or two from community development, computer

science, economics, education, geography, gerontology, history, information science, management science, mathematics, psychiatry, public health, and statistics. In recent years, membership from management science, communication science and information science has grown substantially, while psychology and anthropology has declined in proportions. (Some of the psychologists went off to form their own "personal relationships" network, founded by Steve Duck on the INSNA model.)

I quickly learned that there were more social network analysts in the firmament than my Harvard-centered life had shown me: (7) small group-niks, communication scientists principally interested in the diffusion of information, often-quantitative anthropologists, and the mathematically inclined influenced by James Coleman at Johns Hopkins University and the University of Chicago. I developed the habit of whipping off a form letter to anyone whose article or book we abstracted, saying that as INSNA members were interested in them, wouldn't they like to join the party. (After all, scholarly camaraderie and recognition are two of the main rewards of the academic life.) I developed the huckster habit of standing up at any conference I was at: I proclaimed INSNA's existence, waved a sheaf of membership application forms. I strew forms and posted signs everywhere I could. INSNA flooded scholarly newsletters with announcements of our existence and invitations to the Sunbelt conferences. I got these out in many disciplines and many countries.

Making *Connections*

Within INSNA, I created the informal journal, *Connections*. We considered calling it Ties and Bonds (as suggested by "groupware" inventors Peter and Trudy Johnson-Lenz), but worried that it might attract the wrong audience. When I stepped down from heading INSNA twelve years later and no longer had to try to behave decorously, I re-titled my "Notes and Comments" section in *Connections*, "Ties and Bonds."

Connections was edited and published in Toronto, with the help of Bev Wellman and student volunteers. To save money, it was stapled with a cheap cover. We published *Connections* three times a year, a reluctant reduction (for lack of time) from a quarterly. I am convinced that *Connections* must appear frequently, and lament its current twice-yearly status. It is INSNA's key source of current information, networking, community building and identity. *Connections* rarely received institutional subscriptions (which is where most societies make their money), because its cheap production didn't make it look like a journal.

Connections was designed to be a means of fostering intellectual and personal connectivity among network analysts. We used a variety of means to keep networkers intellectually and socially linked. *Connections* had lots of small news bits, meeting calendars, information about computer stuff, teaching aids, membership directories, quirky items about networking in the real world, how-to-do-it articles, literature reviews, position statements, and hundreds of abstracts. Based on my British networking experience, I thought that such information would be more useful than a "real" journal.

As I really wanted to be a journalist when I was growing up and have always been a *yenta*, creating and sustaining this style gave me great *naches*.

Anyway, we were already forming a nascent journal, *Social Networks*, and our network missionary position demanded that we publish extensively in other journals rather than deteriorating into a self-satisfied, isolated movement. My principal regret is that we have never developed the habit of complementing formal journal papers with quick communication of early results in short research reports, either in *Connections* or on our Socnet email list. Perhaps our website can do this one day. The Sunbelt conference does communicate such results well, but its annual meeting is not frequent enough for rapid dissemination.

In those pre-web, pre-textbase days, the hardest and most time-consuming part of preparing *Connections* was identifying relevant articles and gathering their abstracts. It took more than half of the time I devoted to INSNA and most of our student assistants' time. Merely searching keywords did not provide the wide range of subject matter relevant to network analysts. My best source was to scan *Current Contents*, a weekly compilation of journals' tables of contents. To save labor, we didn't do book reviews, but did book summaries, using information gleaned from a book's introduction, jacket blurb, table of contents and publisher's ad. This provides at least 50% of a book review's information at less than 5% of the time, labor and aggravation cost. *Connections'* format seems to have held up nicely over time.

Connections, like INSNA itself, has always been as much a base for reaching out as *Cosa Nostra* for providing internal information, support and development. I remember an INSNA meeting in the late 1970s at the American Sociological Association conference where we said that we would reach out to other scholars rather than forming our own isolated intellectual neighborhood. (Harrison White was especially vocal about this.) We reasoned that we could have greater influence that way plus profit from a variety of intellectual approaches, substantive findings, and research methods.

Our approach has been to reach out through articles in a variety of journals and conference papers, bringing the network word to many substantive disciplines and areas, and subjecting our approach to the critical examination of diverse others. *Socnet*, *Connections*, and our website provide us with scope, awareness, identity, tools, and connectivity. *Social Networks* provides us with a vehicle for formal scholarly communication about theory, methods and findings of primary interest to network analysts.

Networkers Never Network Alone

INSNA/*Connections* wasn't the only game in town. Networking ¶ and network analysis ¶ was in the air. We had a scholarly mission and a movement. Paradigms and careers were in the making. Many other things happened about then, each contributing separately and interactively to the successful institutional take-off of social network analysis.

1. The late Nick Mullins published *Theories and Theory Groups in Contemporary American Sociology* in 1973.⁽⁸⁾ The book devoted a chapter to social network analysis, giving us equal-status with then heavy-duty approaches such as structural-functionalism, Marxism, and ethnomethodology. One comment probably started me thinking about INSNA even before my English hegira: Each chapter named a theory's intellectual leader (Harrison White in the social networks case) and organizational leader (position then open for social network analysis: I saw this as a career opportunity as well as a chance to do good for the scholarly world). Nick's book also put many of us on the map because it named names. Only the *cognoscenti* noted that many were Nick's former fellow Harvard graduate students. I remember well going into a tenure meeting for Nancy Howell and brandishing the page with her name on it as a leading network analyst. Not that there was much doubt, but set in cold type, it clinched the case immediately.

2. Bev and I capitalized on the holding of the World Congress of Sociology in Toronto, August 1974, to organize a parallel set of zero-cost meetings in Toronto, using space scrounged from the Department of Sociology and the Centre for Urban and Community Studies. About 75 people participated in our eight sessions. A lot of network analysts formed their first in-person ties at that time. Most of us realized that there was more to social network analysis than the little circle with whom we had gone to graduate school. Bev and I still remember, now-fondly and then-exhaustedly, the party we held for network analysts in our back yard the night we left for our aforementioned sabbatical stay in England.

3. The Torontonians organized a "New Directions in Structural Analysis" conference in March 1978. The "structural analysis" moniker signaled that we cast a wider net than traditional social network analysis. Speakers presented informal papers, with plenty of time for discussion. Out-of-Toronto participants included Grace Anderson, Steve Berkowitz, Russ Bernard, Pat Doreian, Lin Freeman, Joe Galaskiewicz, Maurice Godelier, Gerry Gold, Peter & Trudy Johnson-Lenz, Tom Koenig, Sam Leinhardt & Paul Holland, Joel Levine, Chris Pickvance, Chuck Tilly, Stan Wasserman, Harrison White and Rolf Wigand.⁽⁹⁾

4. The Department of Sociology took advantage of a fleeting University of Toronto opportunity to found a "Structural Analysis Programme": a visible college of twelve colleagues. Nancy Howell and I applied to start it; I was the founding director for four years. We capitalized on SAP's funds, staff, and enthusiastic colleagues and students to give INSNA a kick-start. SAP's sole employee, Susan Haggis and then Karen Anderson, became INSNA's administrator. Our working paper series and active conference participation increased network analysis' visibility. Most Torontonians became contributors to *Social Structures* (1988) a book of theory and exemplary case studies that I edited with then-Torontonian Steve Berkowitz.

5a. Others organized important conferences. In 1975, Sam Leinhardt (now starting up his *third* high-tech firm) brought together theory and methods people at Dartmouth concomitantly linking Chicago and Harvard folks with each other. (Holland and Leinhardt 1979 presents some concrete results of this.)

5b. Lin(ton) Freeman, Sue Freeman and Woody (Forrest) Pitts organized several social network conferences: There were four in Hawaii, December, 1974-1978, with Larry Kincaid organizing a fifth and final one in 1979. In Spring, 1980, the Freemans organized a meeting in Laguna Beach CA, near their University of California-Irvine base. In 1981, (H.) Russ(ell) Bernard and Al(vin) Wolfe started the Sunbelt Social Network conference, an annual event loosely linked with INSNA, and attended by between 150 and 300 network analysts. Traditions became quickly established:

- Most importantly: Being informal, having fun, but being serious about our work.
- Use of the term "Sunbelt" in our conference, signaling our lack of pomposity;
- Meeting in warm, sunny climates in funky places in the winter getaway month of February;
- Alternating between the American east and west coasts;
- Having only two or three colleagues do the arranging in a bureaucratically light way;
- Doing most things informally by volunteers rather than formally through committees;
- Encouraging innovative sessions;
- Letting session organizers do their own refereeing;
- Heavily relying on the self-refereeing of participants who did not want to embarrass themselves in front of their network peers;
- Running introductory and technical workshops, generally taught till now by Steve Borgatti, Katie Faust, Bill Richards, Stanley Wasserman and myself.
- Avoid sessions during PTH (the peak tanning hours between Noon and 3 PM ☐ a great time for the informal networking that is the heart of every good conference);
- Eating well at night.
- Limiting ceremonies to an annual banquet at which a leading figure would give a keynote address.

The initial pattern has held up well, with the big change being a switch to a three-year rotation: the third year being in Europe at an attractive location. This revised pattern has helped keep the conference and INSNA truly international.

6. In addition to being a conference founder, Lin Freeman founded *Social Networks* in 1978, a year after INSNA/*Connections* got under way. He has been its intrepid editor ever since, joined in 1999 by Ron Breiger as co-editor. *Social Networks* has been an

adventuresome, refereed, in-house, quarterly journal that publishes articles by and for social network analysts. It proudly bills itself as a "journal of structural analysis," indicating its hospitality to a range of ideas and methods. In the past year, a fledgling *Journal of Social Structure*, edited by Lin's one-time student David Krackhardt, has appeared as an online journal.

7. Lin Freeman, who was starting a lot of things in those days, also secured a U.S. National Science Foundation grant in 1978 to set up one of the first computerized conferencing systems for scientists: a precursor of what would later transmute into the Internet. (Lin is the Original Net Surfer. [\(10\)](#)) Unlike the current, distributed Internet system, the EIES system we used then allowed about 25 network analysts to make a local call (to what we would now call an ISP, run by GTE) into a single server in Newark, New Jersey. [\(11\)](#) Our activity prefigured the great use that invisible scholars currently make use of the Internet (Koku, Nazer and Wellman 2001). Using software developed by founding INSNA board members Peter and Trudy Johnson-Lenz, EIES afforded what we would call today "newsgroups" (collective discussions for the entire group), and more selective "electronic mail" (one-to-one or one-to-many). [\(12\)](#) Because of the use of a single server to store all messages until the recipient retrieved, we were able to do things we cannot do today on the web: (1) EIES could cancel a misguided message after it had been sent (but before it had been retrieved): This feature eliminated many flames. (2) EIES made it easy for any participant to form and dissolve *ad hoc* discussion groups. Being on EIES gave social network analysis a certain cachet, helped our intellectual and organizational discussions, and gave me snob status when I began collaborating with computer scientists in 1990 ("What? You only started doing email in 1982!").

Evaluative research by Lin and Sue Freeman (1980) showed a J-curve distribution of participation in the computerized EIES conference. Just as in face-to-face discussions, some participated a lot; others did not. Lurking was even easier on-line than in a big conference room. Absences are hard to perceive, and it was almost impossible to notice which EIES members were only lurking or not participating at all. On-line discussion was fitful. By contrast, when scholars meet face-to-face at intermittent conferences, we have saved up over the year lots of interesting things to say to one another. Perhaps one or two good ideas is about all that most scholars can muster annually.

8. In addition to serious substantive articles and books, a variety of integrative books began appearing. J. Clyde Mitchell's pioneering edited collection (1969) was followed by others, including Paul Holland and Samuel Leinhardt (1979) and Wellman and Berkowitz (1988, 1997). David Knoke and James Kuklinski's 100-pager (1982) helped many figure out what network methods were all about; Wasserman and Faust's (1994) heavier tome magisterially provides methods and more. Steve Berkowitz did an early book-length treatise (1982) about the structural analytic approach, notable for its broad purview. John Scott has done a more recent one (1991), its reach limited by his non-involvement in the Sunbelts. Among the more specialized books, those by Rogers and Kincaid (1981), Burt (1982, 1992), Tilly (1984), Knoke (1990), and White (1992) speak to broader audiences than their titles might suggest.

9. When we began doing social network analysis, it was a black art; now it is a light grey one. *UCINET*, begun by Lin Freeman and developed by Steve Borgatti, Martin Everett and associates, is the most widely-disseminated package for analyzing a single "whole network". Its current version runs on Windows 98, although its companion graphics program, *Krackplot*, is still DOS-bound. Other programs have appeared and are used, including the Dutch *GRADAP*, Ron Burt's *Structure*, Stan Wasserman and Phillipa Pattison's *p**, and Bill Richards' *Negopy*, *Fatcat*, and *MultiNet*.⁽¹³⁾ Most years, there are good introductory seminars to *UCINET*, *p** and MultiNet at the Sunbelt conferences, and Wasserman has been running heavily-subscribed one-week summer courses for years at the University of Michigan's ICPSR (Inter-University for Political and Social Research). Although these affordable, usable, and useful programs have made network analysis do-able by the masses, the affordable availability of these usable and useful programs has obscured other aspects of network analysis:

- Because most programs analyze only one social network at a time, they are convenient to use when analyzing batches of networks, something that is done frequently by those studying personal networks of community, support and information flow. John Sonquist, myself and associates have shown some ways of using the widely distributed *SPSS* and *SAS* statistical packages to deal with such matters.⁽¹⁴⁾
- Current network analytic programs stay at one level of analysis — the network. Yet many intellectual issues profit from being able to analyze individuals and ties in relation to the characteristics of the networks in which they are embedded. Multilevel analysis offers one approach to this (Snijders 1999; Wellman and Frank 2000).
- The seductive precision of software packages has obscured the value of qualitative analyses — ethnographic, archival, etc. — to the study of organizations, communities, social movements, and world systems. To some extent, the unstatistical have avoided involvement in INSNA and the Sunbelt. However, those who do participate are welcomed and heeded, and *Connections* has always deliberately included such work.

Passing It On

When you start something you love, it is hard to turn it loose. I adored every day I headed INSNA for 12 years. (To me INSNA began in 1976 when I started soliciting interest, not our formal 1977 start date.) But I began to be burdened by the time it took away from getting my own research and writing done. I also realized that we couldn't be sure that INSNA was really a society until others had taken it over and run it.

Several successions later, I am comfortable. My proudest moment since starting INSNA and getting out the first *Connections* was when I was successfully replaced. This was the closest that I'll ever come to being a proud *Bar Mitzvah* parent. Susan Greenbaum and Alvin Wolfe, two anthropologists at the University of South Florida, agreed to share the jobs of INSNA Coordinator and *Connections* Editor.⁽¹⁵⁾ They took over with enthusiasm

and organization. I asked if I could stay on as International Coordinator and satisfy my journalistic itch by continuing to write for *Connections* an 8-12 page article that brings together short items that strike my interest and I hope provoke yours. They graciously agreed, as have subsequent editors and coordinators. As a compulsive magpie and contributor, I've continued to compile many of *Connections'* abstracts and book summaries.

It has been interesting watching INSNA change since I moved from founder to *eminence grise*. We've largely kept our informal, ad hoc character, as Greenbaum / Wolfe gave way to Katie Faust / John Skvoretz (Univ of South Carolina), Steve Borgatti / Candy Jones (Boston University School of Management), and now to the long distance leadership of Martin Everett (our first "president" instead of coordinator, Greenwich University, UK), and Bill Richards (*Connections* co-editor, Simon Fraser University, Canada) and Tom Valente (*Connections* co-editor, UCLA, USA). Many founding stalwarts such as Russ Bernard and Lin Freeman are still active, although Clyde Mitchell has passed on, others have retired, and many have drifted elsewhere. New faces keep showing up at the Sunbelt, and what is more important, keep coming back. We're on the web and our email discussion list is lively, informative, and not too time-consuming. *Connections* now looks much more professional but has kept its mission and its informality.

My major concern is that we have become too formal in some ways □ changing the name of our organizer from "Coordinator" to "President" □ but not structured enough in other ways. Despite the explosive growth of interest in social network analysis, our membership hasn't commensurately grown in size. *Connections* is less timely, coming out now only twice per year. I think advice needs to come from a matrix structure of board members that would represent □ and recruit □ network analysts from our disciplines and our countries.

At times, I also worry how we are developing. On the one hand, I *kvell* at the proliferation of serious substantive papers and the ready availability and easy use of heavy-duty methods. On the other, I get concerned that despite the participation of so many smart people, our work has not cumulated enough or developed enough integrated theory. Why is it that many people with network analytic sensibilities do not participate? When I ask, they tell me that our methods are too hard and our scope is too narrow. Or else, they think that only a metaphoric "network" sensibility is enough. I wonder how to reach out to them so that a broad, rigorous structural analytic perspective flourishes.

Yet no founder can realistically hope that all of his foibles will become graven in immortal stone. I'm delighted that I started INSNA, that many of my ideas about how to do it have persisted, and that so many people continue to enjoy it, profit from it, and contribute to it. I am joyous every time I encounter INSNA in action □ through *Connections*, *Social Networks*, the Sunbelt conference, the web-site, and our daily networking on and off line.

References

Berkowitz, S. D. 1982. *An Introduction to Structural Analysis: The Network Approach to Social Research*. Toronto: Butterworth.

Burt, Ronald. 1982. *Toward a Structural Theory of Action*. New York: Academic Press.

Burt, Ronald. 1992. *Structural Holes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Craven, Paul and Barry Wellman. 1973. "The Network City." *Sociological Inquiry* 43 (1): 57-88.

Freeman, Linton and Sue Freeman. 1980. "A Semi-Visible College: Structural Effects on a Social Network Group." Pp. 77-85 in *Electronic Communication: Technology and Impacts*, edited by M.M. Henderson and M.J. MacNaughton. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Hiltz, S. Roxanne and Murray Turoff. 1978. *The Network Nation*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley. 2nd ed. 1993. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Holland, Paul and Samuel Leinhardt (eds.) 1979. *Perspectives on Social Network Research*. New York: Academic Press.

Johnson-Lenz, Peter and Trudy. 1998. "Groupware: Coining and Defining It." *SIGGROUP Bulletin* 19 (2): 34.

Knoke, David. 1990. *Political Networks: The Structural Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Knoke, David and James Kuklinski. 1982. *Network Analysis*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Koku, Emmanuel, Nancy Nazer and Barry Wellman. 2001. "Netting Scholars." *American Behavioral Scientist*: forthcoming (February).

Metcalf, Bob. 1999. "The Visionary Thing: Hey, It's Not Easy Being a Valley Proto-Prophet." *Wired*, November: 300-303.

Mitchell, J Clyde (ed.). 1969. *Social Networks in Urban Situations*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Mulherin, James P., Hugh M. Kawabata, and John A. Sonquist. 1981. "Relational Databases for Combined Network and Attribute Data Files: A SAS Implementation." *Connections* 4(1):22-31

Mullins, Carolyn. 1977. *A Guide to Writing and Publishing in the Social and Behavioral Sciences*. New York: Wiley.

Mullins, Nicholas. 1973. *Theories and Theory Groups in Contemporary American Sociology*. New York: Harper and Row.

Müller, Christoph, Barry Wellman and Alexandra Marin. 1999. "How to Use SPSS to Study Ego-Centered Networks." *Bulletin de Methode Sociologique* 69 (Oct): 83-100

Rogers, Everett and D. Lawrence Kincaid. 1981. *Communication Networks*. New York: Free Press.

Scott, John. 1991. *Social Network Analysis*. London: Sage.

Snijders, Tom and Roel J. Bosker. 1999. *Introduction to Multilevel Analysis*. London: Sage.

Tilly, Charles. 1984. *Big Structures, Large Processes, Huge Comparisons*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Wasserman, Stanley and Katherine Faust. 1994. *Social Network Analysis: Methods and Applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wellman, Barry. 1992. "How to Use SAS to Study Egocentric Networks." *Cultural Anthropology Methods* 4 (2): 6-12.

Wellman, Barry and S.D. Berkowitz (eds.). 1988. *Social Structures: A Network Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Updated ed. 1997. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Wellman, Barry and Kenneth Frank. 2000. "Network Capital in a Multi-Level World: Getting Support from Personal Communities." Forthcoming in *Social Capital*, edited by Nan Lin, Ron Burt and Karen Cook. Chicago: Aldine

De Gruyter, White, Harrison. 1992. *Identity and Control*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

1. Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto, Ontario, Canada. I would be thankful for your comments. Began and largely written Nov. 1999; completed May, 2000. Email: wellman@chass.utoronto.ca Web: <http://www.chass.utoronto.ca/~wellman>

2. This paper is dedicated to the late J. Clyde Mitchell who welcomed me to British network analysis in 1974 and continued as a friend, enthusiastic member of INSNA, and frequent contributor to Connections until his death in 1995. I also appreciate the advice, comments, editing, and continued support of Bev Wellman.

3. J. Clyde Mitchell, Chris Pickvance, and Bryan Roberts at the University of Manchester; J.A. (John) Barnes at Cambridge; Abner Cohen and Adrian Mayer at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London; Peter Willmott at the Institute of Community Studies, London; Ray Pahl at the University of Kent; Howard Newby at the University of Essex; Colin Bell at Aston University (Birmingham); Norman Long at Durham University; Brian Elliott, Charles Jones and Anthony (Tony) Coxon up at Edinburgh University. Our elders—Clyde Mitchell, John Barnes and Peter Willmott—were especially supportive.

4. The initial Advisory Board consisted of Janet Abu-Lughod, J.A. Barnes, Colin Bell, Stephen Berkowitz, Jeremy Boissevain, Nancy Marshall Chapman, A.P.M. (Tony) Coxon, Bonnie Erickson, Claude Fischer, Linton Freeman, Harriet Friedmann, Gerald Gold, Mark Granovetter, Gudmund Hernes, S. Roxanne Hiltz, Leslie Howard, Peter & Trudy Johnson-Lenz, Charles Kadushin, Fred Katz, T. David Kemper, Edward Laumann, Joel Levine, J. Clyde Mitchell, Robert Mokken, Christopher Pickvance, Bengt Rundblad, Christopher Smith, David Todd, Herman Turk, Lois Verbrugge, Peter Willmott, and Bev Wellman (conjugal consultant). Of these only Erickson, Freeman, Laumann, and the Wellmans were at the April 2000 (Vancouver) International Sunbelt Social Network Conference.

5. These students were most notably: Karen Anderson, Peter Carrington, Liviana Mostacci Calzavara, June Corman, Barry Edginton, Vicente Espinoza, Alan Hall, David Hillock, Robert Hiscott, Edward Lee, Barry (Crump) Leighton, Michelle Martin, Keiko Minai, Pat Parisi, Alexandra Radkewycz, R.J. (Jack) Richardson, Cyndi Rottenberg, Alicia VanDerMeer, Walter Carroll, and Scot Wortley. Although INSNA has largely left Toronto, we currently have an active crew of network analysis graduate students: Susan Bastani, Mark Chapman (Religious Studies), Keith Hampton, Dimitrina Dimitrova, Laura Garton, Emanuel Koku, Nancy Nazer, Emi Ooka, Anabel Quan-Haase (Information Studies), Detelina Radoeva, and Alicia Zuccala (Information Studies). Caroline Haythornthwaite recently graduated to Assistant Professor at the Graduate School of Library and Information Science, University of Illinois, Nancy Nazer is joining Nortel Network's Digital Interpretative group (11/00), and Keith Hampton will be an Assistant Professor of Urban Studies and Technology at MIT (1/01).

6. Source: An undated grant proposal I prepared in the early 1980s.

7. At the 2000 Sunbelt-related Vancouver festschrift for Lin Freeman, Ron Burt referred to the early "Harvard hegemony" in social network analysis. Despite the handicap of a Harvard-less education, I recall that Ron set the record during his early career for the most articles written and abstracted in *Connections* per issue. It was not a closed system; there was affirmative action for Chicago graduates.

8. Nick's widow, Carolyn Mullins, was closely involved with his work at Harvard and while he was writing theory groups. A professional teacher of technical writing, Carolyn taught many of us how to write clearly – see her *A Guide to Writing and Publishing in the Behavioral Sciences* (1977). Carolyn Rack continues in the writing game, working with her husband Phil in Columbus Ohio USA, as editor/publisher of a major periodical for the hardware and plumbing trades.

9. I didn't do any conference organizing after 1978. Editing and publishing *Connections* and building INSNA was more than enough.

10. The evidence is clearly visible in the Freeman festschrift t-shirt produced by Bill Richards for the Vancouver 2000 Sunbelt.

11. EIES (the Electronic Information Exchange System) was originally developed by NJ Institute of Technology computer scientist Murray Turoff for the US Office of Civilian Defense, with substantial input from his soon-to-be wife, S. Roxanne Hiltz – a Lazarsfeld/Columbia-trained, small-groups sociologist, an original INSNA board member. Hiltz and Turoff's *The Network Nation* book (1978, 1993) is named after the "Network City" article that I wrote with an undergraduate (Craven and Wellman 1973).

12. P+T also invented the now widely-used term, "groupware," about that time; see the account in Johnson-Lenz and Johnson-Lenz 1998.

13. You can find information about most social network software packages on INSNA's website: http://www.heinz.cmu.edu/project/INSNA/soft_inf.html

14. Mulherin, Kawabata and Sonquist (1981); Wellman (1992); Müller, Wellman and Marin (1999).

15. Conspiracy theorists should note that it is Lafayette College, not Harvard, that dominated INSNA at the start. Al Wolfe had taught at Lafayette in the early 1960s while I was an undergraduate there. Having not yet come to my career senses (I was following my parents' wishes to become a doctor — "or at least a dentist"), I did not take courses from him then.
