What Happens when Methods Move?

John Law and Evelyn Ruppert

Social worlds are saturated and materialised by methods that move between academic, governmental, commercial and social sites. In a digital world this is obvious, but the trend is hardly new. For instance, surveys grew up with Gallup polls in the US in the late 1930s and the Department of Agriculture during the Second World War. In the UK, they also became important in the Second World War with the Government Social Survey. Later in the 1960s the UK state used surveys to modernise government, and the method was embraced by a technocratic middle class that sought to distinguish itself from older gentlemanly intellectuals. Academics and especially sociologists also helped to develop survey methods, and in an era of quantification the survey has become a pre-eminent method in academic, commercial and government work.

The focus group was also created in the space between the academy and the state – in US media research early in World War Two. Interestingly Frankfurt School theorists such as Theodor Adorno played an important role in this – proof that the gap between theory and methods was smaller at this time than it was subsequently to become. Popularised by Paul Lazarsfeld and Robert K. Merton, focus groups were used to test how well radio programmes sold war bonds. But then the method largely disappeared from the academy. Why? Perhaps in the high era of American quantitative sociology it wasn’t thought to be scientific enough. Whatever the reason, it only reappeared in academic research in the 1980s. So where had it been? The answer is: in the private sector. Indeed, in the intervening period it had been turned into a core marketing research method.
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There are many more examples of methods on the move. Ethnographic methods have been used by organisation analysts, and auditing techniques by governments, corporations and academic research councils. And as the examples above suggest, methods also move across locations and get adapted to different social and cultural contexts. The population census is a good example of such a method that has been taken up by almost every state over the past 300 years. But such movements are neither simple nor transparent. Methods are reworked as they shift. They are reshaped, and reordered as they enter into new social and practical relations. And they are generative too, becoming active agents in both the representations and realities that they depict. For instance, it is widely recognised that theories about markets have not simply been used to describe how markets work, but have been used to format economic transactions.

"...it is widely recognised that theories about markets have not simply been used to describe how markets work, but have been used to format economic transactions."

The first of our seminars explores how methods move in markets and what happens when theories about the market move into practices. Speakers include Michel Callon and Fabian Muniesa (both from the Ecole Nationale Superieure des Mines de Paris) and Adam Leaver and Karel Williams (both from CRESC Manchester). A second explores what happens when methods move between film studies and science studies and the intersections between animation and automation. Lucy Suchman (Lancaster University) and Jacqueline Stacey (University of Manchester) are speaking at this. A third explores how methods move between film studies and science studies and the intersections between animation and automation. Lucy Suchman (Lancaster University) and Jacqueline Stacey (University of Manchester) are speaking at this. A third explores how methods move between film studies and science studies and the intersections between animation and automation. Lucy Suchman (Lancaster University) and Jacqueline Stacey (University of Manchester) are speaking at this.

More information about these – and other – seminars can be found at http://www.cresc.ac.uk/events/calendar.

New CRESC Working Papers

The following working papers have been added to the CRESC website http://www.cresc.ac.uk/publications/papers.htm

Working Paper No 92
The Age of Insecurity, Johnna Montgomerie – February

Working Paper No 106
The Reith Mission. An episode in the development of global telecommunications and in the demise of the British Empire’, Richard Collins – August

Working Paper No 107
Life, Death and Everyday Experience of Social Media’ Anita Greenhill, Gordon Fletcher – November

Working Paper No 108
Groundhog Day: elite power, democratic disconnects and the failure of financial reform in the UK’, Julie Froud, Sukhdev Johal, Adam Leaver, Michael Moran and Karel Williams - November

Working Paper No 109
‘Assembling the Baroque’, John Law - December

Working Paper No 110
Deep Stall? The Eurozone Crisis, banking reform and politics, Ismail Erturk, Julie Froud, Sukhdev Johal, John Law, Adam Leaver, Mick Moran, Karel Williams – March

Forthcoming Events

For more information about all our forthcoming events please check out our website: http://www.cresc.ac.uk/
Bringing home the bacon: rebalancing the economy and the food industry

Andrew Bowman

Talk abounds at present on the need to ‘rebalance’ the UK economy away from financial services and towards manufacturing. During the past 30 years of neoliberalism ‘industrial policy’ became taboo, associated with sheltering failed industries from healthy competition. Better to let the market decide, and embrace the ‘weightless’ knowledge economy. In rhetoric at least this has now changed, even amongst the likes of George Osborne, who ended his 2011 budget speech with a vision of “a Britain carried aloft by the march of the makers.”

Proposals for rebalancing the economy still tend to focus on high-tech industries in which the UK might hope to gain an early lead. But what about the fundamentals of the economy, like food for example? The food industry is the largest single element of British manufacturing, accounting for around 15% of the sector, and the pig meat industry provides a useful case study of the challenges and opportunities in this area.

Most of the pork, bacon and sausages eaten in the UK come from overseas, and most of it would have been illegal to produce under UK animal welfare laws. Its origins are not low-wage emerging economies though, but high-wage northern Europe: the Netherlands and Denmark, for example, together account for over 50% of the UK’s bacon market. The UK pig herd shrank dramatically from the late 1990s, from 800,000 breeding pigs in the late 1990s to less than 450,000 in 2010. As of 2008, the only countries in the EU that did worse in terms of self-sufficiency were Bulgaria, Greece, Latvia and Lithuania. Crisis has become the norm.

There is nothing inevitable about this story though, and the problem the British pig industry faces in regaining its lost ground is as much cultural as it is economic. Unlike its highly integrated EU competitors, the UK industry’s supply chain has been turned into a form of organised chaos. Producers must first – struggling with the vagaries of nature and fluctuations in price and demand – create a complex product which is disassembled into a range of basic materials at the primary processing stage, and then at the secondary stage re-assembled into complex consumer items which must be quickly sold to powerful supermarket retailers. The supermarkets fight on the one hand to drive down prices and win a bigger share of the grocery market, and on the other to increase their (already more than healthy) profit margins to please shareholders. To win in this game, they squeeze their suppliers – using short-term contracts or more informal ‘agreements’ which allow them to switch suppliers at short notice. The result? Matching supply to demand becomes extremely difficult, forcing producers and processors to follow the supermarkets in pursuing a strategy that we call ‘opportunistic transactionalism’, as they attempt to clear their inventories. The lack of stability deter them from making productivity-enhancing investments, and the complexity of the supply chain adds transaction costs, waste and added environmental damage. All parties seem to recognise the defects of the system on some level, but are unable to break from it when it enables them to achieve short term gains at the expense of trading competitors.

Official responses are locked in a straightjacket of orthodox micro-economics. The pathological competition is not recognised as such, and solutions forthcoming involve attempts to perfect competition by punishing the most blatant abuses of buyer power, increasing ‘transparency’ and ‘communication’ among market actors, and setting standards. Additional government intervention cannot be conceived of beyond clumsy subsidies or protection measures to prop up losers.

Things do not have to be as they are. Our research seeks to demonstrate that they are the outcome of a particular business culture which has become so entrenched in the behaviour of management and the operation of firms as to appear common-sense. Breaking from this, we argue, requires the government taking steps to incentivise the production of UK and/or regional value-added, more vertical integration to internalise supply chain conflicts, and a move toward industry-wide capacity reduction to eliminate the present power imbalances. Morrisons, for example, operate just such a model, and it is proving to be very successful enabling them to compete on price with the big supermarkets, whilst capturing margins, controlling quality, and supporting British farmers and industry. The adoption of this model on a wider basis could go some way towards fostering the industrial renaissance which politicians speak so much of at the moment. Reducing the UK’s import-dependence in food could provide enormous opportunities for increasing employment, decreasing the national carbon footprint and increasing the national carbon footprint and guaranteeing future food security in the face of volatile world commodity markets.

Andrew Bowman is a researcher currently working on a joint project between the CRESC Centre and Vion UK

Contact: andrew.bowman@manchester.ac.uk
To talk of the ‘future of the book’ is to immediately enter a complex field of materials, forms, and temporariness. For if one thing is certain here, the book and its associated mediums of inscription are heading in many directions in a future that is far from determined. It was with a mind to sample and intervene in this field and its futures that the colloquium Materialities of Text: Between the Codex and the Net took place in November 2011, co-convened by Sas Mays at the University of Westminster’s Archiving Cultures, who hosted the event, and myself.

The colloquium was less interested in speculating about the future of the book per se, than in exploring the many ‘materialities’ of which textual media are comprised. Materialities of text cohere in familiar objects — printed books, e-readers, blogs — but they are much else besides, including technical components, publishing architectures, paradigms and metaphors of reading and authorship, regimes of truth and authority, economic structures, the list can of course go on. Approached in this fashion, any text object is always a ‘hybrid’ or ‘assemblage’ of materials — structured, certainly, by dominant platforms, meanings, and economies, but also open, unfinished, and multiformal.

The colloquium was itself something of a minor experiment with textual materials, for it took place wholly online, where it functioned both as a site for presentation and discussion of short academic papers, and as a writing workshop toward articles that will be published in a special issue of New Formations (see archivingcultures.org). In our time of blogs and wikis this was in no sense a radical move, but it was a new experience for most of us — and though clearly not a substitute for face-to-face meeting and conference structure, it has some promising forms of its own. Mays remarks in one of the comment streams that unlike a conventional conference, the online platform allowed for asynchronous conversation that could ebb and flow over the course of two weeks, a conversation mediated and enriched through the books, online texts, and Web searches that were drawn upon in the gap between stimulus and response — a more ‘archival’, less ‘organic’ relationship to knowledge and communication. For Davin Heckman, whose paper explored ‘deliberation’ and the digital text, the comments function allowed for ‘something in between an essay and a conversation’, a style of writing shaped by the conventions of academic exchange but also by the affordances of the Web, simultaneously broad- and micro-cast in its address.

Heckman’s essay shared with the group as a whole an interest in a diverse range of textual materials. Johanna Drucker presented a speculative text on ‘diagrammatic writing’. For Drucker a ‘diagram is an image that works’, ‘it provokes and supports performative engagement by virtue of its structures and the relations they express’. It was especially pleasing to have this contribution because the diagram has been a relay point for a number of us working with ‘topology’ in CRESC’s Theme 4, and Drucker takes it to a realm we have not considered, the diagrammatic form of text. Drucker understands the diagrammatic orchestration of text to be inherent in writing — think of punctuation or footnotes — but it can become a means of experimentation and poetic in writing that makes deliberate use of graphical and spatial forms.

A thinker and practitioner of both digital media and the ‘artists’ book’, Drucker is wary of the hyperbolic claims to non-linearity that permeate the culture of new media; in many ways, the flat screen and the branching and linking structure of digital media are less diagrammatically sophisticated than the three-dimensional codex or than writing itself, which is ‘only superficially linear’. And so, attentive to design as much as to text and poetics, she seeks a properly diagrammatic writing adequate to the digital screen’s ‘flexible and fungible display space: ‘a kind of visio-logico-compositional authoring that engages mind-mapping, grids, matrices, lattices, and other spatialized structures whose semantic value as forms inflects and informs the production of meaning in the works they enable.’

Richard Burt’s contribution was equally nuanced in its handling of the many materialities of text, exploring the ‘biopolitical archive’ through the forms and materials of books as they are interlaced with the structures of citizenship, identity, and migration. He pursued the object and metaphor of the passport, in Benjamin’s reflections on books by the mentally ill and their entry, or not, into publishing — the ‘biblio-polis’ — and in the biometric passport. This dissimulating artifact which processes and partitions citizenship and its outside is a ‘hybrid’ of ‘printed book [and] a kind of e-book, a Kindle that doesn’t function’, its chips being loaded and locked in its articulation of state, border, and identity.

The political potential of the artists’ book was Janneke Adema and Gary Hall’s point of intervention. What might the problematisation of the book’s form and function among artists in the 1960s and ‘70s offer us today in challenging the structures of property, authorship, and distribution in new media publishing? It’s an important question if we are to approach the sensory, technical, and economic materialities of text as simultaneously sites of politics. As co-founder of the open access Open Humanities Press, Gary Hall brings a strong practical dimension to these questions. That practical dimension was to the fore also in the conversation I chaired among practitioners of independent media — AAAARG, Chito Delat?, I Cite, Mute, and Neural — which explored the politicization of publishing across the mediums of print and digital magazine, newspaper, blog, and online archive. In the course of conversation and in the essay by Mays on philosophies of the ‘infinite book’, attention shifted from the textuality of writing to that of computer code and the communicative structures of social media. Jodi Dean argued that as blogging transforms communication into quantified data — a field of posts, hits, and links, valued by pattern and volume rather than content, meaning, or consequence — writing becomes self-inscription in ‘communicative capitalism’. It’s a timely insistence on the political stakes of textual materials.

Contact: n.thoburn@manchester.ac.uk
The Lost Weekend?

Jill Ebrey

The weekend is a spatio-temporal construction that many of us take for granted. It has, remarkably, remained an important and pervasive institution, despite a social life, which as Swyngedouw (2004) and Harvey (1996) concur, is characterised by perpetual change, transformation and refiguration. It has become more than just the end of the week - Saturdays and Sundays have subsequently, as Rybczynski (1991) has pointed out, gained 'a spontaneous existence', in 'the weekend', a term which suggests a separateness from the week, a 'different' or 'alternative', time and space, something 'out of the ordinary'.

My PhD thesis involved looking at the weekend in terms of space, time and the everyday. I became interested in the weekend being 'out of the ordinary', yet very much of the everyday, whether in the 'mundane' context of the home or the more 'spectacular' contexts of the city at night. Time was also spent discussing the weekend with those who had to work on Saturdays and Sundays at a supermarket in Salford. Our conversations about their 'lost weekends', (many having signed new contracts which included compulsory weekend working), led me to consider both the importance of the weekend, the consequences of its loss for both social life and lives, and whether this loss was unevenly distributed. Emma, one of the women with whom I talked, expressed her relief at being 'awarded' weekends off in exchange for taking on a boring job in the supermarket from Monday to Friday. She explains why her working regime of a Monday to Friday cycle works for her, and compares weekends off with her formerly 'fragmented' working life:

‘To have a weekend off is a big deal.’ ...I’ve not had any routine for a long time...it’s always been scattered. I’ve always been doing something and something’s encroached on some day, something that I’ve had to do and I’ve never had like two days off together, a period of time when...there’s a period I could separate work from leisure time. It was always interspersed between the different bits. Everything was scattered about.

Emma then went on to explain the relief of being off at the weekend:

It’s a wind-down in whatever way from the week. There’s a lot of times when I’ve come home from work all upright and stressed out and I know I’ve got to go back in the morning and do it all again. At (the) weekend I can come home on a Friday night, I can relax or I can put my feet up or I can just, even if I’m not gonna literally sit down and unwind, I’m gonna let go of that little bit, let go of work for a couple of days and however I use the time, I know I’m not going back. I don’t have to think about that for a little while. I can just think about me and what I want to do. (24 year old supermarket worker).

How can we begin to research this? What questions might it be useful to ask? I have found myself in the position of being a defender of the weekend and it’s promise of ‘difference’. But is it useful to perpetuate the week/weekend binary? Could days ‘off’ in the week mean a greater ability to participate or conversely, might weekend working mean a form of cultural exclusion? But participate in what, and who can participate? Given its ubiquity as the subject of many popular cultural forms, just what is the weekend and would there be ‘popular culture’ if the weekend didn’t exist in its current form?

These issues are currently being addressed in collaboration with colleagues in Portugal at the University of Porto, in Spain at the University of the Basque Country and France. Together, we have formed an international research group focusing specifically on the weekend.

A CRESC workshop in autumn 2012 will consolidate our international network and further the debate around the weekend. All welcome!

Contact: jill.ebrey@manchester.ac.uk

Saturday afternoon – Moss Side, Manchester 1970’s (By kind permission of Caroline Binch)
It is now commonplace to talk about the ‘information age’ or the ‘information society’ as if information and communication technologies were not only ubiquitous but also socially determining. How are we to understand the significance of information in contemporary societies? How do different disciplines conceive of and research this slippery concept? Why does information matter?

The anthropologist and cyberneticist Gregory Bateson defined information as ‘the difference that makes a difference’ an idea which provided inspiration for a three-day interdisciplinary workshop organised by the Communication & Systems Department at the OU, in collaboration with CRESC researchers. The Difference That Makes a Difference was organised and chaired by David Chapman and Magnus Ramage (members of CRESC’s ‘Reframing the Nation’ research theme), and ran from the 7th-9th September 2011, in Milton Keynes. The workshop attracted 45 participants from 10 different countries and nearly as many disciplines.

The principal goal of this multi-disciplinary workshop was to debate very diverse understandings of and uses of the term information and its relationship with forms of knowledge production and dissemination. The first session of the workshop ‘What is information?’ wrestled with philosophical and theoretical ideas of information. Some posit a dichotomy between ‘hard’ information (as if it were a material entity) and ‘soft’ information (as a way of experiencing the world), but Wolfgang Hofkirchner argued for a dialectical combination in pursuit of a ‘universal theory of information’ (UTI).

Competing concepts of information in the natural sciences and their importance for the public understanding of science were the focus of the second session. Keynote speakers, Vlatko Vedral from Oxford University and Jonathan Silvertown from the OU and others, explored how the concept of information is approached and represented in quantum physics, biodiversity, citizen science and environmental regulation. Highlights included presentations on the information needed by non-specialists to enable them to participate in scientific discourse, and the quality of data obtained through ‘citizen science’.

The third session, led by Richard Harper from Microsoft Research, explored the performativity of information and data within organisations, and information as the content of human communication. Tony Hirst from the OU examined new forms of data visualisation and the way patterns can be revealed through sophisticated visual models of complex data sets. Other topics included how cultural capital is acquired and augmented among users of Twitter, issues of information, culture and evolution, and the semiotic analysis of the use of arrows in printed media and signposts. A key theme here included ‘making sense of muddle’ – finding ways to navigate through complex multiple information sources, how to tackle non-coherence, and how best to communicate very diverse understanding of information through a variety of different media.

The final main session was explicitly ‘sociological’ in its focus. Hugh Mackay discussed the ways in which empirical sociology is being transformed and challenged by the abundance of information – here conceived of as social and demographic data – now being collected by and made available to commercial organisations (such as the MOSAIC database of households). Such information is generally not available to academics but has much to reveal about social worlds, and the ways the social is being classified and defined. Hugh talked about his placement in an AHRC funded Public Policy Fellowship based in Audience Research at the BBC World Service where he has been granted access to BBC social media data. Based in CReSC, this kind of collaboration between CReSC and BBC researchers provides a fruitful way forward for tackling some of the thorny problems raised during the conference (For more information about the fellowship and the collaboration please see http://www8.open.ac.uk/researchprojects/diasporas/news/public-policy-fellowship-at-the-bbc-world-service).

An interdisciplinary understanding of information is still taking shape, but in this workshop we were able to participate in, and help the ongoing conversation. Full proceedings of the event, with recordings of each talk and plenary discussions, plus copies of the slides, can be found at http://www.dtmrd2011.info/programme.

We are currently editing a special issue of the online journal Triple-C containing papers arising from the workshop, and planning a further event to be held in April 2013.

Contact: m.ramage@open.ac.uk
CRESC Annual Conference

Promises: Crisis and Socio-Cultural Change

The University of Manchester, UK
Wednesday 5th-Friday 7th September 2012

Speakers include:
Barbara Adam (Social Sciences, Cardiff University), Robert Boyer (ENS, Paris),
Will Hutton (Hertford College, Oxford University),
Elizabeth A. Povinelli (Anthropology, Columbia University)
plus Aditya Chakrabortty (The Guardian) and Paul Mason (BBC Newsnight)

In the midst of global financial crisis and radical transformations in states, institutions, environments and social relations, it is vital to explore the role promises play in effecting socio-cultural change. We use the word ‘promises’ to encapsulate the range of plans, policies, projects, dreams and visions that both open and close the possibility of different kinds of socio-cultural futures (and pasts). Asking ‘What promises are contained in the current moment of crisis? And ‘What social futures should we plan for or anticipate?’ The 2012 CRESC conference will explore how promises are made to work and fail in the following contexts and fields:

- **Capitalism**: in the midst of rolling crisis, what are the (broken) promises of financialised and globalised capitalism? What rewards do consumption and investment now promise?
- **Democracy**: what projections can we make for future democracies, for forms of civic representation and participation? What futures are anticipated in the political reforms of crisis and in the actions of elites?
- **Expertise**: what are the prospects of the knowledge fields of politics, higher education, media, law, science and the sustainable environment? What is the emergent potential for new, progressive or transformative public knowledge?
- **Intimacies**: what promises are implicated in transformations of everyday intimacies and personal relationships? How are intimacies being re-configured through objects, networks, technologies and bodily practices?
- **Cultures**: what counts as a successful future in terms of cultural policy, production, participation, engagement or inclusion? Which histories and whose values underpin forecasts of lifestyles, life chances and cultural futures?
- **Methods**: what methods and techniques meet the challenge of understanding complex patterns of socio-cultural change? How are we to understand promises when confronted by different (non)coherencies, (dis)connections, localities and dispersals?

We invite paper contributions on these and related topics that seek to explore – both theoretically and empirically - the ways in which different plans, projects and visions are shaping social futures and patterns of socio-cultural change. We are concerned with how such promises inform and relate to concrete impacts, successes and failures - as well as their rhetorical function and their intended and unintended consequences. Overall, we aim to show how promises both sustain and transform socio-cultural worlds.

Please submit either a) proposal for individual papers or b) full panel proposal by **Friday 20th April 2012**

Proposal Forms can be downloaded from the CRESC website at by clicking on the following link: [http://www.cresc.ac.uk/events/cresc-annual-conference](http://www.cresc.ac.uk/events/cresc-annual-conference) and returned via CRESC.AnnualConference@manchester.ac.uk

Alternatively, proposal forms can be returned to the following address:
CRESC Conference Administration, 178 Waterloo Place, Oxford Road, University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL, UK.
Tel: +44(0)161 275 8985 / Fax: +44(0)161 275 8985

For more information please contact Dr Mark Banks, CRESC 2012 Conference Chair at m.o.banks@open.ac.uk
Welcome to CRESC...

Andrew Bowman

Andrew studied social anthropology at the University of Manchester, before doing a PhD at the University's Centre for the History of Science Technology and Medicine. He is now working as a research assistant at CRESC.

Tone Huse

Tone is visiting CRESC in spring 2012. She is a research fellow and PhD-candidate at the University of Tromsø, and her doctoral research examines how citizenship is enacted in urban efforts to mitigate climate change. Her main academic curiosity lies in the different ways the political can work in and through the city. Previously she has worked on issues related to neoliberal urbanism, activist uses of urban public spaces, gentrification, ethnicity and segregation.

Stewart Muir

I have a longstanding interest in the ways in which visions of the past are drawn upon and projected into imagined futures. After working as an Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultant in Victoria, Australia, for nearly a decade, I completed a PhD in Social Anthropology at La Trobe University that explored the circulation of images of Aboriginality in New Age spiritualities and how such imagery was used in both projects of self making and in visions of a new kind of nation. Since coming to Manchester several years ago, and working with the Morgan Centre for the Study of Relationships and Personal Life, I have undertaken research into family rituals and traditions in the English northwest and the ways in which these are brought into life in participant speech and acts.

Within CRESC, I am currently working on the Step-Change project, a major qualitative panel study undertaken with participants in Leeds and Manchester. This project is designed to develop understanding of the complex mix of factors underlying transport practices, especially transport behaviour change. Over a four-year period, we are following households in both cities and will explore their histories of mobility and travel as well as the ways in which their travel choices are influenced by both the built environment and life factors such as getting a new job, having children, or moving house. The insights we glean from this study will be used to help challenge existing planning paradigms and develop a foundation for transport planners and decision-makers to better imagine, and make, sustainable urban futures.

Research Interests:
• Sustainable lifestyles
• Utopias and imagined futures
• Domestic and family ‘traditions’
• Indigenous and settler life in southeast Australia
• Australian nationalism
• New age and alternative spiritualities
• Cultural appropriation and intellectual property

Stewart is also co-convenor of the Pacific Interest Group.

Annabel Pinker

Annabel completed her doctoral thesis at the University of Cambridge in 2010. She is now a postdoctoral research associate at CRESC working on the collaborative project “Experimental States”, which focuses on the neoliberal state in Peru. As part of this, she has been following the political and technical processes entailed in the elaboration of a road engineering study in Cusco, exploring how these enact and rearticulate concepts of the state.