

**Leopoldina FORTUNATI**

### ***Reflections on Mediated Gossip***

In this paper I would like to advance some reflections about the construct of gossip and its social practice from my observatory on the new media. According to Foster (2004), who reviewed half century of gossip research, psychological research has been relatively little on this topic. Furthermore, most data are not parametric. So he argues that both gossip theory needs to be strengthened and that research methods could benefit from the application of neurobiological and social network analysis. The gossip is a communicative practice which corresponds to the 'social grooming' among primates. However, among humans this practice becomes more complicated because it is carried out in the backstage of social communication, that is in its informal level. In fact it is practised in absence of the person who is object of the gossip and in co-presence with interlocutors. The absence of the person object of gossip is a fundamental premise, because it allows a more free expression of thinking on his/her behaviour. Social spaces are in fact governed by rules of discretion (Simmel, 1906) and by the concern to not say unpleasant things to the others. Gossip is an old communicative practice that has had a great social efficiency in pre-industrial societies.

In the traditional everyday life, this practice, such as it was experienced in rural villages, served as exercise of social comparison and control, re-affirmation of social rules and moral norms, elaboration and structuration of reality (Wert & Salovey, 2004). Modernization with its social consequences such as urbanization, development of individualization and spread of depersonalized and psychologically neutral social relationships, reshaped the social and communicative structure in which people were living. The anonymity of urban crowds and the new spatial organization of civil coexistence changed partially the practice of gossip. This practice has enlarged and was modified with the advent of both traditional and new media (Harrington & Bielby, 1995). The press was the first that captured this need and conveyed it even through more or less dedicate magazines (McAndrew & Milenkovic, 2002). Then, other information and communication technologies such as the telephone, mobile, television and the internet have been means of communication which this practice has tried to colonize (Thornborrow & Morris, 2004). Mediated gossip has ended up with cohabiting with gossip in co-presence (Fox, 2001). But what is new in the mediated gossip if compared to gossip in co-presence? Do its social meaning and functions have changed when it is carried out through new media?

### **References**

- Foster, E.K. (2004) Research on Gossip: Taxonomy, methods, and future directions, *Review of general psychology*, 8(2), pp.78-99.
- Fox, K. (2001) Evolution, Alienation and Gossip, Social Issues Research Centre, <http://www.sirc.org/publik/gossip.shtml> (consulted 02/14/2008).
- Lee Harrington, C. and Denise D. Bielby (1995) Where Did You Hear That? Technology and the Social Organization of Gossip, *The Sociological Quarterly*, 36(3), pp. 607-628.
- McAndrew Francis T. and Megan A. Milenkovic, (2002) Of Tabloids and Family Secrets: The Evolutionary Psychology of Gossip, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Volume 32, Issue 5, Page 1064-1082, May 2002, doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2002.tb00256.x
- Paine, R. (1967) What is gossip about? An Alternative Hypothesis, *Man*, 2(2), pp.278-285.
- Simmel, G. (1906) *Psychologie der Diskretion*, Der Tag, 2 e 4.9.

Thornborrow Joanna and Deborah Morris, (2004) Gossip as strategy: The management of talk about others on reality TV show 'Big Brother', *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 8(2), pp. 246-271, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9841.2004.00260.x

Warner, M. (2002) Publics and Counterpublics, 14(1):49-90; DOI:10.1215/08992363-14-1-49

Wert, Sarah R. and Peter Salovey (2004) A Social Comparison Account of Gossip, *Review of General Psychology*, 8(2), 122–137.

**Leopoldina FORTUNATI** is professor of Sociology of Communication at the Faculty of Education of the University of Udine. She represents Italy in the COST Domain Committee “Individuals, Societies, Cultures and Health”, and takes part in COST 298, “The Participation in the Broadband Society”. She has conducted many research projects in the field of gender studies, cultural processes, and communication technologies. She is the author of a number of articles and books, including *The Arcane of Reproduction* (Autonomea, 1995) and *I mostri nell'immaginario* (Angeli, 1995). She is the editor of *Gli Italiani al telefono* (Angeli, 1995), *Telecomunicando in Europa* (1998), with J. Katz and R. Riccini, of *Mediating the Human Body: Technology, Communication and Fashion* (2003), and with P.-L. Law and S. Yang, *New Technologies in Global Societies* (2006). Her works have been published in eleven languages. E-mail: [fortunati.deluca@tin.it](mailto:fortunati.deluca@tin.it).

