choice theory or resource mobilization theory in the study of social movements. In contrast, frame analysis emphasized agency, the free choice of both activists and audiences (especially of potential participants in a movement), the importance of meaning and interpretation in human events, and the cultural backgrounds out of which varying interpretations of events could arise or within which interpretations could be accepted. Frame analysts studied, for instance, how activists devised arguments that would appeal to broad publics; how media organizations interpreted public events in politically consequential ways; and how various audiences responded to different appeals and interpretations. In America, for example, movements often frame their arguments as a fight against "injustice" and cast arguments drawing on widely held values, such as individual rights, equality of opportunity, or freedom from government intervention. Scholars examined how the "alignment" of frames with the fundamental values of audiences affected acceptability and how frames could be extended or reshaped. The underlying message of frame analysis in social movements theory is that a movement's audiences—members, potential members, opponents, and the public at large—are affected by the interpretation they place on events, and the interpretations (a) can be shaped deliberately by movement activists and (b) frequently rest on emotional and symbolic responses to messages as much as on logical or empirical grounds.

— Daniel F. Chambliss

See also Discourse; Goffman, Erving; Social Movement Theory

FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

Benford, Robert D. and David A. Snow. 2000. "Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26:611–39.

Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Snow, David A., E. Burke Rochford Jr., Steven K. Worden, and Robert D. Benford. 1986. "Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation." *American Sociological Review* 51(4):464–81.

Williams, Rhys H. and Robert D. Benford. 2000. "Two Faces of Collective Action Frames: A Theoretical Consideration." *Current Perspectives in Social Theory* 20:127–51. Greenwich, CT: JAI.

FRANKFURT SCHOOL

The "Frankfurt school" refers to a group of German American theorists who developed powerful analyses of the changes in Western capitalist societies that occurred since the classical theory of Marx. Working at the *Institut fur Sozialforschung* in Frankfurt, Germany, in the late 1920s and early 1930s, theorists such as Max Horkheimer, T. W. Adorno, Herbert Marcuse, Leo Lowenthal, and Erich Fromm produced some of the first accounts within critical social theory of the importance of mass culture and communication in social reproduction and domination. The Frankfurt school also generated one of the first models of a critical cultural studies to analyze the processes of cultural production and political economy, the politics of cultural texts, and audience reception and use of cultural artifacts (Kellner 1989, 1995). The approach is valuable in that it links the reading and critique of cultural texts with economic analysis of the system of cultural production and social analysis of uses and effects of media culture. This systematic approach combines social theory with cultural criticism in a synoptic approach that overcomes the one-sidedness of many positions within cultural studies and media critique.

Moving from Nazi Germany to the United States, the Frankfurt school experienced firsthand the rise of a media culture involving film, popular music, radio, television, and other forms of mass culture (Wiggershaus 1994). In the United States, where they found themselves in exile, media production was by and large a form of commercial entertainment controlled by big corporations. Two of its key theorists, Max Horkheimer and T. W. Adorno, developed an account of the "culture industry" to call attention to the industrialization and commercialization of culture under capitalist relations of production ([1948] 1972). This situation was most marked in the United States, which had little state support of film or television industries and where a highly commercial mass culture emerged that came to be a distinctive feature of capitalist societies and a focus of critical cultural studies.

During the 1930s, the Frankfurt school developed a critical and transdisciplinary approach to cultural and communications studies, combining political economy, textual analysis, and analysis of social and ideological effects. They coined the term "culture industry" to signify the process of the industrialization of mass-produced culture and the commercial imperatives that drove the system. The critical theorists analyzed all mass-mediated cultural artifacts within the context of industrial production in which the commodities of the culture industries exhibited the same features as other products of mass production: commodification, standardization, and massification. The culture industries had the specific function, however, of providing ideological legitimation of the existing capitalist societies and of integrating individuals into their way of life.

For the Frankfurt school, mass culture and communications therefore stand in the center of leisure activity, are important agents of socialization and mediators of political

reality, and should thus be seen as major institutions of contemporary societies, with a variety of economic, political, cultural, and social effects. Furthermore, the critical theorists investigated the cultural industries in a political context as a form of the integration of the working class into capitalist societies. The Frankfurt school theorists were among the first neo-Marxian groups to examine the effects of mass culture and the rise of the consumer society on the working classes that were to be the instrument of revolution in the classical Marxian scenario. They also analyzed the ways in which the culture industries and consumer society were stabilizing contemporary capitalism and accordingly sought new strategies for political change, agencies of political transformation, and models for political emancipation that could serve as norms of social critique and goals for political struggle. This project required rethinking Marxian theory and produced many important contributions—as well as some problematical positions.

The Frankfurt school focused intently on technology and culture, indicating how technology was becoming both a major force of production and formative mode of social organization and control. In a 1941 article, "Some Social Implications of Modern Technology," Herbert Marcuse argued that technology in the contemporary era constitutes an entire "mode of organizing and perpetuating (or changing) social relationships, a manifestation of prevalent thought and behavior patterns, an instrument for control and domination" (p. 414). In the realm of culture, technology produced mass culture that habituated individuals to conform to the dominant patterns of thought and behavior, and thus provided powerful instruments of social control and domination.

Victims of European fascism, the Frankfurt school experienced firsthand the ways the Nazis used the instruments of mass culture to produce submission to fascist culture and society. While in exile in the United States, the members of the Frankfurt school came to believe that American "mass culture" was also highly ideological and worked to promote the interests of American capitalism. Controlled by giant corporations, the culture industries were organized according to the strictures of mass production, churning out mass-produced products that generated a highly commercial system of culture, which, in turn, sold the values, lifestyles, and institutions of "the American way of life."

The work of the Frankfurt school provided what Paul Lazarsfeld (1941), one of the originators of modern communications studies, called a "critical approach," which he distinguished from the "administrative research." The positions of Adorno, Lowenthal, and other members of the inner circle of the Institute for Social Research were contested by Walter Benjamin, an idiosyncratic theorist loosely affiliated with the institute. Benjamin, writing in Paris during the 1930s, discerned progressive aspects in new technologies of cultural production such as photography, film, and

radio. In "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction" (1969), Benjamin noted how new mass media were supplanting older forms of culture whereby the mass reproduction of photography, film, recordings, and publications replaced the emphasis on the originality and "aura" of the work of art in an earlier era. Freed from the mystification of high culture, Benjamin believed that media culture could cultivate more critical individuals, able to judge and analyze their culture just as sports fans could dissect and evaluate athletic activities. In addition, Benjamin believed, processing the rush of images in cinema created subjectivities better able to parry and comprehend the flux and turbulence of experience in industrialized, urbanized societies.

Himself a collaborator of the prolific German artist Bertolt Brecht, Benjamin worked with Brecht on films, created radio plays, and attempted to use the media as organs of social progress. In the essay "The Artist as Producer" ([1934] 1999), Benjamin argued that progressive cultural creators should "refunction" the apparatus of cultural production, turning theater and film, for instance, into a forum of political enlightenment and discussion rather than a medium of "culinary" audience pleasure. Both Brecht and Benjamin wrote radio plays and were interested in film as an instrument of progressive social change. In an essay on radio theory, Brecht anticipated the Internet in his call for reconstructing the apparatus of broadcasting from one-way transmission to a more interactive form of two-way, or multiple, communication (in Silberman 2000:41), a form first realized in CB radio and then electronically mediated computer communication.

Moreover, Benjamin wished to promote a radical cultural and media politics concerned with the creation of alternative oppositional cultures. Yet he recognized that media such as film could have conservative effects. While he thought it was progressive that mass-produced works were losing their "aura," their magical force, and were opening cultural artifacts for more critical and political discussion, he recognized that film could create a new kind of ideological magic through the cult of celebrity and techniques, such as the close-up that fetishized certain stars or images via the technology of the cinema. Benjamin was thus one of the first radical cultural critics to look carefully at the form and technology of media culture in appraising its complex nature and effects. Moreover, he developed a unique approach to cultural history that is one of his most enduring legacies, constituting a micrological history of Paris in the eighteenth century, an uncompleted project that contains a wealth of material for study and reflection.

Max Horkheimer and T. W. Adorno answered Benjamin's optimism in a highly influential analysis of the culture industry in their book *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, which first appeared in 1948 and was translated into English in 1972. They argued that the system of cultural production

dominated by film, radio broadcasting, newspapers, and magazines was controlled by advertising and commercial imperatives, and served to create subservience to the system of consumer capitalism. While later critics pronounced their approach too manipulative, reductive, and elitist, it provides an important corrective to more populist approaches to media culture that downplay the way the media industries exert power over audiences and help produce thought and behavior that conforms to the existing society.

The Frankfurt school also provides useful historical perspectives on the transition from traditional culture and modernism in the arts to a mass-produced media and consumer society. In his pathbreaking book, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere,* Jürgen Habermas further historicizes Adorno and Horkheimer's analysis of the culture industry. Providing historical background to the triumph of the culture industry, Habermas notes how bourgeois society in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries was distinguished by the rise of a public sphere that stood between civil society and the state, and mediated between public and private interests. For the first time in history, individuals and groups could shape public opinion, giving direct expression to their needs and interests while influencing political practice. The bourgeois public sphere made it possible to form a realm of public opinion that opposed state power and the powerful interests that were coming to shape bourgeois society.

Habermas notes a transition from the liberal public sphere that originated in the Enlightenment and the American and French Revolutions to a media-dominated public sphere in the current stage of what he calls "welfare state capitalism and mass democracy." This historical transformation is grounded in Horkheimer's and Adorno's analysis of the culture industry, in which giant corporations have taken over the public sphere and transformed it from a site of rational debate into one of manipulative consumption and passivity. In this transformation, "public opinion" shifts from rational consensus emerging from debate, discussion, and reflection to the manufactured opinion of polls or media experts. For Habermas, the interconnection between the sphere of public debate and individual participation has thus been fractured and transmuted into that of a realm of political manipulation and spectacle, in which citizen-consumers passively ingest and absorb entertainment and information. "Citizens" thus become spectators of media presentations and discourse that arbitrate public discussion and reduce its audiences to objects of news, information, and public affairs. In Habermas's (1989) words: "Inasmuch as the mass media today strip away the literary husks from the kind of bourgeois self-interpretation and utilize them as marketable forms for the public services provided in a culture of consumers, the original meaning is reversed" (p. 171).

Habermas's critics, however, contend that he idealizes the earlier bourgeois public sphere by presenting it as a forum of rational discussion and debate when, in fact, many social groups and most women were excluded. Critics also contend that Habermas neglects various oppositional working-class, plebeian, and women's public spheres developed alongside the bourgeois public sphere to represent voices and interests excluded by this forum (see the studies in Calhoun 1992 and Kellner 2000). Yet Habermas is right that in the period of the democratic revolutions, a public sphere emerged in which for the first time in history, ordinary citizens could participate in political discussion and debate, and organize and struggle against unjust authority. Habermas's account also points to the increasingly important role of the media in politics and everyday life and the ways in which corporate interests have colonized this sphere, using the media and culture to promote their own interests.

The culture industry thesis described both the production of massified cultural products and homogenized subjectivities. Mass culture, for the Frankfurt school, produced dreams, hopes, fears, and longings, as well as unending desire for consumer products. The culture industry produced cultural consumers who would consume its products and conform to the dictates and the behaviors of the existing society. And yet, as Walter Benjamin pointed out (1969), the culture industry also produces rational and critical consumers able to dissect and discriminate among cultural texts and performances, much as sports fans learn to analyze and criticize sports events.

In retrospect, one can see the Frankfurt school work as articulation of a theory of the stage of state and monopoly capitalism that became dominant during the 1930s. This was an era of large organizations, in which the state and giant corporations managed the economy and in which individuals submitted to state and corporate control. This period is often described as "Fordism," to designate the system of mass production and the homogenizing regime of capital that wanted to produce mass desires, tastes, and behavior. It was thus an era of mass production and consumption characterized by uniformity and homogeneity of needs, thought, and behavior, producing a mass society and what the Frankfurt school described as "the end of the individual." No longer was individual thought and action the motor of social and cultural progress; instead, giant organizations and institutions overpowered individuals. The era corresponds to the staid, conformist, and conservative world of corporate capitalism that was dominant in the 1950s, with its organization men and women, its mass consumption, and its mass culture.

During this period, mass culture and communication were instrumental in generating the modes of thought and behavior appropriate to a highly organized and massified social order. Thus, the Frankfurt school theory of the

culture industry articulates a major historical shift to an era in which mass consumption and culture were indispensable in producing a consumer society based on homogeneous needs and desires for mass-produced products, and a mass society based on social organization and homogeneity. It is culturally the era of highly controlled network radio and television, insipid top-40 pop music, glossy Hollywood films, national magazines, and other mass-produced cultural artifacts.

Of course, media culture was never as massified and homogeneous as was portrayed in the Frankfurt school model, and one could argue that the model was flawed even during its time of origin and influence and that other models were preferable, such as those of Walter Benjamin, Siegfried Kracauer, Ernst Bloch, and others of the Weimar generation, and, later, British cultural studies. Yet the original Frankfurt school model of the culture industry did articulate the important social roles of media culture during a specific regime of capital; and it provided a model, still of use, of a highly commercial and technologically advanced culture that serves the needs of dominant corporate interests and plays a major role in ideological reproduction and in enculturating individuals into the dominant system of needs, thought, and behavior. Moreover, its many theorists and texts provide a treasure-house of ideas, methods, and models that can still be applied in a wide range of projects within cultural studies and critical social theory today.

— Douglas Kellner

See also Benjamin, Walter; Cultural Marxism and British Cultural Studies; Habermas, Jürgen; Hollywood Film; Political Economy; Popular Music; Television and Social Theory

FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

Adorno, T. W. 1991. *The Culture Industry.* London: Routledge.
———. 1994. *The Stars Down to Earth and Other Essays on the Irrational in Culture.* London: Routledge.
Benjamin, Walter. 1969. "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." In *Illuminations.* New York: Shocken.
———. [1934] 1999. "The Artist as Producer." In *Collected Writings,* vol. 2. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Calhoun, Craig, ed. 1992. *Habermas and the Public Sphere.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Habermas, Jürgen. 1989. *Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Horkheimer, Max and T. W. Adorno. [1948] 1972. *Dialectic of Enlightenment.* New York: Herder & Herder.
Kellner, Douglas. 1989. *Critical Theory, Marxism, and Modernity.* Cambridge, UK, and Baltimore, MD: Polity and Johns Hopkins University Press.
———. 1995. *Media Culture: Cultural Studies, Identity, and Politics Between the Modern and the Postmodern.* New York and London: Routledge.
———. 2000. "Habermas, the Public Sphere, and Democracy: A Critical Intervention." In *Perspectives on Habermas,* edited by Lewis Hahn. Chicago, IL: Open Court Press.
Lazarsfeld, Paul. 1941. "Administrative and Critical Communications Research." *Studies in Philosophy and Social Science* IX(1):2–16.
Marcuse, Herbert. 1941. *Studies in Philosophy and Social Science* IX(1):414–39.
Silberman, Marc. 2000. *Bertolt Brecht on Film and Radio.* London: Metheun.
Wiggershaus, Rolf. 1994. *The Frankfurt School.* Cambridge, UK: Polity.

FREUD, SIGMUND

Sigmund Freud (1856–1939), one of the figures who has shaped the intellectual landscape of contemporary thought, is the founder of psychoanalysis. *Psychoanalysis,* as it is commonly known, is a form of psychotherapy ("analysis") that operates through the investigation of the human psyche. It also offers a rich theory of the development and function of the psyche.

Coming from a middle-class Jewish family, Freud originally trained as a doctor and adhered to a nineteenth-century scientific ideal for his whole life. His interests soon focused on mental illnesses, especially neuroses, and after a short stay in Paris where he studied with Jean-Martin Charcot, he set up a private practice in Vienna, where he was to spend almost all his life. Initially influenced by Joseph Breuer, a Vienna consultant, he eventually developed his own technique and ideas largely on his own. The first major statement of psychoanalysis was *The Interpretation of Dreams,* published in 1900. From then onward, Freud produced a constant flow of publications, tirelessly developing, questioning, and reformulating his own theoretical concepts. Psychoanalysis gradually gained an international audience but remained outside institutionalised medicine and university teaching. Freud, having fled occupied Vienna in 1938, died in London a year later. Psychoanalysis, while still largely marginal to official institutions, was to gain unprecedented growth after World War II, both as a therapeutic technique and as a theory of the psyche.

Freud's intellectual honesty precluded a well-polished theoretical edifice, and the vast domain of inquiry he opened up is still, more than a half century after his death, both fascinating and open to interpretation, not least regarding the relationship between the psyche and the social.

The analytic process, based on the person's own free association of thoughts, led Freud to postulate the existence of the "unconscious" as a specific level of operation of the

culture industry articulates a major historical shift to an era in which mass consumption and culture were indispensable in producing a consumer society based on homogeneous needs and desires for mass-produced products, and a mass society based on social organization and homogeneity. It is culturally the era of highly controlled network radio and television, insipid top-40 pop music, glossy Hollywood films, national magazines, and other mass-produced cultural artifacts.

Of course, media culture was never as massified and homogeneous as was portrayed in the Frankfurt school model, and one could argue that the model was flawed even during its time of origin and influence and that other models were preferable, snch as those of Walter Benjamin, Siegfried Kracauer, Ernst Bloch, and others of the Weimar generation, and, later, British cultural studies. Yet the original Frankfurt school model of the cnlture industry did articulate the important social roles of media culture during a specific regime of capital; and it provided a model, still of use, of a highly commercial and technologically advanced culture that serves the needs of dominant corporate interests and plays a major role in ideological reproduction and in encultnrating individuals into the dominant system of needs, thought, and behavior. Moreover, its many theorists and texts provide a treasure-house of ideas, methods, and models that can still be applied in a wide range of projects within cultural studies and critical social theory today.

— Douglas Kellner

See also Benjamin, Walter; Cultural Marxism and British Cultural Studies; Habermas, Jürgen; Hollywood Film; Political Economy; Popular Music; Television and Social Theory

FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

Adorno, T. W. 1991. *The Culture Industry.* London: Routledge.

———. 1994. *The Stars Down to Earth and Other Essays on the Irrational in Culture.* London: Routledge.

Benjamin, Walter. 1969. "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." In *Illuminations.* New York: Shocken.

———. [1934] 1999. "The Artist as Producer." In *Collected Writings,* vol. 2. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Calhoun, Craig, ed. 1992. *Habermas and the Public Sphere.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Habermas, Jürgen. 1989. *Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Horkheimer, Max and T. W. Adorno. [1948] 1972. *Dialectic of Enlightenment.* New York: Herder & Herder.

Kellner, Douglas. 1989. *Critical Theory, Marxism, and Modernity.* Cambridge, UK, and Baltimore, MD: Polity and Johns Hopkins University Press.

———. 1995. *Media Culture: Cultural Studies, Identity, and Politics Between the Modern and the Postmodern.* New York and London: Routledge.

———. 2000. "Habermas, the Public Sphere, and Democracy: A Critical Intervention." In *Perspectives on Habermas,* edited by Lewis Hahn. Chicago, IL: Open Court Press.

Lazarsfeld, Paul. 1941. "Administrative and Critical Communications Research." *Studies in Philosophy and Social Science* IX(1):2–16.

Marcuse, Herbert. 1941. *Studies in Philosophy and Social Science* IX(1):414–39.

Silberman, Marc. 2000. *Bertolt Brecht on Film and Radio.* London: Metheun.

Wiggershaus, Rolf. 1994. *The Frankfurt School.* Cambridge, UK: Polity.

FREUD, SIGMUND

Sigmund Freud (1856–1939), one of the figures who has shaped the intellectual landscape of contemporary thought, is the founder of psychoanalysis. *Psychoanalysis,* as it is commonly known, is a form of psychotherapy ("analysis") that operates through the investigation of the human psyche. It also offers a rich theory of the development and function of the psyche.

Coming from a middle-class Jewish family, Freud originally trained as a doctor and adhered to a nineteenth-century scientific ideal for his whole life. His interests soon focused on mental illnesses, especially neuroses, and after a short stay in Paris where he studied with Jean-Martin Charcot, he set up a private practice in Vienna, where he was to spend almost all his life. Initially influenced by Joseph Breuer, a Vienna consultant, he eventually developed his own technique and ideas largely on his own. The first major statement of psychoanalysis was *The Interpretation of Dreams,* published in 1900. From then onward, Freud produced a constant flow of publications, tirelessly developing, questioning, and reformulating his own theoretical concepts. Psychoanalysis gradually gained an international audience but remained outside institutionalised medicine and university teaching. Freud, having fled occupied Vienna in 1938, died in London a year later. Psychoanalysis, while still largely marginal to official institutions, was to gain unprecedented growth after World War II, both as a therapeutic technique and as a theory of the psyche.

Freud's intellectual honesty precluded a well-polished theoretical edifice, and the vast domain of inquiry he opened up is still, more than a half century after his death, both fascinating and open to interpretation, not least regarding the relationship between the psyche and the social.

The analytic process, based on the person's own free association of thoughts, led Freud to postnlate the existence of the "unconscious" as a specific level of operation of the

Garfinkel, Harold. 1939. *Color Trouble.* In *Best Short Stories of 1939*, edited by Edward O' Brien. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

———. 1956. "Conditions for Successful Degradation Ceremonies." *American Journal of Sociology* 61:420–24.

———. 1967. *Studies in Ethnomethodology.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

———. 2002. *Ethnomethodology's Program: Working Out Durkheim's Aphorism.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Rawls, Anne W. 1996. "Durkheim's Epistemology: The Neglected Argument." *American Journal of Sociology* 102:430–82.

GENDER

Simone de Beauvoir claimed, "One is not born, but rather becomes, a woman." Corresponding to this, one is not born, but rather becomes, a man. Beauvoir's claim is important because it is among the first statements in modern feminism to draw attention to "woman" as a social, rather than natural, category of being.

In the broadest sense, gender has been employed by social theorists to denote a distinction between the biological categories of female and male and the socially constructed categories of woman and man (or girl and boy). In this juxtaposition, while sex is assumed to represent a biological difference, gender is used to define those socially constructed feminine and masculine modes of behavior considered normal and natural for females and males. Thus, gender varies dramatically across societies and throughout human history.

The analysis of gender involves studying the normative conduct associated with males and females, the relative valuations of masculinity and femininity, and the social processes whereby males and females learn normative behaviors. Gender constructions thus relegate female and male bodies to discrete and often intensely regulated masculine and feminine types. Indeed, feminist studies have exposed the typically rigid constructions of masculinity and femininity. For example, within the United States, especially in studies focused on the white middle class, research has revealed that femininity demands that girls and women be passive, caring, sensitive, and gentle. Conversely, masculinity demands that boys and men be aggressive, individualistic, and rational. The bodies of females and males exhibit femininity and masculinity through both actions and culturally appropriate clothing and adornment. Gender is revealed to involve the management of situated conduct in adherence with normative conceptions of masculinity and femininity. Gender is thus seen as a highly significant dimension for understanding how the body becomes a social fact.

Interactionists such as Candace West and Don Zimmerman argue that males and females actively *do* gender. From their perspective, gender is a set of complex activities that, when routinely accomplished, are cast and experienced as expressions of masculine and feminine *natures.* Yet, while social theorists treat gender as a social construction, studies reveal that gender is *experienced* by many people in everyday life as natural and essential, not as put on or performed. Gender theorists have tried to understand how and why gender is experienced as natural. Their attention focuses on socialization practices. For instance, research has revealed that in the United States, at birth, a male baby is immediately referred to as a boy or girl, wrapped in a gender-coded blanket, given a name that is gendered, and described using gender-specific language such as "handsome and smart," or "sweet and fragile." All of these activities seem natural, and insofar as they are done over and over again, the "boying of the boy" and "the girling of the girl" are normalized and naturalized.

In addition to studying the socially produced differences between masculinity and femininity, sociologists also study how these differences are linked to inequality, power, and domination. Feminist sociologists are interested in revealing whether, why, and how feminine qualities, practices, and accomplishments are socially and historically subjugated or valued, celebrated or negated. R. W. Connell has argued that while there is no single form of masculinity or femininity, there are culturally dominant normalizations of gendered identity that he characterizes as hegemonic. Significant work among feminist sociologists has revealed the ways in which gender constructions relegate women into subordinate and unequal social relations with men, thereby instantiating the belief that men "naturally" possess a superior nature in comparison with females. Masculine bias has been exposed in dominant ways of knowing, experiencing, and acting. Dorothy E. Smith has been particularly concerned with the consequences of women's intellectual subjugation. She points out that women have been systematically excluded from doing the intellectual work of society. For example, most sociology and history are constructed from the standpoint of men and are largely about men. There are relatively few women poets, and the records kept of those few are haphazard. In comparison with how men's intellectual history is recorded and taught, relatively little is known about women visionaries, thinkers, and political organizers. By examining gender relations, feminist sociologists, activists, and writers produce strategies to challenge the negative conceptions and invisibility of women's intellectual accomplishments.

Approaches to understanding the connections between gender and sex, gender differences and gender inequality, vary widely. Gender has been studied as a central problematic within various branches of feminist social theory, including liberal feminism, radical feminism, existential

feminism, psychoanalytic feminism, socialist feminism, postmodern feminism, and queer theory. In addition, gender has been studied as a significant feature of area studies such as the sociology of the family, work, politics, race, and class relations. Approaches to gender in liberal feminism, radical feminism, and postmodern feminism is the focus here.

LIBERAL FEMINISM

Classical liberal thought holds a conception of human nature that articulates the distinctness of human beings in the capacity for rational thought. Rational thought was considered a characteristic of men's nature, while women were seen as naturally emotional and incapable of rational thought. A woman's ovaries, uterus, and capacity for reproduction were seen as peculiarities of females that naturally limited her rational capacities. In contrast, men were seen as worldly, open, and capable of higher cultural production. Observed differences between men's and women's emotional and intellectual lives supported this claim.

Beginning with Mary Wollstonecraft, however, this view was challenged among liberal thinkers advocating social change and sex equality. Wollstonecraft observed that women in her society lack virtue, rationality, and full personhood; women overindulged in idle activities. Although Wollstonecraft does not describe the social distinction between males and females as "gender" roles, she nevertheless saw men's and women's differences as socially constructed. She believed that men would develop similar inferior natures if they were relegated to the domestic sphere and denied opportunities to enhance their capacity for rational thought through education and work outside the home.

Arguing that the basic capacity for rational thought is natural to all human beings, liberal feminists locate the cause of observed differences between men and women not in differences in their natural capacities for rational thought but rather in women's comparatively limited social opportunities for developing their capacities for rational thought. In other words, liberal feminists believe that women have the same capacities as males for rational thought, but biological reproduction and corresponding sex-specific roles limit their opportunities. Liberal feminists assume that the sexual division of labor is a natural effect of women bearing children; men and women have different social roles to perform as a consequence of their different reproductive roles. Masculine and feminine genders thus correspond with this sexual division of labor; women's different gender identity is grounded in biological reproduction and in the mundane and repetitious acts of housework and mothering. With control of reproduction, however, the classic liberal assumption that biology is destiny is undermined. Men and women need no longer be confined to sex-specific roles and

narrow gender identities. Liberal feminists recognize that women can develop and possess the same qualities seen as inherent to men if they are allowed the opportunity to become educated on an equal basis with men and are able to work outside the home. Liberal feminists have advocated social change in women's educational, political, occupational, and economic opportunities. They argue that as more women enter the public spheres of education and work, and thereby become the social equal of men, the status of women would simultaneously rise.

One major assumption of liberal feminism is that the masculine qualities possessed by men are superior and therefore more desirable than the feminine qualities possessed by women. In addition to this, liberal feminists largely assumed that reproduction was an impediment to equality, and that only through reproductive control could women achieve equality. Significantly, women were conceptualized as having similar desires, essences, and mental capacities as men. These are issues radical feminists would challenge.

RADICAL FEMINISM

Like liberal feminist theorists, radical theorists employ gender to differentiate the qualities of males and females that are biologically determined from those that are socially constructed. They also theorize that natural sexual differences are directly linked to normative gender practices. But unlike liberal feminists, radical feminists challenge the notion of women's biological inferiority, the assumed superiority and desirability of masculine traits, and the notion that equality can or should be achieved by opening male-defined opportunities to women.

Radical feminists argue that there are essential, natural differences between males and females, but that these differences in and of themselves do not render women inferior to men. Nor are the activities that women perform in and of themselves less desirable or important in comparison with those of men. Radical feminists understand women as not only different but oppressed, as kept in a subservient place, pushed down within patriarchal power structures. Women's oppression is understood as a complex matrix of female subordination and misogynist constructions of the qualities possessed by women. Patriarchal domination is linked to strict adherence to gender roles in which masculinity is expressed through male bodies as powerful, rational, and dominant. Conversely, expressed femininity demands that women adhere to passive, gentle, emotional, and communal practices. While masculine rationality, authority, individualism, and power are rewarded in a patriarchal capitalist society, the different feminine qualities possessed by women are devalued and used to justify their subordination and degradation. Binary gender differences are problematic insofar as the feminine qualities seen as biologically natural

to females are degraded, devalued, and expressed as inferior while masculine qualities seen as biologically natural to males are esteemed, valued, and expressed as superior.

Radical feminists claim the personal is political, making a direct connection between gendered experience and the sociopolitical structures of capitalist patriarchy. Insofar as authority and superiority are attached to the male body and masculine gender attributes are valued within male-dominated structures, radical feminists explain women's experienced oppression as an inherent feature of the interlocking structures of capitalism and patriarchy. Research reveals how men and masculinity express domination, control, power, and authority over all things, including less powerful women. Kate Millet located women's oppression in patriarchal relations between women and men. Significantly, men are dominant in both the public and private spheres. Within the gender binary, men wield power over women as society rewards masculine qualities with economic mobility and social authority. For Millet, women can experience full personhood and social affirmation only by ending the practice of gender segregation in which men ultimately control, define, and dominate women. Hartmann argued that job segregation by sex is the primary mechanism in capitalist society that maintains masculine superiority insofar as it enforces lower wages and unpaid labor for women. Low wages and unpaid labor force and legitimate women to marry for economic survival, thereby ensuring that emotional and interpersonal experiences are tied to capitalist patriarchy. As Catherine MacKinnon argued, heterosexual relations are rooted in inequality and female subordination, making sexuality as we know it an expression of male domination. In order to understand women's oppression, one must acknowledge the ways in which the objectification of the female body is connected to domination and violence against women.

Significantly, radical feminists treat the valuation of male gender roles as superfluous insofar as women and men have learned to evaluate their collective identities within patriarchal, misogynist frames. Women, they argue, need to reclaim, rename, redefine, and revalue their sexual and gendered identities. By doing so, they will begin to appreciate emotionally and socially the inherent differences between men and women and value self-defined frames of womanhood.

POSTMODERN FEMINISM

Postmodern feminists challenge both liberal and radical constructions of the relationship between biological sex and socially constructed gender. Unlike both radical and liberal feminists, postmodern theorists challenge the notion that an essential difference exists between biological sex and socially constructed gender categories, thus rendering relatively inconsequential questions over whether women and men are essentially the same or different. The problem is this: When social theorists and people in everyday life compare sex with gender, we are not comparing something natural with something social; rather, postmodern theorists claim that we are comparing something social with something else that is social. For postmodernists, embodied traits do not exist independently of observations and interpretations of those traits; they are part of the same social process. The ways in which a society constitutes biological categories and criteria are learned, defined, and enacted by given agents situated in specific sociohistorical settings. For example, Christine Delphy's research exposed the ways in which the "natural appearance" of the body is defined according to socially constructed biological criteria.

Postmodern theorists claim that theoretical explanations of women's oppression are wrongly limited to heterosexual male and female binaries. Moreover, the binary sexual categories of female and male are mediated through gendered language. Butler posits the body as constituted and recognized through language. Insofar as language is a social product, the body is a social construct. Butler asserts that language sustains the body. Only by being interpellated within the terms of language does a certain social existence of the body become possible (Butler 1997). Nicholson (1992) questions the very distinction between sex and gender, claiming that the body is always interpreted socially; rather than seeing sex as somehow separate from gender, sex is subsumable under gendered interpretations. In this sense, the natural categories of the body are understood as "sedimented acts rather than a predetermined and foreclosed structure, essence, or fact, whether natural, cultural, or linguistic" (Butler 1988:523). This stance challenges the notion that the body represents a natural entity unaffected by gender. Joan Scott (1988) defines gender as the social organization of sexual differences but further posits that gender is the knowledge that establishes meaning for bodily differences. We cannot see sexual differences except as a function of our knowledge. Knowledge is not pure and cannot be isolated from its implications in a broad range of discursive contexts.

In the most basic sense, postmodern feminists define gender as constructed and instantiated through participation in intensely regulated activities that congeal over time and thereby produce the appearance of naturalized categories of sexual identity. The body, moreover, expresses meaning dramatically. Gender management is performative; men and women actively perform gendered behavior deemed appropriate for a male or female sexual category. Gender is, then, instituted through the stylization of the body. Gender is constituted in the bodily gestures, movements, and enactments that are routinized, sedimented, and rendered mundane. Through this same process, bodily acts constitute the illusion of an abiding gendered self.

— Candice Bryant Simonds and Paula Brush

See also Beauvoir, Simone de; Feminist Epistemology; Liberal
Feminism; Postmodernist Feminism; Radical Feminism;
Smith, Dorothy

FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

Beauvoir, Simone de. 1949. *The Second Sex.* New York: Knopf.
Butler, Judith. 1997. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the
Subversion of Identity.* London, UK: Routledge
Connell, R. W. 1987. *Gender and Power.* Cambridge, UK: Polity.
Delphy, Christine. 1993. "Rethinking Sex and Gender." *Women's
Study International Forum* 16:1–9.
Hartmann, Heidi. 1976. "Capitalism, Patriarchy and Job
Segregation by Sex." *Signs* 1:137–68.
MacKinnon, Catherine. *Feminism Unmodified: Discourses on Life
and Law.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Millet, Kate. 1981. *Sexual Politics.* New York: Avon.
Nicholson, Linda. 1995. "Interpreting Gender." Pp. 39–57 in
Social Postmodernism: Beyond Identity Politics, edited by
Linda Nicholson and Steven Siedman. New York: Cambridge
University Press.
———. 1997. *The Second Wave: A Reader in Feminist Theory.*
New York: Routledge.
Nicholson, Linda and Steven Seidman. 1995. *Interpreting Gender
in Social Postmodernism: Beyond Identity Politics.* New York:
Cambridge University Press.
Scott, Joan W. 1992. "Experience." Pp. 22–40 in *Feminists
Theorize the Political,* edited by Judith Butler and Joan W.
Scott. New York: Routledge.
West, Candace and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender."
Gender & Society 1:125–51.
Wollstoncraft, Mary. [1792] 1988. *A Vindication of the Rights of
Women.* New York: Norton.

GENEALOGY

Genealogy, a concept given sociological currency by Frederick Nietzsche and revived by Michel Foucault, refers to the most important methodological innovation of the so-called poststructuralist tradition of French social theory of the late twentieth century. In *Genealogy of Morals* ([1887] 1927), Nietzsche executed his famous sociological investigation of the origins of European "moral prejudices." At some risk, one might even call Nietzsche's essays on good and evil the first deconstruction of the classical vocabulary of modern culture. In effect, as he says at the opening of *Genealogy of Morals,* the concept of the Good owes, not to an essential goodness, but "to the good themselves, that is, the aristocratic, the powerful, the high-stationed, the high-minded, who have felt that they themselves were good." By thus situating one of the modern world's most essentializing philosophical categories

in the historical system of social stratification, Nietzsche may well have been the first implicit sociologist of culture.

Methodologically, a genealogy traces the elements of culture, including practices as well as concepts and norms, back to their origins in a historical social arrangement. In this respect, the origins are decidedly *not* first causes or any similarly abstract and reductive first principles of human agency. In this, it may be said that Nietzsche completed the work begun by the eighteenth-century Enlightenment. Kant, most notably, demonstrated that knowledge arises neither in synthetic experience nor in an analytic a priori. Rather, knowledge, like morality, is based on a synthetic process that has the effect of being a priori without being analytically abstract. In this sense, Kant went beyond the early modern debates between Cartesian rationalisms and Lockean empiricisms. Still, Kant did not take the final step toward an explicit sociology of thought or morality. His famous categorical imperative (to act as though one's moral practices were necessary for the good of the social commonwealth) was a backhanded way of preserving moral absolutes as if they were practically attainable by the reasonable judgments of the social actor. Nietzsche, a full century later, took the next step. Concepts, including moral ones, arise not in essential categories of the good, the true, or the beautiful but in the social hierarchies whereby historically specific versions of the concepts dominate.

Curiously, Nietzsche's *Genealogy of Morals* appeared in 1887, between the publications of two other great works of nineteenth-century skeptical social theory, that is, 20 years after the first volume of Marx's *Capital* (1867) and just more than a decade before Freud's *Interpretation of Dreams* (1899). Both Marx and Freud claimed, in their ways, to have perfected a robust critical method for diagnosing the hidden, prior existing origins of superficially apparent social forms and behaviors. Yet, both Marx and Freud remained faithful to the Enlightenment method of asserting the true or the good with reference to an (at least) quasi-transcendental principle. This is the effect of Marx's allegiance to value producing labor as the first principle of essential humanity and Freud's to the Ego as the protector of human reason between the moralizing demands of the Superego and the presocial impulses of the Id. By focusing sternly on the social origins of ideas, Nietzsche's genealogical method provided subsequent social philosophy with a powerful critical tool at the expense of sacrificing claims to positivist empirical or even analytically realist truths.

With the guarded exception of Max Weber, whose sociology of the moral contradictions of modern society were evidently influenced by Nietzsche, early twentieth-century social theory largely ignored Nietzsche's method. In Weber's case, the German hermeneutic method represented still another attempt to study positive factual appearances with reference to their hidden meanings. Weber's famous principle of methodological understanding (*verstehen*) was

Yet globalization also recasts the agenda of social theory. For example, whereas social theory once focused on the rise of individual, state-organized societies, it now must address the implications of a change of scale in supraterritorial social relations. While modernization could once be treated as change within a single civilizational arena, students of globalization must now examine how world order can arise in the face of civilizational differences. Critiques of globalization that reprise standard anticapitalist, particularly Marxist, social theory have to draw the necessary lessons from the sobering historical experience of attempts to construct alternative societies. Though most contemporary scholarship adapts conventional terms to the new global circumstance, the very relevance of older ideas, linked to the study of state-based societies, is uow in question.

Social theory once aspired to produce one grand account of human affairs. In the era of globalization, Western confidence in the viability of this aspiration has diminished. Yet, given the momentum of current globalizing forces, the future prospects of social theory as an intellectual tradition depend on its ability to produce increasingly effective and comprehensive accounts of globalization.

— Frank J. Lechner

See also Capitalism; Civil Society; Modernity; Rationalization; World-Systems Theory

FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

Albrow, Martin. 1997. *The Global Age: State and Society Beyond Modernity.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Appadurai, Arjun. 1996. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Bestor, Theodore C. 2000. "How Sushi Went Global." *Foreign Policy* November-December.

Broad, Robin, ed. 2002. *Global Backlash: Citizen Initiatives for a Just World Economy.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Falk, Richard. 1999. *Predatory Globalization: A Critique.* Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Guillén, Mauro F. 2001. "Is Globalization Civilizing, Destructive or Feeble? A Critique of Five Key Debates in the Social Science Literature." *Annual Review of Sociology* 27.

Hannerz, Ulf. 1996. *Transnational Connections: Culture, People, Places.* London: Routledge.

Held, David, Anthony McGrew, David Goldblatt, and Jonathan Perraton. 1999. *Global Transformations.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Lechner, Frank J. and John Boli, eds. 2003. *The Globalization Reader.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Meyer, John W., John Boli, George M. Thomas, and Francisco O. Ramirez. 1997. "World Society and the Nation-State." *American Journal of Sociology* 103:144–81.

Micklethwait, John and Adrian Wooldridge. 2000. *A Future Perfect: The Challenge and Hidden Promise of Globalization.* New York: Crown.

Robertson, Roland. 1992. *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture.* London: Sage.

Robertson, Roland and Kathleen White, eds. 2003. *Globalization.* 6 vols. London: Routledge.

Scholte, Jan Aart. 2000. *Globalization: A Critical Introduction.* Honndmills, UK: Palgrave.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1974–1989. *The Modern World-System.* 3 vols. San Diego, CA: Aeademic Press.

GOFFMAN, ERVING

Erving Goffman (1922–1982) was one of the most important sociologists in the twentieth century. The focus of his work was the organization of observable, everyday behavior, usually but not always among the unacquainted in urban settings. Using a variety of qualitative methods, Goffman developed classifications of the different elements of social interaction. The hallmark of his approach was the assumption that these classifications were heuristic, simplifying tools for sociological analysis that did not capture the complexity of lived experience. In addition to the study of everyday social interaction, Goffman retained a strong interest in the sociology of mental illness. This began in the 1950s when he conducted ethnographic research at a large hospital in Washington, D.C. He considered the study of everyday interaction and the study of mental illness as two sides of the same coin. The intellectual context of Goffman's work was both the narrow sociological concerns of the 1950s and 1960s and the broad scholarly concerns of this era. This vantage point allows us to understand his work as an extension and integration of the perspective of symbolic interactionism, the methodological assumptions of Chicago Sociology and the sociology of Emile Durkheim and Georg Simmel, both of whom he greatly admired. However, his work should also be understood as a reaction against three dominant intellectual traditions of this time. The first is the "grand theory" of Talcott Parsons, the second is the psychoanalytic approach of Sigmund Freud, and the third is the positivistic, quantitative trend of many social scientists of this era. Goffman's work is therefore a response to these three gravitational pulls. Goffman made a concerted effort to engage in sociological research that did not acquiesce to the demands of these research traditions. In addition to the literary quality of his writings, the elegance of his formal sociology, and the subtlety of his observations, the theoretical sophistication of his work has assured a continuing audience for his work after his death, even though there is to date no "Goffman School" of sociology to extend his research.

BIOGRAPHY

Erving Manual Goffman was born on June 11, 1922, in Mannville, Alberta, Canada, the second of two children. His parents, Max and Ann, were Jewish and among the 200,000 Ukrainians who moved to Canada between 1897 and the beginning of World War I. Erving had one sister, Frances, who later became an actress. Max Goffman was a shopkeeper, Ann Goffman a homemaker. They raised their family in Dauphin, near Winnipeg, where Erving attended St. John's Technical High School. As befits a school with this name, Goffman's first intellectual interest was the natural sciences. In 1939, while far away from the tumultuous events in Europe, Goffman enrolled at the University of Manitoba, where he pursued an undergraduate degree in chemistry.

Perhaps the beginning of Goffman's interest in sociology occurred in 1943–1944, when he worked temporarily at the National Film Board in Ottawa. In addition to the inherently sociological nature of film, as both a record and as an interpretation of social life, Goffman met Dennis Wrong during this time. This chance meeting with someone who will also be remembered as a key North American sociologist was the impetus for Goffman to leave Manitoba and enroll at the University of Toronto, where he studied anthropology and sociology. Goffman was fortunate to study under two eminent social scientists at Toronto: C. W. M. Hart and Ray Birdwhistell. At this time, he obtained a thorough grounding in the work of, among others, Durkheim, Radcliffe-Brown, Warner, Freud, and Parsons. During his studies, Goffman also developed a close friendship with Elizabeth Bott (now Elizabeth Bott-Spillius), who went on to become a leading Kleinian psychoanalyst, based in London.

After graduating from the University of Toronto in 1945 with a degree in sociology and anthropology, Goffman began graduate study in sociology at the University of Chicago, one of the centers of sociological research in the United States, and a department already with a rich tradition dating back to the mid-1890s. The University of Chicago was at that time a hive of activity, with its student numbers swelled to near breaking point by the G.I. Bill. Under these trying circumstances, the close mentoring of students by professors was almost impossible and was replaced by close intellectual friendships among students, who learned to rely on themselves (Fine 1995). Goffman did not initially thrive in this uncertain environment. However, he gradually settled into the rhythm of graduate school life, taking numerous courses, most notably Everett Hughes' seminar, "Work and Occupations." According to Burns (1992:101), it was here that Goffman first encountered the idea of the "total institution" that later became the conceptual cornerstone of *Asylums* (1961), his idiosyncratic ethnography of St. Elizabeth's hospital.

In 1949, Goffman successfully completed all the requirements for his master's degree, including a thesis. This unpublished manuscript played an unexpectedly large part in his intellectual development, as it is his only research project that employed interview, survey, and quantitative data. In the thesis, Goffman analyzed interview responses from middle-class Chicago women to a then popular radio soap opera called *Big Sister*. Following the lead of his advisers, Goffman attempted to use—and failed by his own estimation—a then popular measure called the Thematic Apperception Test. His dissatisfaction with his own findings grew into general dissatisfaction with the analysis of variables, marking a significant moment in his intellectual development.

For his doctoral dissertation, Goffman chose to study rural life in the Shetlands Islands. This was a far cry from the hustle, heterogeneity, and sprawl of Chicago life. Instead, in December 1949, Goffman arrived on the Island of Unst, a small, static community. In his published work, Unst is often referred to as "Dixon." His research was sponsored by the Department of Anthropology and the Committee on Social Science Research at the University of Edinburgh. While masquerading as a student of agricultural techniques, Goffman actually studied social interaction among the islanders. After initially suspecting that he was a spy, the islanders warmed to Goffman, who stayed there until May 1951.

For reasons that are no longer clear, Goffman did not return immediately to Chicago, but moved instead to Paris, where he spent a year preparing the first draft of his doctoral dissertation. Upon returning to the United States, Goffman married 23-year-old Angelica Choate, whom he had met earlier at the University of Chicago, where she was pursuing an undergraduate degree in psychology. Unlike his own modest upbringing, Angelica came from a prominent American family, some of the members of which were significant shareholders in media companies. Erving and Angelica had one child, Tom, who was born in 1953, the same year that Goffman was awarded his doctorate from the University of Chicago. Although Goffman was at this time far from being an influential sociologist, his personal transformation was striking. He was no longer a boy from a poor and undereducated family. Through both education and marriage, he was now part of an intellectual and economic elite.

Goffman's dissertation was a mixture of observations and classifications: part case study, part general theory. As such, it was the forerunner to nearly all his later work. It was also perplexing to his examiners, who had expected a traditional community study. Nevertheless, the dissertation was approved, and soon after Goffman began working for Edward Shils. In 1955, Goffman left Chicago and moved with his young family to Washington, D.C., where he conducted ethnographic work at St. Elizabeth's Hospital. This

project was one of several qualitative sociological studies funded by the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) at this time, and it was impossible for anyone to know then that the ensuing book—*Asylums* (1961)—would become one of the most influential pieces of sociology in the twentieth century.

On January 1, 1958, Goffman began work at the University of California at Berkeley at the invitation of Herbert Blumer, who had himself moved to California from Chicago. Goffman's academic career progressed very rapidly, and he became a full professor in 1962. In the decade from 1959 to 1969, Goffman published seven significant books—a remarkable achievement. In addition to his considerable academic success, Goffman also showed himself to be a knowledgeable and successful investor on the stock market. In his spare time, he collected antiques and enjoyed playing poker and blackjack, the former badly, the latter well. Goffman's social interest in blackjack later became a scholarly one: He returned to school to earn certification to become a blackjack dealer, a position he occupied periodically at the Station Plaza Casino in Las Vegas, where he was later promoted to Pit Boss. This experience was intended as research for an anticipated ethnographic project of the social world of the gambler. However, nothing was ever published, although his paper "Where the Action Is" touches upon the topic.

Although the 1960s were a time of intellectual and career success for Goffman, he also experienced tragedy. In 1964, his wife Angelica killed herself after struggling with mental illness. Goffman's reflections on his own experiences of living with someone who is mentally ill are captured, albeit in a detached way, in his 1969 paper, "The Insanity of Place."

In 1966, Goffman spent a sabbatical year at the Harvard Center for International Affairs at the invitation of Thomas Schelling. During this year, Goffman prepared two papers on game theory, which were published together in *Strategic Interaction* (1969. In 1968, Goffman resigned from Berkeley in order to accept a Benjamin Franklin Chair in Sociology and Anthropology at the University of Pennsylvania. Faculty in the sociology department opposed his appointment, and Goffman was initially housed in an office of the Anthropological Museum, whose letterhead he happily used. He continued to be a very productive scholar, publishing *Relations in Public* (1971), *Frame Analysis* (1974) (his hoped-for magnum opus), *Gender Advertisements* (1979) and *Forms of Talk* (1981).

In 1981, he married the linguist Gillian Sankoff, with whom he had one daughter, Alice. Tragically, it was a short marriage, as Goffman developed a stomach cancer that killed him on November 20, 1982, at age 60. In the year of his death, he had been elected president of the American Sociological Association. One of his duties as such was to give the presidential address. He had prepared this ahead of

time, but spent his final weeks revising the manuscript. He chose a nostalgic title, "The Interaction Order," which was the title of the conclusion to his dissertation almost 30 years earlier. It symbolized the unity and consistency of his intellectual interests. In keeping with his detached and reflexive manner, Goffman anticipated the posthumous reading of his paper at the upcoming annual meeting and added a Goffmanesque preface concerning the difficulties of such presentations.

CENTRAL THEMES

The Interaction Order

Goffman's overarching theme is the investigation of face-to-face interaction, primarily among the unacquainted. At the beginning and end of his career (but not in the middle), he referred to this as the study of the interaction order. The burden of this investigation was the classification of the different elements of face-to-face interaction. The subsidiary tasks involved the use of theatrical and game metaphors to explore deception in the social world and an analysis of the role of reflexivity in sociological investigation, particularly as revealed by the "framing" of social life. In addition, Goffman made significant contributions to the related fields of the sociology of mental illness and the sociology of stigma.

Goffman's primary ambition was to establish the study of face-to-face interaction as a substantive concern in its own right. This flew in the face of both grand theorists, such as Parsons, who—while admiring Goffman's analyses—nevertheless wanted to absorb this and other fields into a larger theory, and of politically minded sociologists of all persuasions who judged Goffman's analyses to be as trivial as those of his intellectual predecessor, Georg Simmel. The subtlety of Goffman's observations was largely lost on the former, whereas the quiet tone of moral outrage was lost on the latter.

The interaction order is a conceptual map to each and every occasion of face-to-face interaction. This map is therefore intended to cover behavior in, among other places, restaurants, elevators, stadiums, and dinner parties. Literally speaking, all face-to-face interaction requires the "copresence" of participants, that is, people must sense that others are close enough to them to be able to register whatever it is that they are doing. In *Behavior in Public Places* (1963:13–22), Goffman distinguished three types of copresence: the "gathering," the "situation," and the "social occasion." For Goffman, a gathering is simply a coming together of two or more people, a situation occurs whenever there is "mutual monitoring," and a social occasion is bounded by space and time and is likely to involve props or special equipment. Thus, a social occasion such as a birthday party becomes the background against which gatherings

and situations can occur. For each of these types of copresence, there are distinctive patterns of "communication traffic order," which Goffman called "situational proprieties" (p. 24). These patterns are "focused" when there is a single focus of attention and "unfocused" when there is not.

Focused interaction occurs when people "extend one another a special communication license and sustain a special type of mutual activity" (1963:83). This involves "face-work" of various kinds among friends, acquaintances, and, under special circumstances, the unacquainted. The initiation and continuation of unwanted focused interaction was for Goffman an interesting topic in its own right.

Unfocused interaction predominates in urban settings where people are unacquainted with each other. Even if efforts are made to slow down the flow of information, people "read" each other through "body idiom" and perceived "involvement." Through our body idiom, people glean information about us by judging us against conventional standards. Our body idiom therefore consists of impressions that either we willingly give or inadvertently give off (Goffman 1959:13–14). Involvement refers to the attention we give—or fail to give—to the social situations in which we find ourselves. It is an internal state that others perceive through observable, behavioral markers. Frequently, people simultaneously manage both a main and a side involvement, as when a student listens to a lecture and doodles on a notepad at the same time. The group and the present situation determine what constitutes a dominant involvement. By contrast, a subordinate involvement is whatever the group tolerates once appropriate respect is shown for the dominant focus of group attention.

Ritual regard for the unacquainted is preserved in unfocused interaction through civil inattention. This involves initial eye contact among the unacquainted and then a studious looking away. The function of civil inattention appears to be to display mutual regard and the absence of threat. It is as if the person were saying: "look at me, remember my face if you wish because I will not harm you in any way."

Goffman extended the analysis of the interaction to the presentation of relationships in public settings. Understood thus, we are sign vehicles: our body idiom conveys information about ourselves and our social relationships. This will often be sensitive material that has to be handled delicately by others, with appropriate ritual care. In *Relations in Public* (1971), Goffman used an ethological perspective to analyze how people negotiate their way around often packed urban spaces, mark their territories while so doing, signal their relationships to others by various "tie-signs," and manage their appearances so as to appear normal or unremarkable. By these elaborate means, we all contribute to what Herbert Spencer called in the prominent quotation given at the beginning of his book, the "government of ceremonial observance." To fail to do so sounds alarm bells for

others because it threatens the predictability and routinization of everyday encounters. Thus, Goffman was able to show the interwoven complexity, necessity, and fragility of ordinary behavior.

Goffman's analysis of the interaction order presents a set of classifications with which to continue the investigation of face-to-face interaction. He assumed that there would be both further conceptual and classificatory refinement and increasing levels of empirical detail. Particularly through the work of ethnomethodologists and conversation analysts, some of whom trained with Goffman, empirical specification has occurred, but the former project of conceptual refinement has not seen the same level of progress, or even interest.

THE SOCIOLOGY OF MENTAL ILLNESS AND STIGMA

Goffman began fieldwork in 1955 at St. Elizabeth's Hospital, a large facility housing about 7,000 patients. It is important to remember that this research was conducted at a time when psychiatry was heavily influenced by psychoanalysis, just before the rise of psychopharmacology. Psychoanalysis and psychiatry were therefore interwoven fields at the height of their prestige. Sociology was then a small but emerging discipline thought to have connections to the study of interpersonal difficulties. Goffman was, then, unwittingly ideally placed to study the final moments of the mental hospital as it was then understood. His perspective was somewhat different: As a product of the Chicago School of Sociology, he understood himself to have a special obligation to side with the underdog and to criticize institutionalized authority. Curiously, while he conducted research at St. Elizabeth's, Michel Foucault was conducting similar research at a mental hospital in Paris, although the similarities between Goffman's and Foucault's analysis of disciplinary power were not to become evident until much later.

Goffman spent about a year and a half at St. Elizabeth's, collecting the ethnographic data that informed *Asylums* (1961). As with his dissertation, this book is highly unusual: It provides very little detailed information about the hospital; rather, it conveys a "tone of life" (Fine and Martin 1990:93). Goffman investigated the characteristics of "total institutions," of which he took St. Elizabeth's as an exemplar. All total institutions sequester inmates, set schedules, and monitor behavior. Inmates are subjected to "batch living" and its attendant indignities. Goffman drew on both his own data and research from other total institutions, such as monasteries, prisons, and boarding schools to produce a general theory of the characteristics of the total institution.

Asylums promises an analysis of the prepatient, inpatient and ex-patient phases of the "moral career" of the mental patient; in point of fact, it only delivers the first two.

Goffman provided a subtle and moving account of the process whereby a person can become a candidate for institutionalization. Prepatients pass through a "betrayal funnel," as the people they trust most—family and friends—conspire against them, reporting their questionable actions to physicians and other members of the "circuit of agents" who often play a decisive role in the decision-making process.

Once institutionalized, inmates experience "civil death" as they lose many of the freedoms that had taken for granted. There is a further "mortification of self" as patients are standardized: They are given regulation clothes and subjected to a myriad of indignities. Uncooperative patients are punished by being placed in an unpleasant ward, ostensibly for their own good. Patients may advance through the ward system only through good behavior, taken by the psychiatrists as indicative of improving mental health.

Over time, patients at St. Elizabeth's—as at other total institutions—are offered privileges for good behavior, as shown by following the house rules. In its own way, acquiescence to privilege is as demeaning as the mortification of self. Both phases of total institutional life demonstrate to inmates that they are less than they took themselves to be. As Goffman put it, the total institution is a "forcing house" for changing people. In the face of these overwhelming challenges, inmates must either accept a massively diminished sense of self or insulate themselves from the social psychological threat posed by the total institution itself. The latter is achieved without direct confrontation by what the patients at St. Elizabeth's called "playing it cool" (1961:62–3). This consisted of a set of strategies designed to restore a sense of autonomy and self-worth to the patient. Ironically, Goffman suggested, hospital personnel often misunderstood these strategies, mistaking them as further evidence of mental illness.

Asylums remains a controversial book. It is a provocative new approach to ethnography, in which the traditional case study is transformed into comparative analysis, producing an ethnography not of a place but of a concept, in this case, that of the total institution (Manning 1992). Goffman's findings are also controversial because they suggest that psychiatrists may have weak clinical knowledge. The central issue for Goffman is that although everyone commits "situational improprieties," only some of these cases of inappropriate behavior are considered by psychiatrists (and others) to be symptomatic of mental illness. Psychiatrists need but lack a "technical mapping" that could distinguish symptomatic from nonsymptomatic situational improprieties. Thus, the occasionally transparent, often latent, message of *Asylums* is that psychiatrists lack a scientific understanding of mental illness and rely instead on lay interpretations. As a result, Goffman thought that psychiatrists routinely misunderstood the behavior of their patients. This aspect of Goffman's work put a special burden on his

analysis to demonstrate how sociological knowledge can undermine psychiatric knowledge. Probably he failed to do this; however, his analysis of St. Elizabeth's did contribute positively to the reevaluation of psychiatry and the treatment of the mentally ill.

In the early 1960s, Goffman also analyzed the interpersonal management of stigma. *Stigma* (1963) emerged out of lectures he gave at the University of California at Berkeley. He defined a stigma as a "deeply discrediting" attribute in the context of a set of relationships (1963:3). He distinguished three types: abominations of the body, blemishes of character, and tribal stigmata (1963:4). The focus of his analysis was primarily the stigmatized person's techniques of "information control" by which discrediting, undisclosed information could be managed. Goffman recognized that the management of potentially damaging information was critical for three aspects of our identity: the personal, the social and the ego. Our personal identity is that which makes each of us unique; it consists of "identity pegs" (such as fingerprints) and life histories (1963:57). Our social identity is that which others understand about us by virtue of the groups to which we belong. Our ego identity refers to that which we think about ourselves. Goffman introduced the term "identity politics" to characterize the interactions between the stigmatized, the "normals" and the "own" (who understand the world of the stigmatized without being stigmatized themselves). In the latter part of *Stigma*, Goffman suggested that we are all, to some degree, stigmatized. At best, we are "discreditable" if we are not already 'discredited.' Thus, there is a continuum rather than a binary opposition between normals and the stigmatized. Among the stigmatized are "normal deviants," who share the perspectives of normals, and "social deviants," who rebel against conventions.

METAPHORICAL INVESTIGATIONS: THE DRAMATURGICAL AND THE GAME THEORETIC

In *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (1959), Goffman outlined a conceptual framework in which any occasion of face-to-face interaction can be interpreted as a theatrical performance. Expanding the ideas of Kenneth Burke, who pioneered a "dramatistic" approach, Goffman developed his own "dramaturgical" investigations based on six themes: the performance, the team, the region, discrepant roles, communication out of character, and impression management. These themes had initially been explored in his dissertation. Here they are separated from a case study and presented instead as general theory. *The Presentation of Self* offers redescriptions of familiar events in which there is a heightened sense of suspicion. Nothing in Goffman's dramaturgical world is quite what it seems. Rather, we are all portrayed as performers enacting rehearsed lines and roles in places that are carefully constructed in order to maximize the potential for deception.

Goffman suggests that as performers we both knowingly give and unwittingly give off impressions. Because nearly all of us are skilled in the arts of impression management, we monitor all aspects of the behavior of the people we encounter. Goffman's actors seek to deceive others while seeing through the deceptive practices of others. Even when among team members in backstage areas, our performances are not necessarily more authentic, although there we often "knowingly contradict" (1959:114) our front stage behavior. Goffman's dramaturgical world is thus one of misdirection in which general suspicion is necessary. In fact, Goffman developed an interest in espionage practices precisely because he recognized these as extensions of everyday behavior. This way of thinking was perhaps part of a broader cultural shift in the United States: The safe assumptions of mainstream Americans in the 1950s were being challenged by the radicalized generation of the 1960s. To some degree, Goffman gave expression to this emerging sentiment.

There is a clearly a literary quality to all of Goffman's published work, and this in part explains their success. The broad appeal of his investigation of everyday conduct is a version of Freud's appeal—and in fact Goffman emerged at the peak of American interest in Freud and psychoanalysis. In this sense, all of Goffman's work involves the elaboration of apt metaphors. Nevertheless, theatrical and game metaphors are given pride of place.

Goffman clarified the main terms of game theory, establishing appropriate definitions for players, moves, and rules (1969). Players can represent themselves or others. They may be pawns that may be sacrificed or merely tokens who express a position. A player may be a "nuncio" who can only represent a party or a "procurator" who can negotiate for a party but cannot represent it. Goffman identified five basic moves in social interaction: the unwitting, the naïve, the covering, the uncovering, and the counter-uncovering move (1969:11–27). Each is designed either to achieve some advantage directly or to reveal the strategies of other players. These moves are used in social worlds, or as Goffman called them, "situated activity systems." Each of these is regulated by internalized norms known by each system's members.

Goffman speculated that game theory was a possible successor to Blumer's symbolic interactionism. Rather than focusing on the production of meanings, the definition of the situation and relevant symbols, as Blumer advocated, Goffman proposed the study of "strategic interaction" using the vocabulary outlined above. For unclear reasons, neither Goffman nor anyone else developed this proposal, and the relationship between symbolic interactionism and strategic interaction has been largely ignored.

FRAMES AND REFLEXIVITY

Goffman expected *Frame Analysis* (1974) to be his crowning achievement: The 586-page book took a decade to prepare and marked a subtle departure from his earlier work. In this project, Goffman emphasized reflexive aspects of social life, that is, the ways in which what we think about what we do affects the performance of the activity itself. This was showcased in the book's preface, in which Goffman interrogated the idea of writing a preface itself.

Goffman defined a frame as a way of organizing experiences: We use frames to identify what is taking place. For example, a story may be a joke, a warning, a lesson, an invitation and so on. Frame analysis is therefore the study of the "organization of experience." The most fundamental frameworks are "primary frameworks," which reveal what is really happening either in the natural or social world. The meaning of a primary framework can be challenged in various ways. It can also be "keyed": This occurs when its meaning is transformed into something patterned on but independent of the initial frame. For example, a keying may convince us that what appears to be a fight is in fact just play. However, caution is needed because every keying can itself be rekeyed. In addition to keys, there are "fabrications." These are frames that are designed to mislead others. Fabrications are benign when they are for the benefit of the audience or exploitative when they are for the benefit of the fabricator. In an attempt to prevent the keying, rekeying, and fabrications of frames, we often attempt to anchor them so that audiences can accept them as real.

Goffman extended this analysis into an investigation of various kinds of talk. These essays were published together as *Forms of Talk* (1981). The central theme of the five essays was the footing of talk. This referred to the participant's projected self during a conversation. Thus, we can change footing by realigning ourselves. This is simply another way of discussing a change in the relevant frame for events. Goffman gave the example of then President Nixon commenting on the dress style of the reporter, Helen Thomas. Goffman argued that this interlude was intended by President Nixon to be a brief time-out from the formal duties of the day, a moment in which he could reveal himself as an ordinary, if sharp-witted, man who could thrive without the protection of presidential authority. Goffman suggested that in this, President Nixon failed, as his performance was too wooden and his jokes were laughed at only out of respect for his office. This small example, taken from one of his final projects, epitomizes his overall concern: the development of general classifications to be used to understand concrete examples of the interaction order.

— Philip Manning

See also Blumer, Herbert; Dramaturgy; Frame Analysis; Impression Management; Mead, George Herbert; Symbolic Interaction; Total Institutions

FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

Burns T. 1992 *Erving Goffman.* London: Routledge.

Drew, P. and A.Wootten, eds. 1988. *Erving Goffman: Exploring the Interaction Order.* Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Fine, G., ed. 1995. *A Second Chicago School?* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Fine, G. and P. Manning. 2000. "Erving Goffman: Shifting Impressions and Tight Frames." In *Blackwell Companion to Major Social Theorists,* edited by George Ritzer. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Fine, G. and D. Martin. 1990. "A Partisan View: Sarcasm. Satire and Irony in Erving Goffman's *Asylums: Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 19:89–115.

Goffman, E. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* New York: Doubleday, Anchor.

———. 1961. *Asylums.* Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.

———. 1963. *Behavior in Public Places: Notes on the Social Organization of Gatherings.* New York: Free Press.

———. 1969. *Strategic Interaction.* Philadelphia, PA: University of Philadelphia Press.

———. 1971. *Relations in Public: Microstudies of the Public Order.* New York: Basic Books.

———. 1974. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience.* New York: Harper & Row.

———. 1983. "The Interaction Order." *American Sociological Review* 48:1–17.

Manning, P. 1992. *Erving Goffman and Modern Sociology.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Smith, G., ed. 1999. *Goffman and Social Organization: Studies in a Sociological Legacy.* London: Routledge.

Verhoeven, J. 1993. "An Interview with Erving Goffman, 1980." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 26:317–48

Winkin, Y. 1988. *Erving Goffman: Les Moments et Leurs Hommes.* Paris: Minuit.

GOLDSTONE, JACK

Jack A. Goldstone's (1953–) work is exemplary of a long and distinguished mode of sociological theory pioneered by such as giants as Karl Marx, Alexis de Tocqueville, and Max Weber. Like the founders of modern sociology, Goldstone develops theories of macrosocial processes designed to explain outcomes of exceptional interest. He has been particularly concerned with understanding why and how revolutions occur in specific places and times, the factors that promote smaller-scale revolts and social transformations, and, most recently, the emergence of the Industrial Revolution in England. Goldstone's explanations invoke general theoretical concepts, but they are also firmly grounded in the histories and empirical details of actual cases. As a result, his work simultaneously speaks to social theorists committed to explaining worldly transformations and historians who care deeply about the specific events of individual cases.

The eldest son of German Jewish immigrants who spent World War II in China, Goldstone studied with Shmuel N. Eisenstadt, Theda Skocpol, and George Homans at Harvard University, and it was here that he cultivated an interest in macro-comparative sociology. He taught at Northwestern University before coming to the University of California at Davis, where he was a professor of sociology and the founding director of the Center for History, Society, and Culture. In 2003, Goldstone joined George Mason University as the Virginia E. and John T. Hazel, Jr. Professor of Public Policy and Eminent Scholar.

One major strand of Goldstone's work focuses on the causes and outcomes of revolutions in the early modern world. In *Revolution and Rebellion in the Early Modern World,* which received the 1993 Distinguished Scholarly Publication Award of the American Sociological Association, he shows how a common pattern was at work in the production of revolutions in both European and non-European societies. Whereas much social theory—both Marxist and liberal—identifies revolutions as critical turning points in long-term social change and the emergence of the modern world, Goldstone argues that the major revolutions in world history were brought about by cyclic demographic changes impinging on structural factors common to agrarian-bureaucratic regimes across Europe and Asia. In particular, population growth produced revolution by triggering a cycle of state financial crises, intra-elite and elite-state conflict, popular opposition, and transformative ideologies. This theory of revolution is notable not only for its parsimony but also for the fascinating vision it offers of gradual, long-term changes operating on several levels of analysis that combine together to produce sudden episodes of dramatic transformation.

Goldstone has been at the forefront of theoretical efforts to link the study of revolutions to other social phenomena. He has shown that social movements and popular protest may emerge from similar causes and that revolutions can be seen as instances where social mobilization receives societal support and where the state response to mobilization is weak or inconsistent. Likewise, he has examined how his basic theory of revolution can be used to explain smaller-scale forms of collective action such as prison riots. If the real test of a theory is its ability to be extended to diverse phenomena, including phenomena at different levels of analysis, then Goldstone's work on revolution fares remarkably well.

A central theme in much of Goldstone's scholarship entails rethinking received theories of Western modernization. In the work on revolutions, he challenges the notion that events such as the French Revolution should be conceived as a breakthrough to a new mode of production. Instead, he shows that even the great revolutions are best conceived as crises of state breakdown in agrarian societies.

Patterns of revolution found in the Western world also apply to non-Western societies that are often regarded as following fundamentally different routes of modernization.

To the extent that new modes of social organization emerge from revolutionary crises, Goldstone argues that it is due to cultural conditions and elite alignments. In particular, the challenges of stabilizing power and solving societal problems in the aftermath of revolutions promote innovative solutions and/or deeply reactive responses. Thus, in countries where conservative elites and traditions dominated, the aftermath of revolution often saw the reinforcement of past practices and beliefs (e.g., counter-reformation Europe, Ottoman Turkey, Qing China). Indeed, no revolution—not the English, or the French, or even the American—created a definitive break with the past or fully undermined prior elites. At best, revolutions in modern world history have set in motion ideological and elite conflicts that evolved into stable republican institutions over many decades, often after further episodes of revolution, autocracy, or civil war.

Goldstone's recent work on industrialization also challenges the idea that the origins of the modern world can be found simply in capitalism or in revolution. Instead, to explain the Industrial Revolution, he insists that we need to understand how discoveries allowed the harnessing of fossil fuel through engines, and we must come to terms with the unique cultural and social milieu that produced that breakthrough. The breakthrough to industrialization occurred only in seventeenth and eighteenth century England, where a peculiar combination of conditions was located: religious pluralism and tolerance that was supportive of new, particularly Newtonian, cosmologies; an engine and instrument-based variant of mechanistic science that developed experimentation and machine construction to very high levels; a broad dissemination of mechanical knowledge and interests throughout society, including to artisans and entrepreneurs; and a social order that encouraged a high level of exchange and cooperation among artisans, entrepreneurs, and natural philosophers. All these conditions coming together in one place—a very unlikely and perhaps accidental mix—produced the first generation of widespread engineering talent based on precise experimental methods and theories of mechanics, and hence the steam engine in particular and industrialization in general.

Goldstone's scholarship is situated squarely within the classical tradition of social theory in which major concepts and explanatory hypotheses are grounded in the histories of concrete cases. The approach here is one of moving back and forth between theory and history, confronting initial theoretical hunches with evidence until plausible explanatory accounts are rendered. In methodological writings, Goldstone uses the phrase "detective method" to characterize this approach to theory building in which potential explanations are systematically evaluated in light of fine-grained evidence from the historiography. His methodological writings have emphasized the ways in which comparative-historical researchers rely on both deduction and induction to formulate hypotheses, and how these scholars have increased our knowledge by combining different methods of causal analysis to rigorously test competing hypotheses.

— James Mahoney

See also Eisenstadt, Shmuel N.; Historical and Comparative Theory; Homans, George; Revolution; Social Movement Theory

FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

Goldstone, Jack A. 1991. *Revolution and Rebellion in the Early Modern World.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
———. 1997. "Methodological Issues in Comparative Macrosociology." *Comparative Social Research* 16:107–20.
———. 2002. "Efflorescences and Economic Growth in World History: Rethinking the 'Rise of the West' and the British Industrial Revolution." *Journal of World History* 13:323–89.
———. 2004. *The Happy Chance: The Rise of the West in Global Context, 1500–1800.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Goldstone, Jack A. and Bert Useem. 1999. "Prison Riots as Micro-Revolutions: An Extension of State-Centered Theories of Revolution." *American Journal of Sociology* 104:985–1029.

GOULDNER, ALVIN

Alvin Ward Gouldner (1920–1980) was an American sociologist who made his early and lasting mark in the field of industrial sociology. A few years after graduating from City College of New York, where he received a bachelor of business administration degree in 1941, Gouldner began work on a master's degree in sociology at Columbia University. By this time, industrial sociology had become an established subfield within sociology, growing in large part out of the earlier Hawthorne experiments conducted between 1927 and 1932 and Elton Mayo's program of human relations management that developed shortly thereafter. With his business background and interest in applying theory to this newly burgeoning area of concern, Gouldner found a supportive and sympathetic mentor in Robert K. Merton, who had joined the Columbia faculty in 1941. Merton (1982) was impressed by the seriousness and scholarly acumen of the young Gouldner, and under his guidance, Gouldner completed his MA thesis in 1945.

Over the next few years, Gouldner took a number of positions while working on his Columbia dissertation under Merton. From 1945 to 1947, he served as resident sociologist on the American Jewish Committee, then as an assistant professor at the University of Buffalo from 1947 to 1951. In 1951 and 1952, he worked as a consulting sociologist at Standard Oil Company in New Jersey, then as an associate professor at Antioch College from 1952 to 1954. During these years, some

of Gouldner's first scholarly articles were published in such journals as *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* (in 1946), *American Journal of Sociology* (in 1947), and *American Sociological Review* (in 1948) (see Chriss 1999 for a thorough bibliography of Gouldner's work).

In 1953, Gouldner completed and successfully defended his doctoral dissertation, which he titled "Industry and Bureaucracy." Robert Merton, serving as committee chair, was impressed with the dissertation and informed Gouldner that with only minor revisions, he should have not one, but *two* books ready for press. And indeed, a year later both *Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy* and *Wildcat Strike* were published from the dissertation. In *Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy*, the more famous of the two books, Gouldner conducted a case study of a gypsum plant undergoing changes in management and plant operation. His main finding was that management succession tends to lead to higher levels of bureaucratization within organizations.

Through the 1950s and into the early 1960s, Gouldner continued to cement his position among the intellectual leadership of the field of industrial sociology while also contributing important insights to another field, sociological theory. These accomplishments led to his becoming professor and chairman of sociology and anthropology at Washington University in St. Louis beginning in 1959. A year later, he published "The Norm of Reciprocity," which still stands today as one of the most frequently cited articles in sociology. In this paper, Gouldner focuses on the ways in which functionalist theorists tacitly invoke the concept of reciprocity but formally neglect to define and elaborate upon it. Saying that A is functional for B assumes that B reciprocates A's services, but also that B's service to A is contingent upon A's performance of positive functions for B. Gouldner, however, echoing a Marxist strand of critique of functionalism's assumptions about functional reciprocity, points out that if B is significantly more powerful than A, B can force A to benefit it with little or no reciprocity. This illustrates how social order is possible not only through consensual reciprocity—the explanation functionalists tend to favor—but also through outright force or coercion where reciprocity may hardly be present at all.

By the early 1960s, Gouldner pretty much left the field of industrial sociology behind, choosing instead to explore issues in social theory, including not only the issue of reciprocity (Gouldner 1960) but also the status of both functionalism and Marxism in contemporary sociology, the nature of values in social theory, the role of intellectuals in modern society, the interplay between science and ideology, ancient Greek thought, and the sociology of knowledge.

The radical ferment of the 1960s prodded Gouldner into publishing, in 1970, a blistering attack against Talcott Parsons and American sociology titled *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology*. Gouldner's major point of contention

against Parsons and the functionalists was that, in placing an overweening emphasis on the importance of normative consensus in assuring social order, functionalism was ideologically and politically conservative, which was contradictory to the liberal and even radicalizing ethos that marked sociology as a discipline circa the late 1960s. This signaled a pending crisis in functionalism and, since Gouldner equated functionalism with sociology's establishment, for sociology more generally.

Gouldner was not only a virulent critic of functionalism, however. From approximately 1962 forward he unleashed a virtual tirade against all systems of thought that lacked the reflexivity to peer into and confront their own assumptions, anomalies, and contradictions. This is seen, for example, in Gouldner's attacks on (1) the doctrine of objectivity and value neutrality in science, (2) the secrets of organizations and the pathological consequences of these for social service agencies in particular, (3) partisanship for the dispossessed and downtrodden in society, especially to the extent that research on such populations is funded by the welfare state, (4) the sociological establishment, and (5) Marxism (see, e.g., Gouldner 1970, 1973, 1980).

Gouldner's program of critique culminated in the final chapter of *The Two Marxisms*, published in 1980, the year of his death. This chapter, titled "Nightmare Marxism," analyzed what went wrong with a theory that began with such high hopes of ending human oppression and fulfilling the Enlightenment ideal of the perfectibility of humankind. Like each of the systems of thought mentioned above, Marxism, too, was never reflexive enough to solve, much less recognize, some of the deeply disturbing paradoxes residing in the theory's infrastructure. For example, how could the intelligentsia, most of whose members came from privileged, bourgeois backgrounds, elude their own social being to give expression to the consciousness of the proletariat? This contradicts what Marxism states overtly, namely that social location gives rise to consciousness, to a particular way of seeing and understanding the world. This garbled account of the origins of Marxism points to weaknesses in the entire Marxist analytic, according to Gouldner, and partially accounts for the nightmarish regimes of terror that have emerged under Critical Marxism in various times and places in the world.

Taken as a whole, Gouldner's body of work represents some of the most important and innovative contributions to sociology and social theory in the postwar era. It is very likely that Gouldner's own difficult personality, which included not only verbal but also physical altercations with colleagues and students at Washington University and elsewhere, contributed to the reduced visibility of his ideas in theory and organizational studies beginning shortly after his death. However, interest in Gouldner appears to be on the rise again, and his programs of reflexivity and social critique are likely to be taken up anew as social scientists

continue to grapple with explanations of human society in the new millennium.

— James J. Chriss

See also Functionalism; Marxism; Merton, Robert K.; Parsons, Talcott

FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

Chriss, James J. 1999. *Alvin W. Gouldner: Sociologist and Outlaw Marxist.* Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

Gouldner, Alvin W. 1960. "The Norm of Reciprocity: A Preliminary Statement." *American Sociological Review* 25:161–178.

———. 1970. *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology.* New York: Avon.

———. 1973. *For Sociology: Renewal and Critique in Sociology Today.* New York: Basic Books.

———. 1979. *The Future of Intellectuals and the Rise of the New Class.* New York: Seabury.

———. 1980. *The Two Marxisms: The Ambiguous Legacy.* New York: Seabury.

Merton, Robert K. 1982. "Alvin W. Gouldner: Genesis and Growth of a Friendship." *Theory and Society* 11:915–38.

GOVERNMENTALITY

Govermentality, a term appearing in the later works of Michael Foucault, refers to the ethical practices whereby individuals form and care for the self as it is affected by the wider array of social powers and knowledges. Governmentality came to replace Foucault's more famous concept power/knowledge *(pouvoir/savoir)* in the empirical volumes of his history of sexuality (Foucault 1985, 1986).

The deep background of the theory of governmentality is the long history of social theory's attempt to find a mediating position between the objective structures of social power and the subjective elements of selfhood. In his theory of power/knowledge, Foucault was one of the first in the late modern era to show that social theories of knowledge must perforce be theories of social power. In this he was able to advance the idea by drawing upon the distinction made in the French language between formal or scientific knowledges *(connaissances)* and practical knowledges of daily life *(saviors)*. This made it possible to avoid an over-simplifying notion of ideology that invites the suggestion that knowledges are all of one kind, thus uniformly susceptible to the distortions of political and economic interests.

Foucault's theory of power/knowledge, though often stated in highly abstract terms, was a direct outcome of his empirical studies in the history of modern social forms, including its forms of culture and knowledge. Thus,

even before the expression came into explicit use in *Archaeologie du savoir* (1969), his early studies of madness, the hospital, and the human sciences were, in effect, a history of the forms of power at play in the modern era. He saw, quite clearly, that the traditional top-down idea of power (commonly associated with Karl Marx) is unable to account for the fact that, in the modern system especially, individuals subject *themselves* to power. At the beginning, for example, the urban migrations for work in the factory system were, in principle, voluntary (if only in the sense that agrarian labor was disappearing). Hence Foucault's idea that in modernity power works often in a gentle way by applying itself to the practical knowledges taught (or absorbed and otherwise learned) by ordinary men and women in the course of daily life. To work in a factory is both to learn a different method of ordering daily life and to subject oneself to a new regime of power.

Power/knowledge eventually gave way to governmentality in the second and third volumes of Foucault's history of sexuality (1985, 1986). Though he used the earlier expression in the first volume (1978), once he immersed himself in the research on sexual practices and self-care, he came to see what was at work, from the earliest, even with the Greeks. Selfhood had always been less a form of knowledge as such than a practical ethic. The effect of this insight was that in the third of his sexuality studies (1986), he seems to have lost interest in sexuality and turned to a general theory of the self and self-formation.

Governmentality is a concept of rich potential (largely unrealized in Anglophone social theory) for theories of the social self. It invites a vastly more complex and broad-ranging social psychology than is permitted, for example, by the concept *socialization.* Governmentality allows social theory to avoid the dead end of supposing that the social self is formed by the introjection of structured cultures and their social values. Instead of the wider social forces intruding upon the self, or offering the self an array of social opportunities, governmentality allows social theory to locate the formation of subjecthood at an earlier, if preconscious, point in the social development of the individual. When, in the earliest months of life, individuals learn to govern themselves, they are learning as well the play of social power mediated by even the gentlest of parental gestures. When, later in development, the individual is said to become a self, or to "have" a self, he or she can be seen as having achieved a degree of ethical competence in governing oneself in relation to the power plays to which one is subjected and into which one inserts oneself. The affinities to power/knowledge are apparent, as are the ways a theory of governmentality seeks to rethink the social self in political terms.

— Charles Lemert

See also Foucault, Michel; Power; Surveillance and Society