

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

*Governmentality*, 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 oversimplifying 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

own avant-garde, and its own futurism, its own automotive and industrial revolution with Fiat rather than Ford at the forefront. Gramsci wanted more of this, not less. He was a modernizing Marxist, but one who retained a sense that the modernity of the cities needed to take the peasants with it. Like the contradiction between democracy and bolshevism in his political thought, these contradictions in his sociology were never resolved.

— Peter Beilharz

*See also* Cultural Marxism and British Cultural Studies; Lukács, György; Marxism

## FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

- Crehan, K. 2002. *Gramsci, Culture and Anthropology*. London: Pluto.
- Davidson, A. 1977. *Antonio Gramsci: Towards an Intellectual Biography*. London: Merlin.
- Gramsci, A. [1926] 1995. *The Southern Question*. Translated by Pasquale Verdicchio. Lafayette, IN: Bordighera.
- . 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. New York: International.
- . 1975. *Letters from Prison*. London: Cape.
- Showstack Sassoon, A. 1980. *Gramsci's Politics*. London: Croom.

## GRAPH THEORETIC MEASURES OF POWER

Power is a topic of long-standing interest in sociology, and its nature, causes, and consequences are approached through a variety of theoretical perspectives. A particularly fruitful definition, attributable to Max Weber, treats power as the ability of individuals or collectivities to exercise their will over another, even against the will of the other.

Graph theoretic approaches to explaining and measuring power have attracted significant interest due to their conceptual precision and predictive accuracy in experimental tests. Graph theory is a branch of mathematics that focuses on properties of graphs, which it defines in terms of sets of points and lines, or *vertices* and *edges*, respectively. This makes it very useful for the description and analysis of social networks that typically represent social actors (individual or collective) as points or *nodes*, and their relationships (directed or nondirected) as lines or *ties*.

In general, graph theoretic measures of power determine the relative levels of power for each position in a network. They do so by taking into account certain attributes of the network structure and aspects of a position's location in that structure. This is in contrast to more individualistic approaches to power that focus on attributes of actors such as personal charisma or negotiation skills.

Graph theory provides methods for describing and deriving a wide array of network structural properties. Some of these properties are quite simple and intuitive. For example, the *geodesic* between two points is simply the minimum number of ties that separates them; the *indegree* of a network node is the number of its ties from other nodes; and the *density* of a network is the ratio of the number of existing ties to the number of possible ties. At the other extreme, some graph properties are much more complicated and esoteric. However, theories of power in social networks usually employ relatively simple graph theoretic measures.

There are two important precursors to graph theoretic approaches to power: measures of *prestige* and measures of *centrality*. Prestige measures usually entail directed ties, for example  $A \rightarrow B$ . Prestige may be assumed to accrue to one who is chosen by many others, such as to a person who is a key source of information. More sophisticated measures account for an actor's prestige in terms of the level of prestige of the actors who select him or her.

In contrast to prestige measures, centrality measures are designed to capture the degree to which a given actor is well connected to the rest of the network. These measures typically employ nondirected or mutual ties. Similar to the case for prestige, more sophisticated measures may be designed to take into account the centrality of not only the focal actor, but also the centrality of actors with whom the focal actor has ties.

Because power is not identical to centrality or prestige, it stands to reason that it is not measured the same way. Even if we suspect that centrality is essential for power, it would not make sense always to equate them. For example, while being tied to others with high centrality may raise one's own centrality, being tied to others with high power may diminish one's own power.

Graph theory does not specify which network properties and measures may be useful for detecting power. Such directives must come from substantive theories of power. Moreover, any theory of power in networks must have certain elements in addition to graph theoretic measures (or measures based in any other logical or mathematical system) in order to generate hypotheses that are testable in social settings.

The relationship between network exchange theory (NET) and its graph-theoretic power index (GPI) illustrates the foregoing point. Although several theories employ graph theoretic methods to explain power phenomena in exchange networks, NET is among the most explicit and thoroughly tested. First, NET includes definitions for its key terms, imbuing with sociological relevance the abstract concepts it borrows from graph theory. For instance, the notion of a *graph* containing *vertices* connected by *edges* is implemented as a *network* containing *positions* (occupied by *actors*) that are in *exchange relations* with one another.

Second, NET includes provisional *scope conditions* that describe and delimit properties of the actors and social