

ERVING GOFFMAN: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Charles Wright Tucker, Jr.

1963



3 1293 10340 8906

~~Q-1137339~~

~~L-178~~ DSS

E-157.

~~20098~~

~~301~~

~~11~~ 011

41 6 23

~~8-2-2010~~

OCT 26 199

SEP 2 199

231

MAY 1 2010

05 24 10

APR 2 199

ERVING GOFFMAN: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

By

Charles Wright Tucker, Jr.

A THESIS

Submitted to Michigan State University College of
Social Science in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

1963

Approved by:

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Charles P. Loomis", is written over a horizontal line.

6.25941

4.2163

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In this section I would like to express my appreciation to those persons who have given their time and effort in order that this thesis might be completed. Of course, they cannot be held responsible for any misinterpretations that may have occurred.

First and foremost, I would like to acknowledge the critical guidance of Research Professor Charles P. Loomis. Without his model, both personal and analytical, this thesis would not have been conceived or completed.

Secondly, I would like to express my thanks to my committee members--Professors J. Allan Beegle and William H. Form for their constructive criticisms regarding the content of this thesis.

Thirdly, I would like to acknowledge some of the graduate students whose recommendations were helpful: S. Saghir Ahmad, Richard A. Brymer, Eugenio Fonseca, Marvin Leavy, and Clark McPhail.

Finally, the sense of obligation that I have to my wife and daughter for their patience and understanding cannot be expressed in writing. Needless to say, the part they played was central.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Purpose	1
The Importance	1
The Organization	2
II. ERVING GOFFMAN: THE SETTING	4
Academic Career	4
Technique	5
Theoretical Orientation	5
Review of Articles	6
Summary	11
III. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS IN TERMS OF THE PAS MODEL.	12
Knowing	14
Feeling	16
Achieving	22
Norming, Standardizing, Patterning	25
Dividing the Functions	30
Ranking	33
Controlling	37
Sanctioning	37
Facilitating	40
Comprehensive or Master Processes	43
Conditions of Social Action	52
Change	54
IV. COMPARISONS AND CONCLUSIONS	56
Comparisons	56
Conclusions	58
GLOSSARY	61
NOTES	66

INTRODUCTION

By way of introduction several concerns will be discussed. First, the purpose of this thesis will be described. Secondly, the importance of this thesis to the field of sociological theory will be discussed. Finally, the organization of the thesis will be outlined to aid the reader on his journey.

The Purpose

The purpose of this thesis is to analyze the major books of Erving Goffman. Although all of his work is treated in one manner or another in this thesis, only his three major books (i.e., The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life; Asylums; and Encounters) will be analyzed using a model designed for this purpose. This analytical device is the Processual Articulated Structural Model (hereafter denoted as the PAS Model) devised by Professor Loomis.¹ Consequently, this thesis will follow closely the examples of other writers who have undertaken a similar task.²

The Importance

It should be apparent to anyone who is even mildly acquainted with sociological theory that one of its severe handicaps is what has been called "terminological confusion."³ We have, as Merton suggests, single terms that symbolize

different concepts and single concepts which are symbolized by the different terms.⁴ The recognition of this state of affairs was one of the prerequisites that stimulated the analytical task and the model employed in this thesis.

Naturally, we would not make the claim that this thesis will immediately "rectify" the terminological confusion of sociological theory. This thesis is just one modest attempt designed to accomplish this task using the work of one man. We will show the relationship between the meanings of the elements and the processes in the PAS Model and similar meanings in the ideas of Erving Goffman. We are not concerned with the terms that he uses, just the meanings given to those terms. Where Goffman employs the same terms and concepts that are contained in the PAS Model, this will be noted; where he differs will also be noted. By this method, we hope to demonstrate that the terminological confusion that exists in sociological theory is more apparent than real.

The Organization

To accomplish the task mentioned in the previous section, this thesis will be divided into four parts. The subject matter of each part will be as follows:

Part II contains some background information about Erving Goffman.

Part III contains the comparative analysis of Goffman's work using the PAS Model.

Part IV contains several comparisons which exist between the concepts of Goffman and the theorists that have

been analyzed in Modern Social Theories. In addition, some general conclusions of this study will be included in this portion.

ERVING GOFFMAN: THE SETTING

The purpose of this section is to provide the reader with some background information about Erving Goffman and his contributions to social science. First, some biographical data is presented. Next, a brief section on his technique of data collecting. Following that, there is a brief section on his theoretical orientation; and finally, a review of his earlier works.

Academic Career

Goffman, a Canadian by birth (1922), received his A.B. Degree at the University of Toronto in 1945. He acquired his M.A. Degree in Sociology at the University of Chicago in 1949 under the direction of W. Lloyd Warner.⁵ From 1949 to 1951 he was affiliated with the Department of Social Anthropology at the University of Edinburgh. During these years in Scotland he conducted the research which developed into his Ph.D. dissertation entitled: Communication Conduct in an Island Community.

Returning to Chicago in 1952 he held the position of Research Assistant in the Division of Social Sciences. He was awarded his degree in 1953. The following year he stayed in Chicago in the capacity of Research Associate. From 1954 to 1957, he was Visiting Scientist for the National Institute of Mental Health. Since 1958 he has been Professor in the

Department of Sociology at the University of California at Berkeley where he specializes in the areas of social organization, social interaction, and deviancy.

Technique

Non-participant observation is used extensively by Goffman for collecting his data. In his work on total institutions the limits of his technique and the type of data gathered are explained:

I did not allow myself to be committed even nominally, and had I done so my range of movement and roles, and hence my data, would have been restricted even more than they were. Desiring to obtain ethnographic detail regarding selected aspects of patient social life, I did not employ the usual kinds of measurement and controls. I assumed that the role and the time required to gather statistical evidence for a few statements would preclude my gathering data on the tissue and fabric of patient life.⁶

Although this is the only place where he clearly states his method of data gathering, it is implied in other works that this is the only method utilized.

Theoretical Orientation

Knowing his interest in the development of the self in the context of interaction, one has to label Goffman as a symbolic interactionist.⁷ The social encounter is the central unit of social organization for him. In a seminar on communication, Goffman stated his interests as follows:

I have been interested in social encounters, in the moments during which people come into and remain in one another's presence. . . . I am interested in how an individual must act to communicate that he is a member in good standing in a situation, in a conversation, or in an occupation . . .

Throughout all of his major books that will be reviewed in this thesis, Goffman maintains this unit as his central concern.

Review of Articles

It is the purpose of this section to present some of the more salient aspects of Goffman's early publications. In doing this, it is believed that support will be given to the previous comments concerning him and, in addition, it will assist the reader in the following sections of this thesis.

Goffman's first article is concerned with the status symbol. He is specifically interested in "the pressures that play upon behavior as a result of the fact that a symbol of status is not always a very good test of status (rank)."⁸ These status symbols, or "sign-vehicles," communicate to others the rank of the individual possessing them. They, in turn, "divide the social world into categories of persons, thereby helping to maintain solidarity within a category and hostility between different categories."⁹ In this work he deals with the various devices for restricting the misrepresentative use of any symbol.¹⁰ These restrictions may be moral, intrinsic, natural, socialization, cultivational, or organic.¹¹ The rationale for mentioning these restrictive devices is their bearing upon the circulation of class symbols.¹² The two major consequences of this circulation process are: (1) those with whom a symbol originates must turn from that which is familiar to them and seek out, again

and again, something which is not yet contaminated; and (2) status symbols provide the cue that is used in order to discover the status of others and, from this, the way in which others are to be treated.¹³ These symbols, then, are important in the study of interaction. In summary, he makes a plea for more empirical studies to trace out the social career of particular status symbols. These studies, he contends, are "useful in a period (1951) when widespread cultural communication has increased the circulation of symbols, the power of curator groups, and the ranges of behaviour that are accepted as vehicles for symbols of status."¹⁴

Goffman's next article¹⁵ employs one of the models that has given a particular identifying style to his works. This model is the interaction process between the confidence man and his "mark." Goffman focuses upon "the social processes by which transformations in self-concept and social role are consciously and deliberately facilitated by others."¹⁶ This essay deals with the adaptation which an individual must make to re-establish self-equilibrium after experiencing a loss. His central concern is the loss of status-role. When an individual discovers that he is unqualified for a particular role, there is a period of time in which he has feelings of dissonance and humiliation. It is Goffman's contention that consonance must be restored. In this restoration process, he only considers those actions by other actors which guide it.¹⁷ Here we find evidence of Goffman's interest in the individual's self-development. He states that the loss

of a status-role is "one of the deaths that is possible for the individual."¹⁸ He maintains that more research should be done on the processes by which these individuals are "put to death," for in this manner it may be possible to reduce the number of "dead that continue to walk among the living."¹⁹

Continuing this same theme, Goffman's next article deals with the interesting process of "face-work."²⁰ Here again, Goffman displays his concern for the individual and his self-development. A person's (face) is a self image delineated in terms of approved social attribute--albeit, an image that others may share.²¹ The purpose and necessity of "face-work" is to guard against the violation of this image. Goffman emphasizes its importance when stating, "one's face, then, is a sacred thing, and expressive order required to sustain it is therefore a ritual one."²² He illustrated and defined the processes, both corrective and protective, that are necessary to save face and suggested there is a "functional relationship between the structure of the self and the structure of spoken interaction."²³ As a whole, this article fits into Goffman's explicit interest in self-creation and development.

Deference and demeanor (see Glossary) are the focus of his next article; it was also the first published account of material from his observations in mental hospitals. Here again, we discovered Goffman's interest for the individual and the social encounter. Based on the assumption (explored

above) that the individual "is allotted a kind of sacredness that is displayed and confirmed by symbolic acts," he guides the reader on a journey through the world of self-presentation. The essence of the article is best expressed in Goffman's own words:

The Meadian notion that the individual takes toward himself the attitude others take toward him seems very much an oversimplification. Rather the individuals must rely on others to paint only certain parts. Each individual is responsible for the demeanor image of himself and deference image of others, so that for a complete man to be expressed, individuals must hold hands in a chain of ceremony, each giving deferentially with proper demeanor to the one on the right what will be received deferentially from the one on the left.²⁴

Therefore, the individual's self is a product of joint ceremonial labor with demeanor being no more significant than deference.

Again, we see an extension of his interest in face-work in his next work on embarrassment.²⁵ The major concern in this article is the "figure the individual cuts before others felt to be there at the time he presents himself."²⁶ Embarrassment plays an important part, according to Goffman, when this presentation process and the individual's self is threatened.²⁷ When the individual recognizes a threatening event (called incident), embarrassment follows because "to conduct one's self comfortably in interaction and to be flustered are directly opposed."²⁸ Then, to banish the embarrassment the individual must attempt to re-establish the smooth flow of the situation. But, for Goffman, embarrassment also has a social function. Its function is:

By showing embarrassment when he can be neither of two people (status-roles), the individual leaves open the possibility that in the future he may effectively be either. His role in the current interaction may be sacrificed, and even the encounter itself, but he demonstrated that while he can not present a suitable and coherent self on this occasion, he is at least disturbed by the fact and may prove worthy at another time.²⁹

So, in effect, the individual discovers through embarrassment which identity he can safely project and, consequently, reduces dissonance in future social interaction.

Using "conjoint spontaneous involvement" as a point of reference, his latest article deals with the ways involvement can fail to occur and the individual can become alienated from conversational encounters. It is Goffman's contention that spontaneous conversational interaction "is a little social system with its own boundary-maintaining tendencies; it is a little patch of commitment and loyalty with its heroes and its own villains."³⁰ He discusses how the individual becomes involved and then proceeds to outline the ways in which he becomes alienated. These are: external preoccupation, self-consciousness, interaction consciousness, and other consciousness.³¹ The rules of conduct that are considered in the encounter are also mentioned. The reason for approaching human behavior at this level is "by doing this we can learn something about the way in which the individual can become alienated from things that take much more of his time."³² Therefore, by exploring this lower level of behavior we can extrapolate, with reservation and caution, to explanation on a higher level.

Summary

Even with this cursory review of Goffman's early articles, his sociological concerns should be apparent to the reader. In terms of the structural-functional categories of the PAS Model these are: Feeling, Norming, and Dividing of Functions. Communication is the Master Process which receives the greatest emphasis. Although these remain the core of his own cognitive mapping throughout his work, it will be seen in the following section on comparative analysis that all the elements and processes of the PAS Model are treated by Goffman.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS IN TERMS OF THE PAS MODEL

This is the central part of this thesis. It will consider the three major books of Erving Goffman in juxtaposition with the PAS Model. But before this discussion, some comments will be given concerning the style of each section and the procedures employed in analysis.

Even though Goffman has a single theoretical thread that runs throughout his works, his writings are on different levels. For example, the book on total institutions is on a higher level than his book on the self. We are distinguishing levels in this case by the complexity of the system under discussion. The book on the social encounter is still at another level which differs from both of the above. For this reason, we have chosen to separate them in the discussion under each element and process. The separation is not difficult to discover. When we are concerned with the total institution, that term will be used in discussion. When we are concerned with the social encounter, that term or simply "encounter" will be used. And finally, in our discussion about the presentation of self, the terms of "performance," "dramaturgically speaking," or simply "self" will be used.

Much of Goffman's work is written in a metaphorical style and for this reason many of his terms differ from

those used by other social scientists. It must be added that even though this is the case, his meanings for those terms do not differ a great deal. Given this condition, this writer thought it would be more meaningful for the reader if he could have a glossary of these terms to which he could refer. This glossary is to be found on pages 61 through 65. It might be helpful if the reader would review the glossary before reading the following sections.

Finally, a note on the procedure which was employed by this writer to accomplish the analysis. It must be first stated that there is no formalized procedure for using the PAS Model in analysis. In other words, there is no "PAS Model Kit" on the sociological market. Each individual analyst decides what is the best procedure for him and uses it. This writer accomplished the analysis in three stages. First, all of the works of the subject were read in order to become familiar with his general style and thought. Secondly, the works were read again, with the elements and processes of the PAS Model particularly in mind. On this second reading all statements which "fit" an element or process were put on cards. And finally, in the writing, the quotations and other information for the elements and the processes were taken from these cards. Naturally, in this last stage the writer was forced to choose which statements were representative of the ideas of the author being analyzed. As a general rule the statements that are found below were chosen because it was thought by this writer they

best represent the total character of Erving Goffman's published works and, in turn, the message he has given to the sociological world.

Knowing

Belief (knowledge) as an element.--Belief concerning human nature is central to the internal activities of total institutions. This is especially true for the mental hospitals and prisons. As Goffman states, "mental hospitals stand out here because the staff pointedly establish themselves as specialists in the knowledge of human nature, who diagnose and prescribe on the basis of this intelligence."³³ In prisons "in America there is a current belief that once a man is brought to the 'breaking point,' he will there after be unable to show any resistance at all."³⁴ These beliefs affect the interaction between the staff and inmates, for it is through these the establishment views the individual. It is here, then, that the identification process of the institution is carried out.

During the performance it is necessary for the actor to believe in his part. Concomitantly, it is necessary for the audience to believe in the actor's role. There are essentially two types of beliefs concerning the actor and his role: (1) "he is fully taken in by his own act," and (2) "he is not taken in at all by his own act."³⁵ The consequence of the first type is the impression of a sincere actor, while the latter is the impression of a cynical actor. In most cases it is not simply a matter of either/or,

but these types are polemical.³⁶ "Each provides the individual with a position which has its own particular securities and defenses, so there will be a tendency for those who have traveled close to one of these poles to complete the voyage."³⁷ To insure an adequate performance the matter of belief in the role is essential.

Cognitive mapping and validation as a process.--In total institutions, generally, beliefs are brought about and sustained "by training procedures, education and working conditions."³⁸ Through interaction with the inmates, the staff either confirm or disconfirm their beliefs. Under the present system, which is called the "ward system . . . the disciplinary frame of reference lays out a relative full set of means and ends that patients can legitimately obtain . . ."³⁹ Therefore, the training conception of the staff is usually confirmed (this would be similar to Merton's idea of "self-fulfilling prophecy"). Although the concepts and methods of treating inmates are changing somewhat in the "progressive" institutions, generally speaking, they are the same as they have been for many years.⁴⁰

Dramaturgically speaking, belief in one's role is the development of many factors. It is continually being revised by the acquisition of new knowledge. This, in a real sense, is the socialization of a self concept. As new knowledge is acquired the role is altered. To exemplify, we must abstract from the process a single performance and consider it analytically.

In a particular performance, the actor attempts to force the audience to judge him and the situation in a particular way. He "may seek this judgement as an ultimate end in itself, and yet he may not completely believe that he deserves the valuation of self which he asks for or that the impression of reality which he fosters is valid."⁴¹

But the essential goal is to convince the audience that he is sincere in his role. After the actor obtains this validation from the audience the performance can commence.

Feeling

Sentiment as an element.--In total institutions some relationships, usually between inmates, reach the character of bonds.⁴² This bondedness functions as a part of the underlife of the establishment in two ways:

First, the mere emotional support and sense of a tie provided thereby may not be something established in the official design of the organization. . . . Second, and more important here, these substructures can provide the basis for both economic and social exchanges, of the kind that result in the unauthorized transfer of goods and services.⁴³

These relations may be one of three types: (1) "buddy" relations, (2) dating relations, or (3) clique relations.

Whatever type it may be, sentiment is at its base.

In social encounters sentiment is a central concern.

Early in his career Goffman dealt with emotions.⁴⁴ In this article he states:

It is plain that emotions play a part in these cycles of response, as when anguish is expressed because of what one has done to another's face, or anger because of what has been done to one's own. I want to stress that these emotions function as moves, and fit so

precisely into the logic of the ritual game that it would seem difficult to understand them without it.⁴⁵

Not only is sentiment or feeling important for face-to-face interaction per se, but Goffman also claims:

One must look rather to the fact that societies everywhere, if they are to be societies, must mobilize their members as self-regulation participants in social encounters. One way of mobilizing the individual for this purpose is through ritual; he is taught to be perceptive, to have feelings attached to self and a self expressed through face, to have pride, honor, and dignity, to have tact and a certain amount of poise.⁴⁶

Sentiment, then is one of the elements in the "cement" that holds the "foundation of societies" intact.

Not only does the actor believe in his role but he has certain feelings about it. Instead of merely doing his task and giving vent to his feelings, the actor must be engrossed in his task and acceptably convey his feelings. To what degree these feelings are conveyed to the audience is dependent upon the particular function of his role. An example of this is found in the role of the minister. The amount and type of sentiment emitted is affected by such factors as: the type of church, the type of audience, the issue involved, and the minister's concern with the issue. Whatever role may be involved, sentiment on a concrete level plays a part in its performance.

Tension management as a process.--If one were asked to epitomize Goffman's work using only one elemental process, tension management would be that process. In every published work he deals with this process and in several⁴⁷

it is the focal point. It would be impractical to include all of the examples to be found in his works, so the following will be some extractions of the more salient ones cited.

The process of "cooling the mark out" is essentially one of reducing the tensions that an individual acquires when he realizes the proof of incapacity, and hence, experiences humiliation.⁴⁸ This incapacity usually involves the loss of a status-role but the main concern here is how the tension is reduced or managed.

Certain devices can be used by the "operator" in advance so the situation will not occur. These are: (1) weed out those applicants for a role, office, or relationship who might later prove to be unsuitable and require removal; or (2) put up with or "carry" persons who have failed but who have not yet been treated as failures.⁴⁹ In addition, the individual (the possible "mark") may employ devices so that he will not experience these tensions. He may use: (1) the strategy of hedging, by not fully committing himself to the situation; (2) the strategy of secrecy, by which he conceals from others and even from himself the facts of his commitments; (3) the practice of keeping two irons in the fire; and (4) the more delicate practice of maintaining a joking or unserious relationship to ones involvements.⁵⁰ So, these devices are utilized to reduce tension creating situations. But if tension is evident, certain procedures are employed to attempt a reduction of them.

"Cooling the mark" is a process of consolation. Some of the "standard procedures" are the following:

- (1) Give the job to someone whose status (rank) relative to the mark will serve to ease the situation in some way.
- (2) Offer the mark a new status-role which provides at least something or somebody for him to become ("second-choice professions were mentioned here).
- (3) Allow the mark to explode, to break down, to cause a scene, to give full vent to his reactions and feelings.
- (4) A related procedure (to above) is called stalling where the feelings of the mark are not brought to a head because he is given no target at which to direct them.
- (5) The operator and the mark may enter into a tacit understanding according to which the mark agrees to act as if he were leaving on his own accord and the operator agrees to preserve the illusion that this was the case. It is a form of bribery.⁵¹

The next question is: what happens if the mark refuses to be cooled out? Several outcomes are cited by Goffman:

- (1) Sustained personal disorganization of the mark.
- (2) Mark can turn "sour."
- (3) He can go into "business for himself" with an "I'll show them attitude."
- (4) He may "escape" into the region of phantasy.⁵²

These ramifications in the process of "cooling the mark out" deal with tension management. But one must note the word management; this does not mean elimination of tension.

Tension, or by definition, dysphoria, is felt in all encounters at certain times. Goffman's definition of tension in this case is restricted: "It is sensed discrepancy between the world that spontaneously becomes real to the individual, or the one he is able to accept as the current reality, and one in which he is obliged to dwell."⁵³ The level of tension is increased when incidents are

introduced into the encounter. These are usually in the form of "slips, boners or malapropisms, which unintentionally introduce information that places a sudden burden on the suppressive work being done in the encounter."⁵⁴ There are also various ways by which the level of tension is reduced.

"Flooding out," or, in other words, "a flow of affect that he (the actor) no longer makes a show of concealing" is one of the techniques utilized.⁵⁵ One particular form of "flooding out" is embarrassment. This happens when the individual shows that he has projected an incompatible definition of himself. It also has a social function of reducing conflict. When tension is reduced it is called euphoria or ease.⁵⁶ In addition, certain processes of integration will bring about an euphoric-like encounter.

Integration is a process of "blending-in tension producing materials."⁵⁷ "By contributing especially apt words and deeds, it is possible for a participant to blend these embarrassing matters (incidents) smoothly into the encounter is an officially accepted way, even while giving support to the prevailing order. Such acts are structural correlates of charm, tact, or presence of mind."⁵⁸ Consequently, by the process of integration the encounter is re-established and interaction proceeds.⁵⁹

Finally, concerning the total institutions Goffman notes certain "lines of adaptation" that need to be employed by some inmates to reduce the pressures that come about through lack of adjustment. He also notes the reasons why

an inmate would not need these mechanisms:

. . . there are circumstances in which the home world of the inmate was such, in fact, as to immunize him against the bleak world on the inside, and for such persons no particular scheme of adaptation need be carried very far. Thus, some lower-class mental hospital patients who have lived their previous lives in orphanages, reformatories and jails, tend to see the hospital as just another total institution to which it is possible to apply the adaptive techniques learned and perfected in other total institutions.⁶⁰

Therefore, what is possible in the total institution may also be possible in other situations. Some persons enter into the encounters that are quite able to adjust and tension does not exist for them.

Communication of sentiment as a process.--Deference

patterns communicate the appreciation one actor has for another. As Goffman states:

The appreciation carried by an act of deference implies that the actor possesses a sentiment of regard for the recipient, often involving a general evaluation of the recipient. Regard is something the individual constantly has for others, and knows enough about to feign on occasion; yet in having regard for someone, the individual is unable to specify in detail what in fact he has in mind.⁶¹

Sometimes this "sentiment of regard" is overstated. That is to say, the actor gives the recipient the benefit of the doubt by emitting a better image than he deserves.

To conceal feelings in a social encounter is sometimes difficult, if not impossible. Recognizing this difficulty Goffman states:

A person tends to experience an immediate emotional response to the face which a contact with others allows him; he cathects his face; his "feelings" become attached to it. . . . In general, a person's attachment to a particular face coupled with the

ease with which disconfirming information can be conveyed by himself and others, provides one reason why he finds that participation in any contact with others is a commitment.⁶²

Goffman states that there is a "ritual equilibrium" which the actor strives to maintain during the encounter. Ritual, then, is composed of "acts through whose symbolic component the actor shows how worthy he is of respect or how worthy he feels others are of it."⁶³ Deference patterns discussed above are just one of the ways in which the actor conveys these sentiments and in the process attempts to maintain equilibrium.

In vis-a-vis interaction, which is the concern here, the communication of sentiment is accomplished by means of elementary symbols ("sign-vehicles"). They could consist of a gesture, a voice inflection, or the interjection of a word. Because of this, it is impossible for the interaction to proceed without a transfer of sentiment. In such a situation it is extremely difficult for an actor to disguise the existence of sentiment.

Achieving

End, goal, or objective as an element.--"One of the expressed objectives in a total institution is the rehabilitation of the inmate so he can maintain the standards that are apparent on the outside world."⁶⁴ But a contradiction is evident. In many cases the inmates are "handled as ends in themselves . . . and we find that some technically unnecessary standards of handling must be maintained with human

material."⁶⁵ This is at times "resented" by those staff members which do not view this activity as part of their "calling." At times they feel "they are being set a contradictory task, having to coerce inmates into obedience while at the same time giving the impression that human standards are being maintained and the rational goals of the institution realized."⁶⁶ Needless to say, there seems to be an abundance of institutions that never realize their goals.

Within the dramaturgical model, Goffman discusses this element on two separate levels: (1) the performance of an actor, and (2) the performance of a team. Concerning the individual, it is noted that "when an actor takes on an established social role usually he finds that a particular front has already been established for it. Whether his acquisition of the role was primarily motivated by a desire to maintain the corresponding front, the actor will find that he must do both."⁶⁷ The task concerned here is the goal of the interaction or performance. The social role will encompass this goal. A team for Goffman is "a group of individuals bound together formally in an action group in order to further like or collective ends by means available to them."⁶⁸ Insofar as they cooperate and maintain a consistent impression, which is a device (facility) or means of achieving their ends, they constitute a team. Several other means outside of dramaturgical cooperation are: bargaining power, strategic manipulation of actors, and force. The exercise of force or bargaining power "gives a set of

a source of group formation unconnected with the fact that on certain occasions the group thus formed is likely to act as a team."⁶⁹ So for Goffman the central focus of a team is the achievement of a goal.

Goal attaining activities and concomitant "latent" activities as a process.--It is extremely difficult to locate within Goffman's work a clear discussion of this process. The reason to be found in his perspective. He describes the activities of an individual from a subjective point of view. In other words, he explains the perceived feelings and beliefs of the actors as they are in the process of acting.

Latent activities are, on the other hand, always discovered taking the objective viewpoint of the observer. The observer can see the manifest functions of an activity and can have them "verified" by interviewing the actors, either during or after the activity. But the latent activities cannot be "verified" in the same manner because, by definition, they are unrecognized by the actors. Goffman, then, never really gets on the "outside" of the activity but remains "inside," making his examples of latent goal attaining activities rather ambiguous.

Goffman does have a few ideas concerning this process. He states:

Walled-in organizations have characteristics they share with few other social entities: part of the individuals obligation is to be visibly engaged at an appropriate time in the activity of the organization, which entails a mobilization of attention and muscular effort, a bending of oneself to the activity at hand.⁷⁰

These "instrumental formal organizations survive by being able to call forth unusual contributions of activity from its members; stipulated means must be employed, stipulated ends must be achieved."⁷¹

The activity involved in attaining a goal depends mainly upon the type of role being performed. For example, the goals of the doctor are, to some degree, specified by his role. He is expected to administer to the sick, maintain a certain impression in order to accomplish this end, and concomitantly acquire specific training for this activity. For Goffman the role and/or the definition of the situation establishes the proper activity for goal attainment and "latent" activity.

Norming, Standardizing, Patterning

Throughout his writing Goffman puts heavy emphasis on this category in his discussion of social action. For this reason, its treatment will be rather long and extensive.

Norm as an element.--Norms are referred to by Goffman using many terms. They are: rules of conduct, procedural rules, ceremonial rules, standards, transformation rules, primary adjustments or definition of the situation. Whatever the term or phrase used or on what level it is used, its definition remains constant. "The rules of conduct which bind the actor and the recipient together are the binding of society. . . . It is here that ceremonial rules play their social function, for many of the acts which are guided

by these rules last a brief moment, involve no substantive outlay, and can be performed in every social interaction."⁷²

In face-to-face interaction where conversation usually is involved, norms are essential. Goffman notes:

In any society, whenever the physical possibility of spoken interaction arises, it seems that a system of practices, conventions, and procedural rules comes into play which function as a means of guiding and organizing the flow of messages. . . . A set of significant gestures is employed to initiate a state of communication and as a means for the persons concerned to accredit each other as legitimate participants.⁷³

Without norms, then, communication would be random and, therefore, incomprehensible. Rules of conduct are also essential to the pattern of interaction.

Goffman describes a rule of conduct as:

A guide for action, recommended not because it is pleasant, cheap or effective, but because it is a suitable or just . . . Rules of conduct infuse all areas of activity and are upheld in the name and honor of almost everything. . . . Attachment to rules leads to a constancy and patterning of behavior, while this is not the only source of regularity in human affairs, it is certainly an important one.⁷⁴

There are two types of conduct rules; symmetrical and asymmetrical. The "symmetrical rules are ones which lead an individual to have obligations or expectations regarding others that these others have in regard to him, while asymmetrical rules are ones that lead others to be treated by an individual differently than the way he treats and is treated by them."⁷⁵ This differentiation will become clearer in the section on ranking.

Ceremonial rules differ somewhat from conduct rules.

Rules of conduct have substantive relevance in that they "guide conduct in regard to matters felt to have significance in their own right, apart from the infraction or maintenance of the rule which may express something about the selves of the person."⁷⁶ On the other hand, ceremonial rules "guide conduct in matters felt to have secondary or even no significance in their own right."⁷⁷ Their primary importance "is a conventionalized means of communication by which the individual expresses his character or conveys his appreciation of others in the situation."⁷⁸ This definition of ceremony departs from the everyday meaning which, in most instances, has a religious connotation. These ceremonial rules are so important for Goffman that much of his writings are spent on them.

In the performance of an act the society imposes certain standards and evaluations upon the actor. The performance of an individual in the "front region" may be seen as an effort to give the appearance that his activity maintains and embodies certain standards.⁷⁹ These standards seem to fall into two broad categories: (1) "matters of politeness: talk or gestural interchanges that are substitute for talk," and (2) "decorum, which is the way that the individual comports himself while in visual or aural range of the audience but not necessarily engaged in talk with them."⁸⁰ The decorum, in turn, is segmented into: (1) moral, i.e., rules regarding sex propriety, rules regarding respect of sacred places, and so on, and (2) instrumental, i.e., duties that an employer might demand of an

employee, duties concerning the care of property, maintenance of work levels, etc. These rules become revealed to the actor as his performance unfolds.

In addition to the above, the definition of the situation exerts an extensive normative character on the interaction. Its character differs in that the actors involved formulate this definition, but the "power" of it is no less important in the outcome of the performance.

Evaluation as a process.--Goffman explicitly recognized this process when he states:

In evaluation of the norms or rules which will control the encounter the participants decide which rules are important or relevant and which are not important or irrelevant. For example, it does not matter whether the game of checkers is played with bottle caps or gold figurines, the players will start with the same positions, employ the same sequence of strategic moves and counter moves, and generate the same contour of excitement.⁸¹

Accordingly, there are certain rules that are recognized by the actors which are relevant for the interaction, while others are considered irrelevant.

What has been noted above as transformation rules also play an important part in evaluation. These rules "screen" external events in their attempt to enter the social encounter.⁸² Others frequently decide who is allowed or required to participate in the encounter and, in addition, how the resources (facilities) are distributed once the participants have been selected (a bridge game is used for an example of this). Although it may seem that these rules are "rigid," it must be remembered that Goffman is concerned

here with matters of secondary importance. A matter of special importance are those properties of the participants (e.g., rank) which determines the distribution of resources.

Evaluation is important in the "adjustment" of the individual to the organization's norms and means.⁸³ Goffman makes the point that when the "adjustment" of the individual "co-operatively contributes required activity to an organization and under required condition . . . he becomes the 'normal,' 'programmed,' or built-in member."⁸⁴ When this circumstance prevails it is called a "primary adjustment." In effect, the individual has accepted the institution's view of his self, even when this view of the organization is implicit.

Another situation arises when the individual, through evaluation and other processes, does not accept the institution's view of his self. This is called "secondary adjustment."⁸⁵ Collectively considered "secondary adjustments" are called the "underlife of the institution"; it is the various ways the individual "makes out" or "works" the system.⁸⁶ When more or less formalized they become similar to the phenomena that is referred to by Robin Williams (after Robert Merton's concept of "institutionalized evasion") as "patterned evasion of norms."⁸⁷ Goffman notes essentially two kinds of secondary adjustments:

(1) Disruptive: where the realistic intentions of the participants are to abandon the organization or radically alter its structure, in either case leading to a rupture in the smooth operation of the organization.

(2) Contained: which share with primary adjustments the characteristic of fitting into existing institutional structures without introducing pressure for radical change, and which can, in fact, have the obvious function of deflecting efforts that might otherwise be disruptive.⁸⁸

Of these, Goffman is only concerned with the contained secondary adjustments. Ramifications of this phenomenon will be found below in the categories of status-role and ranking.

Dividing the Functions

Status-role is central to Goffman's analytical framework. Before beginning this section the reader should refer to the glossary to review the concepts of his "role-theory." For the discussion of this combined element and process, two of Goffman's works will receive sole emphasis. These are the books on social encounters and the presentation of self.

Status-role incorporating both element and process.--

Considering the individual in the "situated activity system" as his focal point, Goffman attempts to overcome the limitations of the traditional framework of role, the normative role, and the actual role.⁸⁹ This was made to show how these differ and also illustrate that in the past these have been not considered separately. With this preface we come to the main point of his monograph on role distance.

Role distance takes place when an individual "effectively expresses pointed separateness between himself and his putative role."⁹⁰ "A shorthand is involved here: the individual is actually denying not the role but the virtual self that is implied in the role for all accepting performers."⁹¹

It concerns essentially ". . . those behaviors that are seen by someone present as relevant to assessing the actor's attachment to his particular role and relevant to assessing in such a way as to suggest that the actor possibly has some measure of disaffection from and resistance against the role."⁹² Role distance is usually established in one of two ways: (1) "the individual tries to isolate himself as much as possible from the contamination of the situation, or (2) the individual co-operatively projects a childish self."⁹³ But "in either case the individual can slip the skin the situation would clothe him in."⁹⁴ The utility of this concept is stated by Goffman:

The concept of role distance provides a sociological means of dealing with one type of divergence between obligation and actual performance. First, we know that often distance is not introduced on an individual basis but can be predicted on the grounds of the performer's gross sex-age characteristics. Role distance is a part of typical role, and this routinized social feature should not escape us merely because role distance is not part of the normative framework of role. Secondly, that which one is careful to point out, is not, or not merely, necessarily has a directing and intimate influence on one's conduct, especially since the means for expressing this dissatisfaction must be carved out of the standard materials available in the situation.⁹⁵

Still in another context the concept of status-role important for Goffman. This is in terms of his dramaturgical model.

A status, a position, a social place is not a material thing, to be possessed and then displayed. But rather, it is a pattern of appropriate conduct, coherent, embellished, and well articulated. "It is performed with the ease or

clumsiness, awareness or not, guile or good faith, it is none the less something that must be enacted and portrayed, something that must be realized."⁹⁶

Goffman speaks of role here in terms of the personal front with its parts: setting, appearance, and manner. The front is the expressive equipment that identifies the actor and remains with him wherever he goes (see Glossary for the composite parts). Therefore, the front stipulates the status-role that the individual is playing in particular spate of interaction.

Another perspective cited by Goffman involves the crucial role of a performance. Given a particular performance as the point of reference, we have to distinguish three roles on the basis of function: (1) "those who perform, (2) those performed to, and (3) outsiders who neither perform in the show nor observe it."⁹⁷ The performers are aware of the impression they foster and ordinarily possess destructive information about the show. The audience (those performed to) know what they are allowed to perceive, qualified by what they can glean unofficially by close observation. In the main, they know the definition of the situation that the performance fosters but no destructive information about it. The outsiders know neither the secrets of the performance nor the appearance of reality fostered by it. Also of great utility is the description of the roles by the way of regions available to them: the performers know the front and back regions, the audience knows the front region, and the

outsiders are excluded from both front and back regions.⁹⁸ Goffman uses these methods to illustrate the concept of status-role.

Ranking

Rank as an element.--In Goffman's first published article, he concerned himself with the problem of ranking. He used the same distinction between prestige and esteem employed by Davis:

A status (position) may be ranked on a scale of prestige, according to the amount of social value that is placed upon it relative to other statuses in the same sector of social life. An individual is rated on a scale of esteem, depending on how closely his performance approaches the ideal established for that particular status.⁹⁹

Although this paper was explicitly interested in the circulation of class symbols (as noted above), this definition has persisted throughout his works. Although there are many instances where status is not used for position, but for rank.

Goffman mentioned ranking in several contexts. He notes that "secondary adjustments to the organization occur with different frequency and in different forms according to the location in the hierarchy of the organization."¹⁰⁰ For instance, "low-placed members tend to have less commitment and emotional attachment to the organization than higher placed members. They have jobs, not careers . . . the smallest amount of secondary adjustment is to be found in the middle range."¹⁰¹

Ranking is also important in the total institution. Staff members have more rank in the organization than the inmates. But the "ward system," which existed in the hospitals studied by Goffman was another factor in the inmates rank. Some wards have a higher rank (those with greater systemic linkage to the outside), while others had a low rank (those with less systemic linkage to the outside).¹⁰² Consequently, the inmate acquires the rank that is given to his ward.

Ranking is also evident in a performance. Concerning the members within a team, it is usually found that someone is given the right to direct and/or control the other members. In general, the members of the team will differ in the ways and the degrees to which they are allowed to direct the performance. It can be noted that the structural similarities of apparently diverse routines are nicely reflected in the like-mindedness that arises in directors everywhere.¹⁰³

Ranking can also be seen when two teams interact. In many cases it is evident the one team has a higher standing than the other. The low ranking is usually in terms of prestige. In these instances the team with the lowest rank usually attempts to alter the basis of interaction in a direction more favorable to them. This alteration may be in terms of a decrease in social distance, formality, or other factors which may be the cause of their differential standing.

Evaluation of actors and allocation of status-roles.--

Inmates are evaluated and ranked in most mental hospitals by

a "ward system." Each patient is segregated by his degree of "mental illness."¹⁰⁴ "By and large this means that patients are graded on the degree to which they violate the ceremonial rules of social intercourse . . ."¹⁰⁵ Even though this may seem to "stabilize" the internal organization of the institution, the ward system "insures a great amount of social mobility . . . especially during the inmate's first year."¹⁰⁶ Goffman mentions the first-year mobility issue:

During that time he is likely to have altered his service once, his ward three or four times, and his parole status (rank) several times; and he is likely to have experienced moves in bad as well as good directions. Each of these moves involves a very drastic alteration in the level of living and in available materials out of which to build a self-confirming round of activities, an alteration equivilent in scope, say, to a move up or down a class in wider class system.¹⁰⁷

In accordance with the evaluation then, each inmate is put in his respective ward and remains there until re-evaluation.

In a social encounter it is common for the participants to be evaluated by their presentation of self:

In general, then, through demeanor the individual relates an image of himself, but properly speaking this is not an image that is meant for his own eyes. Of course, this should not prevent us from seeing that the individual who acts with good demeanor may do so because he places an appreciable value upon himself, and that he who fails to demeanor himself properly may be accused of having "no self respect" or of holding himself too cheaply in his own eyes.¹⁰⁸

Evaluation is also a regard in deference pattern of social encounter. Essentially we are concerned with the balance of the interaction:

Between status (rank) equals we may expect to find interaction guided by symmetrical familiarity. Between superordinate and subordinate we may expect to find asymmetrical relations, the superordinate having the right to exercise certain familiarities which the subordinate is not allowed to reciprocate.¹⁰⁹

Therefore, from this example, the pervasiveness of evaluation even on this level is evident.

In the team performance the actor is evaluated in terms of his contribution to the total effort. High evaluation is given to those who contribute the most, quantitatively and qualitatively, to the team effort. An interesting aspect of this is the function of the clique. It often "functions to protect the individual, not from persons of other ranks but from persons of his own rank."¹¹⁰ Thus, while all the members of one's clique may be of the same rank, it may be crucial that not all persons of one's rank be allowed into the clique.

In many teams the director or leader is given the social duty of allocating the parts in the performance and also the personal front that is to be employed by each. It is fairly obvious that each individual has differential ability to perform in a certain part. Usually, in the small group, the leader is given the job of allocating these various parts or routines. The success of the performance and, in turn, the reputation of the director depends largely upon his ability to distribute the proper parts to the suitable individual.

Controlling

Power as an element.--For Goffman, power is defined as it is in the PAS Model. The staff of the total institution has the explicit function of controlling the inmates. At times the inmates may respect a staff member and follow his commands out of the mere authority of his position. But more often than not, especially in mental hospitals, there are other means (not inherent in the status-role) by which the staff member enforces his control over the inmates.¹¹¹ The nature of these means and their uses will be further explored under the category of sanctioning.

Decision-making and initiation into action as processes.

--Staff members in total institutions are the individuals who make decisions. These decisions usually have the force of strict mandates which carry negative sanctions if violated. Goffman discusses these matters under what is termed in this model as facilities, so further discussion will be found there.

Sanctioning

Sanction as an element.--For order to be maintained in social interaction, sanctions--both positive and negative--are necessary. Goffman cited these sanctions in various contexts. Moral restrictions that are embodied in status (rank) symbols are aided by external sanctions (e.g., group opinion).¹¹² In conversation, the violation of the rules could result in negative sanction resulting in the condition

of alienation,¹¹³ Perhaps the most vivid account of sanctions is to be found in the mental hospital's privilege system.

The purpose of the privilege system is to integrate the individual in the internal system of the institution.

Several of its base elements are:

- (1) House rules- a relatively explicit and formal set of prescriptions and proscriptions that lays out the main requirements of inmate conduct.
- (2) Gratifications- a small number of clearly defined rewards or privileges that are held out in exchange for obedience to staff in action and spirit.
- (3) Deprivations- a set of punishments that are designated as the consequences of breaking the rules. One set of punishments consists of temporary or permanent withdrawal of privileges. In general, the punishments meted out in total institutions are more severe than anything encountered by the inmate in his home world.¹¹⁴

Therefore, outside of the individual rewards that the inmate can muster for himself through secondary adjustments, all of the sanctions are imbedded in this system.

As stated above, there are two types of norms or standards in the front region: moral and instrumental. When we examine the order that is maintained, these standards "seem to affect in much the same way the individual who must answer to them, and that both moral and instrumental grounds or rationalizations are put forth as justifications for most standards that must be maintained."¹¹⁵ "Providing the standard is maintained by sanctions and by a sanctioner of some kind, it will make little difference to the actor whether the standard is justified chiefly on instrumental grounds or moral ones, and whether or not he is asked to incorporate the standard."¹¹⁶ As seen in these statements,

sanctions enforce the conformity to norms.

Application of sanctions as a process.--Goffman refers to two major procedures by which sanctions are applied. One type is "internalized sanctions," which are applied to one's self,¹¹⁷ while another type is "external sanctions," which are applied by others.¹¹⁸ Internal sanctions refer to guilt, shame, and remorse. These feelings can be found in almost every encounter. Specific reference was made to them in connection with status symbols.

External sanctions are the most obvious to the observer and, hence, are at times considered to be the only ones present. In total institutions the staff can apply negative sanctions to an inmate for such matters of conduct, dress, deportment, and manners--the patient is constantly aware of judgmental aspects.¹¹⁹ Goffman states the extent to which these judgments extend in the following:

. . . it follows that in total institutions one crucial difference from civil life is that deference is placed on a formal footing, with specific demands being made and specific negative sanctions accorded for infractions; not only will acts be required, but also the outward show of inward feelings. Expressed attitudes such as insolence will be explicitly penalized.¹²⁰

We can see from this, then, that the application of sanctions is an "enveloping process" when considered in this context. Next we will add a note about the dramaturgical performance.

Refusing to take part in the performance of a team brings about the application of negative sanction. A good

performance would conversely call for positive sanction. In most cases these sanctions are applied by the director. Such acts as rate-busting or giving extra concession to the audience on the part of member of a team is a threat to the stature that others have taken. These actions would, therefore, call forth the application of negative sanctions.¹²¹

Facilitating

Facility as an element.--Means required or utilized to achieve goals are facilities. In the PAS model these are restricted to material entities. Goffman expands the category and defines facilities as social and non-social materials that are available in the situation or encounter.¹²² He also uses the terms "realized resources"¹²³ and "sign-vehicles"¹²⁴ for what we note as facilities. Consequently, social objects for Goffman are means to an end in many situations.

When considering the underlife of an establishment, Goffman refers explicitly to facilities. These are physical arrangements used by an inmate to store or conceal possessions which are not allowed to him by the staff.¹²⁵ These are called "stashes." Some are mobile, while others are fixed. These facilities achieve the goals necessary for individual adjustment, although secondary, to institutional life.

In the case of a performance an action or object that the actor can use to achieve the task of presenting his self is a facility. The actor's setting is a facility. Props and scenery within the setting are also facilities. As

mentioned previously, the appearance and manner in the front region are on the same order. Actors use an enumerable variety of facilities in the execution of a performance.

Utilization of facilities as a process.--Goffman deals with this process on several levels. Individuals in expression of self need facilities. Within the social encounter certain facilities are necessary. On the institutional level, facilities are used to convey certain impressions to the people of the outside world. Although examples of this process are abundant in Goffman's writings, only a few will be necessary for our purposes.

Concerning the self, lack of facilities definitely inhibits expression. Individuals "must have an expandable supply of the small indulgences which his society employs in its idiom of regard--such as cigarettes to give, chairs to proffer, food to provide, and so forth."¹²⁶ Without these, proper deference and demeanor by the actor are impossible.¹²⁷

For the total institution the visiting rooms are an excellent example of a facility which is important in systemic linkage. Both decor and conduct in them are typically closer to the outside standards than are those that prevail in the inmates' actual living quarters.¹²⁸ The development of institutional display illustrates something in general about the use of facilities in the symbolization process:

First, the displayed part of the institution is likely to be the new, up-to-date part of the institution, which will change as new practices or equipment are added. . . . Second, display certainly need not be connected with frankly ceremonial aspects of the institution such as flower beds and starched curtains, but often stresses utilitarian objects such as the latest kitchen equipment. . . . Finally, each item on display will necessarily have substantive implications . . . ¹²⁹

The interesting factor in this procedure is the impression maintained by a visitor as he views these facilities. All the parties involved in this viewing process (patient, staff member, and visitor) usually realize that the display represents a dressed-up view of the institution, but even with this knowledge, all tacitly agree to continue the fiction.¹³⁰

In social encounters or focused gatherings all the facilities for the events are at hand.¹³¹ Here again facilities pertain to social as well as non-social objects. These are referred to by Goffman as "realized resources." Their relevance is apparent from this statement:

I propose to try to analyze focused gatherings on the assumption that each can be viewed as having carved everything needed from stuffs at hand; the elements of each encounter will be treated as if they constituted a full deck.¹³²

Given the presence of realized resources, it is apparent that in each encounter there will arise the problem of allocation. In more cases than not the norms of the situation (called transformation rules) determine the utilization of facilities.

For the actor, dramaturgically speaking, all the parts of the front region (setting, appearance, and manner) are given high evaluation during the performance. Obviously,

they are not all equal in any one performance, but each factor varies with specific acts. For example, under certain circumstances a doctor's appearance and manner are given high value, while on others (e.g., during an operation) the setting and the props would have a high value. It can be seen from this illustration that the modes for the utilization of facilities depend most certainly upon definition of the situation and the status-role within the situation.

Comprehensive or Master Processes

Communication.--To have and maintain interaction there must be communication of information, verbally and/or gesturally. This information may be in the form of facts, feelings, or ideas. Goffman includes all of these in his works.

In the presentation of one's face the actor must be able to verify the information that he conveys to the recipients.¹³³ More specifically:

An act that is subject to a rule of conduct is, then, a communication, for it represents a way in which selves are confirmed . . .¹³⁴

In addition, an individual can be alienated from the encounter for failing to recognize the rules of conversation.

"Poise plays an important role in communication, for it guarantees that those present will not fail to play their parts in the interaction, but will continue as long as they are one another's presence to receive and transmit disciplined communication."¹³⁵ Hinted communication (e.g., innuendo, ambiguities) also play an important part in communication

of face because "it provides a means by which the person can be warned that his current line or the current situation is leading to loss of face, without this warning, it may become an incident."¹³⁶

Communication in total institutions plays a central part in their organization. Information which is available to the staff is a necessary requirement of mental hospitals. Without it treatment would not be possible. But this information can also be used in a damaging manner. Case histories reveal certain facts which would be considered "scandalous, defamatory and discrediting" by those in the outside world. There have been cases where this information, used on an informal level, has been utilized to control and degrade the inmate.¹³⁷ This is considered by Goffman a misuse of the communication process.

For the inmates an undercover system of communication is used for the circulation of messages.¹³⁸ There are several techniques that are effectively used. One type is face-to-face communication without any verbal utterances. For example, "in prisons, inmates have developed a technique of talking without either moving their lips or looking at the person they are talking with."¹³⁹ There is also another system of silent language where individuals solely, through eye-to-eye gestures, signify acceptance or rejection of objects without again uttering a word.¹⁴⁰ These few examples seem to point out the necessities of communication and some of the seemingly insurmountable obstacles the individual

will overcome to take part in this process.

One over-all objective of any team is to sustain the definition of the situation that its performance fosters. "This will involve the over-communication of some facts and the under-communication of other facts."¹⁴¹ The basic problem then is communication control; the audience must not acquire destructive information about the situation that is being defined for them.

The means by which these facts are transferred in a performance are: verbal and gestural. In vis-a-vis interaction these elementary means are adequate. Even though these are fairly simple ways of communicating, the lack of understanding is always present. Failure to communicate the correct fact may result in an unsuccessful performance.

Boundary maintenance.--The salience of this process for Goffman is evident by the constant references made to it, regardless of the level of analysis. The self has and maintains a boundary or "ideal sphere" which is private to the actor possessing it.¹⁴² Each social encounter has a "membrane" which "surrounds" it so information is "screened" out.¹⁴³ Finally, total institutions by definition, have "barriers" which encompass them.¹⁴⁴ The remainder of the discussion on this process will consider these aspects in fuller detail.

Deference and demeanor are essential to the boundary of self. Explicitly stated by Goffman:

Patterns of deference, both avoidance and presentational, illustrate the boundary maintaining characteristics of the human self or personality.

As Durkhiem suggested, "The human personality is a sacred thing; one dares not violate it nor infringe its bounds, while at the same time the greatest good is in communion with others."¹⁴⁵

To further illustrate this idea, Goffman uses Simmel's concept of "ideal sphere," which for him meant man's honor and dignity.¹⁴⁶ Finally, not only is there a boundary around the self but it cannot be entered without permission.

Boundary maintenance in an encounter can be best thought of as an "interaction membrane." The membrane, therefore, is not a solid barrier by which the participants cut themselves off from external matter. It is instead a "sieve, which allows a few externally based matters to slip through into the encounter."¹⁴⁷ Transformation rules (norms) tell us what modifications in shape will occur in the encounter. The centrality of this process for Goffman is noted in the following:

If we think of an encounter as having a metaphorical membrane around it, we can bring our concerns into focus. We can see that the dynamics of an encounter will be tied to the functioning of the boundary-maintaining mechanisms that cut the encounter off selectively from wider worlds. As we can begin to ask about the kinds of components in the encounters external milieu that will expand or contract the range of events with which the encounter deals, and the kinds of components that will make the encounter resilient or destroy it.¹⁴⁸

As previously mentioned, a total institution is by definition a boundary maintaining establishment. It is cut off from the outside world. In addition to this, there exist maintaining processes which facilitate separation among subsystems. Accordingly, "there is strict boundary maintenance between the staff and the inmates concerning

information, activities and other normal daily chores."¹⁴⁹ Also, the inmates via secondary adjustments place a barrier between themselves and the institution.¹⁵⁰ Other devices, such as staggered work hours, segregated cafeterias, and the like, are mentioned by Goffman as means of maintaining boundaries between groups.¹⁵¹ As a whole, then, Goffman's works are pervasive with explicit examples of this process.

Within a team an amount of solidarity is necessary to accomplish its goal or objective. To insure this characteristic, boundaries of information are compulsory. The audience should be prohibited from obtaining any destructive information about the performing team. Acquisition of this information could possibly destroy the performance.

A "region" may be defined as "any place that is bounded to some degree by barriers to perception."¹⁵² The very conceptualization of a front region implies the existence of a back region. This latter region contains certain information which would contradict the actor's "given off" impression, if it was discovered by the audience. By techniques of "impression management" the actor guards this back region from the audience. As soon as the audience intrudes into the back region the actor's role is in jeopardy.

Systemic linkage.--The case of total institutions illustrates most clearly Goffman's thoughts on systemic linkage. It would seem from the previous discussion that this process would have no significance in Goffman's scheme. But the opposite of this is true.

Total institutions can be classified on the degree of permeability of systemic linkage that exists. That is to say, the "degree to which social standards maintained within the institution and the social standards maintained in the environing society" influence each other.¹⁵³ Although "some impermeability in an establishment seems necessary," there "are some limits to the value of impermeability for these institutions."¹⁵⁴ Permeability of these institutions can have a variable consequence for its internal workings and cohesion. This is illustrated by the following:

If the institution is appreciably permeable to the wider community, then these (lower) staff members may have the same, or even lower, social origins as the inmates. Sharing the culture of the inmates home world, they can serve as a natural communication channel between high staff and inmates. But, on the same ground, they will have difficulty maintaining social distance from their charges.¹⁵⁵

Therefore, even though impermeability is stressed in these types of establishments, systemic linkage plays an important part in its internal organization.

In total institutions, the matter of ranking is relevant in systemic linkage. It is suggested by Goffman that ranking is part of working with people. It is also important in the privileges that an inmate has concerning the outside world. He states:

. . . when inmates have rights to visit off the grounds, . . . the mischief they may do in civil society becomes something for which the institution has some responsibility. Given this responsibility, it is understandable that many total institutions tend to view off-grounds leave unfavorably.¹⁵⁶

Therefore, only those in the front wards, who have the highest rank, are allowed to have these privileges.

Institutionalization.--It would seem that Goffman, with his emphasis on total institutions would have many examples of this process. But instead he puts a heavy emphasis on what has been discussed above in norming and sanctioning. The several examples which explicitly refer to this process will be given at this time.

In the social encounter the rules and procedures must, to some extent, be institutionalized for a constant flow of interaction to exist. Reference is made to this in the following:

In the matter of conduct deference and demeanor practices must be institutionalized so that the individual will be able to project a viable sacred self . . .¹⁵⁷

In the context of the performance Goffman also notes this process.

Here he deals with this process in terms of the institutionalized role. He states, "In addition to the fact that different routines may employ the same front, it is to be noted that a given social front tends to become institutionalized in terms of the abstract stereotyped expectations to which it gives rise."¹⁵⁸ Along with this the front tends to acquire a meaning and stability apart from the specific tasks which happen at the time to be performed, i.e., it becomes a "collective representation" and a fact in its own right. Therefore, over a period of time certain roles tend to become

routinized and this puts certain pressures upon the occupants to conform to the routine.

Socialization.--As is true for the other master processes, social interaction cannot be maintained without socialization. An actor must be able to abide by the "ground rules" of interaction. This is the "hallmark of his socialization as an interactant."¹⁵⁹

In total institutions the process of socialization is quite interesting and in some instances applicable to wider society. Goffman refers to the total process as the "career" of the patient.¹⁶⁰ It is carried out in three stages: the pre-patient stage, the in-patient stage, and the ex-patient stage. The first two stages are relevant for our discussion.

In the first phase, which is called the "mortification process," the patient is "stripped" of all evidence by which he is identified and was identified in his "home world."¹⁶¹ In a true sense he is "desocialized."

Resocialization is an integral part of the in-patient phase. "Here one begins to learn about the limited extent to which a conception of self can be sustained when the usual supports for it are suddenly removed."¹⁶² The ward system and its ensuing ramifications are introduced at this point. Another important part of this phase is the learning of the privilege system (sanctioning), which when learned is indicative of a "adjusted inmate." If the individual finds it difficult to adjust in a primary sense; secondary adjustments usually result.

Through the process of socialization individuals come to acquire the traits of a certain role. These traits can be the product of institutionalization or the definition of the situation. In addition, each performance is socialized, molded, and modified to fit into the understanding and expectations of the society. So, not only is the actor "socialized" to the role, but the role itself is "socialized" to society.¹⁶³

Socialization may not so much involve a learning of the many specific details of a single concrete part--often there is not enough time or energy for this. But what does seem to be required of the individual is that he learn enough pieces of expression to be able to "fill in" and manage, more or less, any part that he is likely to be given.¹⁶⁴ The legitimate performances of everyday life are not "acted" or "put on" in the sense that the performer knows in advance just what he is going to do, and does this solely because of "the effect it is likely to have."¹⁶⁵ An individual must be socialized widely enough to perform any role that is requested of him and should attempt to avoid those for which he feels himself to be ill suited.

Social control.--Control of deviancy within certain bounds is necessary for social interaction. Naturally, in total institutions this process is pervasive. Minute segments of a person's line of activity are subjected to regulation and judgments.¹⁶⁶ Within the organization there develops various devices by which control is maintained.

One of the most simple devices is name-calling, which is used by the staff to control the inmates. Social distance also serves as a means of control. There are many illustrations of this process to be found in Goffman's writings, but one example should be enough to illustrate this process.

Control is vital in a performance to insure the proper "given off" impression. The actor must have control over his personal front and especially his back region. The team or individual that has control over the setting definitely has the advantage over the team or individual that does not. This control allows the team to introduce strategic devices for determining the information that the audience is able to acquire.¹⁶⁷ The inability of an actor or a team to control these factors will result in a faulty performance and, in turn, failure in achieving the goal.

Conditions of Social Action

Territoriality.--Goffman, at the onset, limits the space of the interaction concerned in his works. His perspective is to study social life that is organized within the physical confines of a building or plant. In addition, a performance itself is limited by the setting. As mentioned previously, the setting tends to stay put, geographically speaking, so that those who would use it as a part of their act cannot begin until they have brought themselves into the appropriate place and must terminate the act upon leaving it.¹⁶⁸ Hence, this condition has definite importance in Goffman's discussions.

Concerning the secondary adjustments of the inmates, space is an important factor. Activities of underlife must expire in some place. There are several different types of spaces. There are those which are off-limits for the inmates,¹⁶⁹ those which are called "surveillance spaces," where the inmate is subjected to the regular restrictions,¹⁷⁰ and certain regions which are ruled less by the staff authorities which are called "free places," "group territories," or personal territory.¹⁷¹ It is obvious from just the names of these places, what the characteristics of each type happens to be.

Size.--In his major concern for social encounters, Goffman limits the number of actors involved under observation in the interaction. In a discussion concerning size of groups, he notes:

Small groups, . . . are distinguished by what their size makes possible, such as extensive personal knowledge of one another by the members, wide consensus, and reliance on information role differentiation.¹⁷²

He further notes:

It is possible, of course, to call a social relationship between two individuals a two-person group, but I think this is unwise. A group that is just beginning or dying may have only two members, but I feel that the conceptual framework with which this ill-manned group is to be studied ought to differ from the framework used in studying the many sidedness of the social relationships between two individuals.¹⁷³

Size, therefore, gives some special characteristics to the study of social relationships. The members of the encounter maintain a continuous engrossment in the official focus of

activity.¹⁷⁴ Groups, on the other hand, continue to exist apart from the occasion when members are physically present. Therefore, groups and encounters differ not only in size but also in some other important characteristics of the total interaction process.¹⁷⁵

Time.--In the encounter time is important for the acquisition of information. In other words, the more time expended in the encounter, the greater the amount "realized resources" will have to be for it to continue. Euphoria is maintained only when there are enough resources to fill the span of interaction.

Time is also a consideration in total institutions. Activities which are planned by the staff for the inmates depend upon time. "Presumably, the shorter the period of continuous time that a given category of participant spends on the premises, the more possible it will be for management to maintain a program of activity and motivation that the participant accepts."¹⁷⁶ This task is rather difficult to accomplish, for many inmates consider that time is wasted regardless of how it is spent. Therefore, time is, for Goffman as for other theorists, a condition of social action.

Change

Goffman, being a symbolic interactionist and limiting his discussions to units of social life which are less complex (see territoriality above), has no explicit theory concerning change in social forms. His concern is basically

with small interaction sequences which take place in face-to-face activity within a particular context. So in our discussion we are necessarily limited to these units.

The change or alteration of the self is brought about by the acquisition of information in a symbolic form. This information must be perceived by the individual as relevant. If the new information produces dissonance, the individual will have to change his self concept in order to maintain equilibrium. This process (theoretically) is continually going on as the individual proceeds from one interaction sequence to another.

The social encounter is also altered as its members obtain new information concerning each other. Encounters are boundary maintaining systems. Given this situation, change could come about as the "interaction membrane" becomes less stable. When the mechanisms which maintain these boundaries fail, systemic linkage with other systems could result. In this process new information is acquired and the encounter undergoes change.

The social behavior that takes place within the confines of a total institution could also change. Goffman seems to be quite dubious about "progressive" changes taking place in these institutions. These alterations could only be possible if the beliefs and feelings of the members were altered. If it were possible to institute a plan by which the attitudes of the staff and inmates with respect to the other could be changed, then behavioral change could take place. This is the only possible way change could be brought about within the limits of Goffman's theoretical framework.

COMPARISONS AND CONCLUSIONS

In the final portion of this thesis two concerns will be discussed. First, we will consider several relationships which appear to exist between Erving Goffman and the theorists discussed in Modern Social Theories. Finally, several conclusions on the nature of Goffman's works and the nature of the PAS Model will be presented.

Comparisons

The relationships to be discussed in the following section will be general rather than specific in nature. This will not be a detailed comparative analysis using every element and process in the PAS Model. Rather, we will take several theorists and discuss the similarities which exist between them and Goffman.

Howard Becker.--Although Becker is a "typological analyst" and his theoretical framework differs from Goffman, there are several similarities to be found. In Becker's treatment of status-role, one discovers the same influence, namely, G. H. Mead, that is central to Goffman. These same influences from symbolic interactionism are found in Becker's discussion of the socialization process. And finally, we find a similarity between these theorists concerning the process of communication, which would be expected, given

the abovementioned influence of Meadian thought.

Kingsley Davis.--In the category of ranking, both Davis and Goffman employ the distinction between prestige and esteem. Goffman's treatment of status-role contains several of the distinctions which are used by Davis regarding the factual and normative aspects of role. Finally, their discussions of the socialization process are similar in that they both emphasize the ideas of G. H. Mead.

Robert Merton.--We have noted in the above analysis, under the category of Norming, the agreement which exists between Goffman and this theorist. The other elements or processes which they have treated analogously are: status-role, socialization, and social control.

Talcott Parsons.--The strongest similarity which exists between Goffman and this theorist is in the element of status-role. Parsons discusses institutionalization, expectations, and conflict and, although on a more abstract level, it is similar to Goffman's discussion.

Robin Williams.--Norms, status-role, rank, communication, and social control are the elements and processes in which we find a similarity between Williams and Goffman. Although much of Williams' work is done at a higher degree of complexity, many of his discussions do point out these likenesses.

The similarities that were mentioned above are incomplete

and inadequate. They were presented mainly for heuristic purposes. From the above the reader should get some idea of what can be done with this model even though this is a poor example. A more detailed analysis will have to be accomplished at a later date.

Conclusions

In this conclusion we will discuss some of the difficulties that were experienced in the analysis of the works of Erving Goffman. Several of them are to be found in the nature of Goffman's writing. Others are general in nature and could be encountered by anyone using the PAS Model. It is hoped that these remarks will assist those who will attempt a similar analysis in the future.

Goffman.--One of the minor difficulties in the works of Goffman is one of style. The major books that were analyzed in this thesis were explicitly written for popular consumption. For one accustomed to reading scientific literature, this was a challenging and one might add, refreshing task.

Coupled with the above difficulty is a more serious problem. Out of the fact that these books were written for the lay public, none of them contained an index. This is especially serious when one attempts a conceptual analysis similar to the one accomplished here. In many instances passages had to be re-read several times in order to discern the exact meaning of the author. A writer always wonders whether a correct analysis has been made. An index would have eliminated much of this difficulty.

Due to the theoretical framework of Goffman, this writer encountered a conceptual problem. Being a symbolic interactionist, his emphasis is focused on the processes of human behavior rather than the elements. His central concern, as mentioned above, is continuing interaction. Therefore, in several instances the elements of his framework were difficult to define.

Concerning the problem of definition, Goffman presents a special problem. He is rather fond of using different terms that have the same meaning. One of the outstanding cases of this was mentioned above in the category of Norming. Goffman also uses some concepts which are unique to him. This is the main reason a glossary is included in this thesis.

PAS Model.--The advantages of using the PAS Model in analysis have been discussed in the introduction of this thesis. For the sake of parsimony, they will not be mentioned here. We will instead discuss a few problems encountered by this writer during the analysis which are independent of those mentioned in the above section. As meanings are never in words but in the user of the words, the same can be true for any analytical device. The analyst may never know whether this analysis is true.

To increase the comparative "power" of the PAS Model some standardizing measures should be instituted. This should be accomplished without eliminating all of the individual thought that goes into every analysis. If standardized procedures could be stipulated for the user of the PAS Model

in theoretical analysis, its comparative force could be greatly increased.

Another difficulty that a reader might encounter when reading a thesis or work of this type is the matter of style. By the nature of the task, the writings of any author being analyzed will have to be segmented. The reader cannot get a grasp of the whole by simply adding up the parts. For this reason an overall statement concerning the methods, techniques, and theoretical framework of the authors under consideration should accompany any analysis of this type. This writer has not found a way to eliminate this problem of segmentation and still, at the same time, accomplish an adequate analysis.

In conclusion, some of the "latent" functions of the PAS Model should be mentioned. When one has completed an analysis using this model, he will never again be satisfied with just "scanning" the literature. This model forces you to look beyond the surface; you must read between and "under" the lines. It aids you in organizing your thoughts within a certain framework. It emphasizes the importance of clear conceptualization. You appreciate a sound analysis and deplore a poor one. In the final analysis, the long run utility of this model may be in its effectiveness as a teaching and learning device.

GLOSSARY

Adjustments, primary--This is a process by which an individual adjusts to the organization in a cooperating manner. He gives and gets, in an appropriate spirit, what has been systematically planned for him, whether this entails much or little of himself.

Adjustments, secondary--This is a process by which an individual adjusts to the organization in an uncooperating manner. It is any habitual arrangement by which a member of an organization employs unauthorized means, or obtains unauthorized ends, or both, thus getting around the organization's assumptions as to what he should do and get and hence, what he should be. This process has also been referred to as "informal" or "unofficial."

Appearance--A part of the front which refers to those stimuli which function at the time of the performance to tell the observer the performer's social state.

Career--This is any social strand of a person's course through life.

Cooling out--This is a process by which one individual attempts to define the situation for another (called the "mark") in a way that makes it easier for him to accept the loss of a status-role.

Deference--That component of activity which functions as a symbolic means by which appreciation is regularly conveyed to a recipient, of this recipient, or something of which this recipient is taken as a symbol, extension of agent.

Definition of the situation--Goffman utilizes the same definition of this phrase that was used by W. I. Thomas. "Preliminary to any self-determined act of behavior there is always a stage of examination and deliberation which we call the definition of the situation. And actually not only concrete acts are dependent on the definition of the situation, but gradually a whole life-policy and personality of the individual himself follows from a series of such definitions."

Demeanor--That element of the individual's ceremonial behavior typically conveyed through deportment, dress, and bearing which serves to express to those in his immediate presence that he is a person of certain desirable or undesirable qualities.

Dramaturgical model--An abstract method of presenting social action which employs the basic fundamental concepts and processes of a theatrical performance.

Encounter, social--A natural unit of social organization. It involves: a single visual and cognitive focus of attention, a mutual relevance of acts, and eye-to-eye ecological huddle that maximizes each participant's opportunity to perceive the other participant's monitoring of him.

Euphoria--A state in which the world made up of objects of our spontaneous involvement and the world carved out of the encounter's transformation rules (norms) are congruent, one coinciding perfectly with the other.

Face--The positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact.

Front--The expressive equipment of a standard kind, intentionally or unwittingly employed by the individual during his performance.

Focused gathering or gathering--Synonymous with encounter (see above).

Home world--Used in the context of total institutions and signifies the external world in which the inmate lived before entering the institution.

Incident--The reciprocal influence of individuals upon one another's actions when in one another's immediate physical presence.

Interaction membrane--A metaphorical phrase used to signify the boundary maintaining function of the transformation rules in a social encounter. This membrane serves to control the flow of externally relevant sentiments and beliefs from their entrance into the interaction.

Interchange--The sequence of acts set in motion by acknowledged threats to the face, and termination in the re-establishment of ritual equilibrium.

Manner--Those stimuli which function during the performance to warn the observer of the interactional role the performer will expect to play in the oncoming situation.

Mark--A term used to signify an individual who has discovered that he has been disqualified for a status-role.

Permeability--Used in the context of total institutions to signify the degree to which the social standards maintained within the institution and the social standards maintained in the environing society have influenced each other, the consequence being to minimize the differences.

Proactive status--Used in the context of total institutions to signify the status-role and rank of an individual in the external society once he has been an inmate. The individual must learn that his social position on the outside will never again be quite what it was prior to entrance.

Ritual--Activities through whose symbolic component the actor shows how worthy he is of respect or how worthy he feels others are of it.

Ritual, avoidance--Refers to those forms of deference (see above) which lead the actor to keep at a distance from the recipient and not violate the area of privacy that lies around him.

Ritual, presentation--Refers to those forms of deference (see above) through which the individual makes specific attestations to recipients concerning how he regards them and how he will treat them in the oncoming interaction.

Role--The activity of an incumbent of a position would engage in if he were to act solely in terms of the normative demands upon someone occupying that position.

Role, commitment--In a restricted sense it signifies the impersonally enforced structural arrangements by which a person takes on a role.

Role, distance--Actions which effectively convey some disdainful detachment of the performer from a role he is performing.

Role, embracement--This involves actions which signify that an actor is attached to a role, has the qualifications and capacities for performing it, and shows an active engagement or spontaneous involvement in the role activity.

- Role, others--This is the category of individuals which the role performer deems significant to him in the role enactment process.
- Role, regular performance of--The enacting of the prescribed normative expectations of a role.
- Role, regular performer of a--An actor consistently performs the same role on prescribed occasions (e.g., a funeral director).
- Setting--In the context of the performance it is the furniture, decorum, physical layout, and other background items which supply the scenery and stage props for the spate of human action played out before, within, or upon it.
- Social establishment--Any place surrounded by fixed barriers to perception and in which a particular kind of activity regularly takes place.
- Status--A position in some system or pattern of positions which is related to the other positions in the unit through reciprocal ties, through rights and duties⁶ binding on the incumbents.
- Status symbol--A means of displaying one's position, a sign-vehicle or a cue which selects for a person the status (rank) that is to be imputed to him and way in which others are to treat him.
- Transformation rules (norms)--In the geometrical sense of that term, these being rules, both inhibitory and facilitating that tell us what modification in shape will occur when an external pattern of properties is given expression inside the encounter.
- Total institution--It is a social establishment which is recognized by the following characteristics:
1. All aspects of life are conducted in the same place and under the same authority.
 2. Each phase of the member's daily activities is carried on in the immediate company of a large batch of others, all of whom are treated alike and required to do the same things together.
 3. All phases of the day's activities are tightly scheduled, with one activity leading to a pre-arranged time into the next, the whole sequence of activities being imposed from above by a system of explicit formal rules and a body of officials.

4. The various enforced activities are brought together into a single rational plan purportedly designed to fulfill the official aims of the institution.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL KEY

- A-Erving Goffman, Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates (Garden City: Doubleday and Company, 1961).
- AI-Erving Goffman, "Alienation from Interaction," Human Relations, Vol. 10 (1957), 47-60.
- CMO-Erving Goffman, "On Cooling the Mark Out: Some Aspects of Adaption to Failure," Psychiatry, Vol. 15 (November, 1952), 451-463.
- DD-Erving Goffman, "The Nature of Deference and Demeanor," American Anthropologist, Vol. 58 (June, 1956), 473-502.
- E-Erving Goffman, Encounters: Two Studies in the Sociology of Interaction (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1961).
- ESO-Erving Goffman, "Embarrassment and Social Organization," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 62 (November, 1956), 264-271.
- IP-Erving Goffman, "Interpersonal Persuasion," in Bertram Schaffner (ed.), Group Processes (New York: The Josiah Macy, Junior Foundation, 1956), 117-196.
- OFW-Erving Goffman, "On Face Work: An Analysis of Ritual Elements in Social Interaction," Psychiatry, Vol. 18 (August, 1955), 213-231.
- SCS-Erving Goffman, "Symbols of Class Status," British Journal of Sociology, Vol. 2 (1951), 294-304.
- SELF-Erving Goffman, The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life (Garden City: Doubleday and Company, 1959).

NOTES

1. C. P. Loomis, Social Systems (New York: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., 1960).
2. C. P. and Zona K. Loomis, Modern Social Theories (New York: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., 1961).
3. R. K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957), p. 20.

4. Ibid. Merton is writing specifically of the terminological confusion concerning the word "function," but his discussion is applicable to many other cases in sociological theory.

5. Erving Goffman, "Interpersonal Persuasion," in Bertram Schaffner (ed.), Group Processes (New York: The Josiah Macy, Jr. Foundation, 1956), p. 12.

6. Erving Goffman, Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates (Garden City: Doubleday and Company, 1961), p. x. Hereafter referred to as A.

7. See Don Martindale, The Nature and Types of Sociological Theory (Boston: Houghton Mifflin and Company, 1960), pp. 334-75 for a more than adequate exposition concerning this branch of social behaviorism.

8. Erving Goffman, "Symbols of Class Status," British Journal of Sociology, Vol. 2 (1951), p. 295. Hereafter referred to as SCS.

9. Ibid.

10. Ibid., p. 297-301.

11. Ibid.

12. Ibid., p. 304.

13. Ibid.

14. Ibid.

15. Erving Goffman, "On Cooling the Mark Out: Some Aspects of Adaptation to Failure," Psychiatry, Vol. 15 (November, 1952). Hereafter referred to as CMO.

16. Ibid., p. 482.

17. Ibid., p. 504.

18. Ibid., p. 503.

19. Ibid., p. 504.

20. Erving Goffman, "On Face Work: An Analysis of Ritual Elements in Social Interaction," Psychiatry, Vol. 18 (August, 1955). Hereafter referred to as OFW.

21. Ibid., p. 213

22. Ibid.

23. Ibid., p. 221.

24. Erving Goffman, "The Nature of Deference and De-meanor," American Anthropologist, Vol. 58 (June, 1956). Hereafter referred to as DD.

25. Erving Goffman, "Embarrassment and Social Organization," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 62 (November, 1956). Hereafter referred to as ESO.

26. Ibid., p. 265.

27. Ibid., p. 270.

28. Ibid., p. 265.

29. Ibid., p. 271.

30. Erving Goffman, "Alienation from Interaction," Human Relations, Vol. 10 (1957), p. 47. Hereafter referred to as AI.

31. Ibid., pp. 49-53.

32. Ibid., p. 59.

33. A., p. 89.

34. Ibid.

35. Erving Goffman, The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life (Garden City: Doubleday and Company, 1959), p. 17. Hereafter referred to as SELF.

36. Ibid., p. 19.

37. Ibid.

38. A., p. 90.

39. Ibid., p. 207.

40. Ibid., p. 90.

41. SELF, p. 21.

42. A., p. 222.

43. Ibid., p. 227.

44. OFW.

45. Ibid., p. 221.

46. SELF, p. 26.

47. OFW., DD., ESO., AI.

48. CMO., p. 439.

49. Ibid., p. 493.

50. Ibid., p. 499.
51. Ibid., pp. 493-5.
52. Ibid., p. 52.
53. E., p. 45.
54. Ibid., p. 45.
55. Ibid., p. 55.
56. Ibid., p. 41.
57. Ibid., p. 48.
58. Ibid.
59. Ibid., p. 64.
60. A., p. 65f
61. DD., p. 478.
62. OFW., p. 213.
63. Ibid., p. 213.
64. A., p. 71.
65. Ibid., p. 76.
66. Ibid., p. 92.
67. SELF., p. 27.
68. Ibid., p. 85.
69. Ibid.
70. A., p. 176.
71. Ibid., p. 177.★
72. DD., p. 496.
73. OFW., p. 226.
74. DD., p. 473.
75. Ibid., p. 476
76. Ibid.
77. Ibid.
78. Ibid.
79. SELF., p. 107.
80. Ibid.
81. E., p. 20.
82. Ibid., p. 31.
83. A., p. 89.
84. Ibid.
85. Ibid.
86. Ibid., p. 219.
87. Robin W. Williams, Jr., American Society (New York: Knopf, 1960), pp. 372-96.
88. A., p. 200.
89. E., p. 93.
90. Ibid., p. 108.
91. Ibid.
92. Ibid.
93. E., p. 110.
94. Ibid.
95. Ibid.
96. SELF., p. 75.
97. Ibid., p. 145.
98. Ibid., p. 146.
99. SCS., p. 294.
100. A., p. 201.
101. Ibid.
102. Ibid., p. 167.
103. DD., p. 497.
104. Ibid.
105. Ibid.
106. A., p. 162.
107. DD., p. 489.
108. Ibid., p. 481.
109. SELF., p. 84.
110. Ibid.
111. A., p. 263.
112. SCS., p. 297.
113. AI., passim.
114. A., pp. 49-51.
115. SELF., p. 108
116. Ibid.
117. SCS., p. 296.
118. A., p. 115.
119. Ibid., p. 42.
120. Ibid., p. 115.
121. SELF., p. 201.
122. E., p. 28.
123. Ibid.
124. Ibid., p. 102.
125. A., p. 248.
126. DD., p. 497.
127. Ibid., p. 498.
128. A., p. 102.
129. Ibid., p. 103f.
130. Ibid., p. 102.
131. E., p. 28.
132. Ibid., p. 28.
133. DD., p. 475.
134. Ibid.
135. ESO., p. 267.
136. OFW., p. 224.
137. A., p. 158.
138. Ibid., p. 257.
139. Ibid.
140. Ibid., p. 258.
141. SELF., p. 141.
142. DD., p. 481.
143. E., p. 66.
144. A., p. 4.
145. DD., p. 487
146. Ibid., p. 481.
147. E., p. 30.
148. Ibid., p. 66.
149. A., p. 9.
150. Ibid., p. 26.
151. ESO., p. 270.
152. SELF., p. 106.
153. A., p. 119.

- | | | | |
|------|------------------------|------|------------------------|
| 154. | <u>Ibid.</u> , p. 120. | 155. | <u>Ibid.</u> , p. 122. |
| 156. | A., p. 80. | 157. | <u>DD.</u> , p. 497. |
| 158. | SELF., p. 27. | 159. | OFW., p. 225. |
| 160. | A., p. 127. | 161. | <u>Ibid.</u> , p. 140. |
| 162. | <u>Ibid.</u> , p. 148. | 163. | <u>SELF.</u> , p. 35. |
| 164. | <u>Ibid.</u> , p. 73. | 165. | <u>Ibid.</u> |
| 166. | A., p. 38. | 167. | <u>SELF.</u> , p. 93. |
| 168. | <u>Ibid.</u> , p. 22. | 169. | A., p. 227. |
| 170. | <u>Ibid.</u> , p. 228. | 171. | <u>Ibid.</u> , p. 230. |
| 172. | E., p. 8. | 173. | <u>Ibid.</u> , p. 9. |
| 174. | <u>Ibid.</u> , p. 10. | 175. | <u>Ibid.</u> , p. 11. |
| 176. | A., p. 212. | | |

ROOM USE ONLY

~~MAR 18 1957~~

~~MAY 18 1957~~

~~JUN 18 1957~~

~~JUL 18 1957~~

~~AUG 18 1957~~

~~SEP 18 1957~~

ROOM USE ONLY

167/



MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293103408906