THE INTERACTION ORDER

STUDIES IN SYMBOLIC INTERACTION

Series Editor: Norman K. Denzin

Recent Volumes:

Volumes 1–35:	Studies in Symbolic Interaction
Volume 36:	Blue Ribbon Papers: Interactionism: The Emerging Landscape
Volume 37:	Studies in Symbolic Interaction
Volume 38:	Blue Ribbon Papers: Behind the Professional Mask: The Self-revelations of Leading Symbolic Interactionists
Volume 39:	Studies in Symbolic Interaction
Volume 40:	40th Anniversary of Studies in Symbolic Interaction
Volume 41:	Radical Interactionism on the Rise
Volume 42:	Revisiting Symbolic Interaction in Music Studies and New Interpretive Works
Volume 43:	Symbolic Interaction and New Social Media
Volume 44:	Contributions from European Symbolic Interactionists: Reflections on Methods
Volume 45:	Contributions from European Symbolic Interactionists: Conflict and Cooperation
Volume 46:	The Astructural Bias Charge
Volume 47:	Symbolic Interactionist Takes on Music
Volume 48:	Oppression and Resistance: Structure, Agency, and Transformation
Volume 49:	Carl J. Couch and the Iowa School: In His Own Words and In Reflection

STUDIES IN SYMBOLIC INTERACTION VOLUME 50

THE INTERACTION ORDER

EDITED BY

NORMAN K. DENZIN
University of Illinois, USA

United Kingdom – North America – Japan
India – Malaysia – China

Emerald Publishing Limited
Howard House, Wagon Lane, Bingley BD16 1WA, UK

First edition 2019

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-78769-546-7 (Print)
ISBN: 978-1-78769-545-0 (Online)
ISBN: 978-1-78769-547-4 (Epub)

ISSN: 0163-2396 (Series)

ISOQAR certified
Management System,
awarded to Emerald
for adherence to
Environmental
standard
ISO 14001:2004.

Certificate Number 1985
ISO 14001

INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

CONTENTS

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

W. Peter Archibald has a PhD in Social Psychology from the University of Michigan. He has written and taught about the relationships among the social sciences, "human nature," industrial relations, and the social and personal impact of economic crises. He is currently Professor Emeritus at McMaster University, Canada.

Gordon Clanton has taught Sociology at San Diego State University since 1975. He previously taught in the Religion Department at Rutgers University. His teachers include Robert Bellah, Peter Berger, and Neil Smelser. His research interests include the sociology of religion and secularization. His 1977/1986/1998 book *Jealousy* (with Lynn G. Smith) is a standard reference on the topic. He is a pioneer in the sociology of emotions, especially love, jealousy, and envy, and a founding member of the ASA Section on Emotions (1984). He is a founding member and past-president (1999) of the California Sociological Association. He has appeared on "Donahue," on ABC-TV's "20/20," and on many other radio and television programs from New York City to Anchorage, Alaska. He also writes a column on politics and the environment for the *Del Mar Times* and four other suburban weeklies.

Jean-François Côté is a Professor of Sociology at Université du Québec à Montréal, Montreal, Quebec, Canada. He has recently published a book titled *La Renaissance du théâtre autochtone. Métamorphose des Amériques I*, 2017. Previous single-authored books include *George Herbert Mead's Concept of Society: A Critical Reconstruction*, 2015, and *Le triangle D'Hermès. Poe, Stein, Warhol, figures de la modernité esthétique*, Bruxelles, La Lettre Volée, 2003. He has also edited and coedited numerous other books.

Harvey A. Farberman is Professor Emeritus of Social Welfare Policy and Research at Stony Brook University where he served on the faculty from 1966-2015. He received a BA in 1961 from Brooklyn College and a PhD from the University of Minnesota in 1968. In 1972, he was a founding member of the Stony Brook University School of Social Welfare. He became a Visiting Scholar and NIMH Fellow at UC, Berkeley, in 1977–1978. In 1974, he was a co-chair of the steering committee that created the Society for the Study of Symbolic (SSSI) and was elected President of Society in 1979. He then served as editor of the journal *Symbolic Interaction* from 1981 to 1983. In 1984, he received the SSSI Distinguished Service Award and was named the SSSI Annual Distinguished Lecturer in 1990. In 2017, he received the Albert Nelson Marquis Lifetime Achievement Award. His book publications include *Social Psychology through Symbolic Interaction* (coedited with Gregory P. Stone) and his article publications include *A Criminogenic Market Structure: The American Automobile*

Industry; Fantasy in Everyday Life: The Intersection of Social Psychology and Political Economy; and Symbolic Interaction and Postmodernism: Close Encounter of a Dubious Kind.

Vidar Halldorsson is an Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Iceland. His main research interests revolve around the positive development of youth sport and the cultural production of sports achievement. Vidar is the author of *Sport in Iceland: How Small Nations Achieve International Success.*

Benjamin W. Kelly is an Assistant Professor of Sociology and Anthropology at Nipissing University, Canada. His research explores the interdependency between social structure, identity, and emotions. His ongoing fieldwork looks at the lived experience of science activists and how they frame environmental risk in relation to industry, government, public policy, and First Nations.

Joël Langonné, PhD, Université de Rennes, France, a member of Arène (Rennes 1) and LEIPC (Universidade de Brasilia). Joël has undertaken a number of research studies, describing news media, over extended period of time, as visual and collaborative pieces shaped by a disparate set of individuals which manifests throughout a news production continuum.

Arthur McLuhan, York University, Canada, engages sociologies of morality and social problems, self and identity, and subcultures in everyday life. He pursues formal theoretical accounts in these areas by examining generic social processes that are empirically grounded in the comparative and ethnographic examination of social worlds.

Robert Perinbanayagam is a Professor of Sociology (Emeritus) at the Hunter College of the City University of New York. He is the author of several books in interactionist theory and has won both the G.H Mead award and the Cooley award from the Society for the Study of Symbolic Interaction and a prize from the theory section of the ASA for his book *The Presence of Self.*

Antony Puddephatt, Lakehead University, Canada, has studied the social philosophy of George Herbert Mead, as it informs issues such as science, technology, language, and the nature of social action. He has researched devotion in amateur chess, the institutional culture of higher education, open-access publishing, and micro-theoretical approaches to environmental studies.

Christopher J. Schneider is an Associate Professor of Sociology at Brandon University in Manitoba, Canada. Schneider is the 2016 recipient of the Society for the Study of Symbolic Interaction *Early in Career Award.* The award recognizes junior scholars who have made significant contributions to the field of symbolic interaction.

Eric O. Silva is an Associate Professor in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Georgia Southern University, USA. He studies how positions on divisive topics such as immigration, creationism, and Indian mascots are accounted for in the public sphere. This work has appeared in *Symbolic*

Interaction, *Public Understanding of Science*, *Secularism and Nonreligion*, and *Qualitative Sociology Review*.

Deana Simonetto is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Criminology at Wilfrid Laurier University. Her research interests include symbolic interactionism, qualitative methods, deviance, sports, and family. She has published on doing qualitative research using a range of data collection techniques, including participant observation, interviews, and media analysis of both traditional and social media.

Olivier Trédan is a Research Professor at the University of Rennes 1, France, and member of the search unit Arènes (Rennes 1). His research deals with the history of the Web, the analyses of online practices, and amateur activities on the web.

Thorolfur Thorlindsson is a Professor of Sociology at the University of Iceland. His current research focuses on two areas: (1) The multilevel nature of social structure and the role of emergence in group behavior and (2) the relationship of science to policy and practice in health, sport, and the fishing industry.

This page intentionally left blank

SERIES EDITOR'S NOTE

I'm sorry to announce that Dan Miller, Professor Emeritus of Sociology, died on March 30, 2017. He was 69. A native of Iowa, Dan earned a BS, MA, and PhD in Sociology at the University of Iowa. After teaching briefly at the University of Manitoba, Dan joined the University of Dayton in 1978. He earned tenure in 1982, was promoted to Associate Professor in 1983, and was promoted to Professor in 2000. He served as Chair of the Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work from 1998 to 2002. Dan earned the College's faculty award for outstanding scholarship in 2006. He retired from UD in 2014.

In his 39 years at UD, Dan was an influential scholar in the sociological field of symbolic interactionism. His article, "The Elements and Structure of Openings" (1975) was foundational in what came to be called the New Iowa School of Symbolic Interactionism. He served as the President of the Society for the Study of Symbolic Interaction (2004–2005). Dan authored many articles and was lead editor of the volume *Constructing Complexity: Social Interaction and Social Forms* (1997).

Norman K. Denzin

This page intentionally left blank

PART I
FOUNDATIONS

This page intentionally left blank

GREGORY P. STONE (1921–1981): AN INTERPRETIVE ANALYSIS OF HIS WORK

Harvey A. Farberman

ABSTRACT

Gregory P. Stone (1921–1981) made original contributions to the fields of urban sociology, social psychology, sociology of sport, and sociological theory. His work gave rise to a set of empirically grounded concepts including nonranked status aggregates, personalization, universes of appearance, and personal and collective identity. These concepts developed over time, were based on quantitative research, and provide continuity to Stone's work. This essay will elaborate on these concepts in order to consolidate and interpret Stone's contribution to sociology.

Keywords: Urban sociology; social psychology; nonranked status aggregates; personalization; universe of appearance; identity

Gregory P. Stone's (1921–1981) enduring contribution to sociology rests on the fact that, in his lifetime, American, European, and Asian sociologists recognized his original contributions to the fields of urban sociology, social psychology, and social theory as well as his pioneering work in the sociology of sport. In fact, his path-breaking work in the sociology of sport helped to establish this area as a legitimate domain of social scientific investigation.

In addition, his contributions to sociologically oriented social psychology both as coeditor of the landmark anthology *Social Psychology Through Symbolic Interaction* (1970, revised ed. 1981) which redirected the field of symbolic interaction and as a cofounder and first president of the Society for the Study of Symbolic Interaction ranks him alongside such towering figures as Kenneth Burke (1897–1993), Herbert Blumer (1900–1987), Erving Goffman

The Interaction Order
Studies in Symbolic Interaction, Volume 50, 3–27

ISSN: 0163-2396/doi:10.1108/S0163-239620190000050001

(1922–1982), Anselm Strauss (1916–1996), and Howard Becker (1928–). His legacy and relevance continue to inspire contemporary inquiry and is reflected in the ongoing Couch-Stone Annual Symposium hosted by the Society for the Study of Symbolic Interaction.

Stone began his academic career as an undergraduate at Hobart College, located in the Finger Lake Region of Geneva, New York. Hobart is a private, liberal arts institution with a historical affiliation to the Episcopal Church. There, he came under the influence of sociologist Leo Srole (1908–1993) and worked with him on a community survey that assessed the impact on small-town life of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. Srole was called into military service in World War II before the project was completed and replaced by the political scientist Ithiel de Sola Poole (1917–1984). Stone remained with the project until he was graduated from Hobart in 1942.

In April 1943, Stone also was called into military service and was placed in a Turkish language certification program at Princeton University in 1944. This preparation was in anticipation for some sort of intelligence work. Instead, after achieving certification, Stone's unit was posted to the European Theatre of Operations and integrated into a mortar company. For 180 consecutive days, Stone saw intensive combat in the Battle of the Bulge. His two closest combat friends, a poet and a mathematician, were killed: one during an enemy artillery barrage and the other when American bombers missed their coordinates and unloaded ordinance on frontline American positions. Stone survived these events and on April 12, 1945, as part of the 104th US Infantry Division, participated in the liberation of Nordhausen concentration camp. Stone's (n.d.a.) prewar ambition to become an Episcopal priest did not survive his military experience.

Throughout his wartime service, Stone carried along – and studied – three books. The first was *The Collected Poems of Kenneth Fearing*. Fearing (1902–1961) was a two-time Guggenheim Fellow, a cofounder of the Partisan Review, and a novelist who wrote about the plight and alienation of the lower and middle working classes. The second was an excursus on Marxist political economy by Harvard trained economist and cofounder of the left-leaning Monthly Review, Paul Swezey (1910–2004), entitled *Theories of Capitalistic Development*. And the third was a treatise on the sociology of knowledge by Karl Mannheim (1893–1947), the Hungarian-born social philosopher and sociologist, entitled *Ideology and Utopia*. Stone described these books respectively as easy, logical, and incomprehensible. In a handwritten, unpublished, and autobiographical fragment, he reports, "what attracted me to Chicago [University] was the brute fact that I did not understand the 'orgiastic chiliasm of the Anabaptists' discussed in Karl Mannheim's book."

Stone was in residence at the University of Chicago in the sociology department from January 1946 to September 1949 and was awarded a masters degree in 1952 and a PhD in 1959. In the sociology department, he encountered established scholars such as William Ogburn (1886–1959), Ernest Burgess (1886–1966), Louis Wirth (1897–1952), Everett Hughes (1897–1983), and Herbert Blumer; young instructors including Herbert Goldhamer (1907–1977) and Nelson Foote (1916–2012); and fellow students including Erving Goffman,

Anselm L. Strauss, Howard S. Becker, and Robert W. Habenstein (1915–2011), among many others. He also was influenced by the work of other Chicago faculty outside of the sociology department including Lloyd Warner (1898–1970), from the Committee on Human Development, Robert Redfield (1897–1958), in anthropology, and Frank Knight (1885–1972), in economics. (Lloyd Warner and Everett Hughes were co-chairmen of Stone's doctoral committee.)

Stone held teaching positions at the University of Illinois, Michigan State College, the University of Missouri at Columbia, Washington University, St. Louis, and the University of Minnesota, MN, where he spent the bulk of his academic career. At Minnesota, he held a joint appointment in the American Studies Program (where, from time to time, he lectured on the history of city planning) and an adjunct appointment in the Department of Home Economics (where, on occasion, he lectured on the social psychological importance of clothing in everyday life).

In the summer of 1977 (while I was teaching a summer session course at the University of Minnesota and living at the Stone residence), I asked Stone to identify the major conceptual contributions that he had made to the field of sociology. In short order, he came up with the following list:

- nonranked status aggregates;
- personalization;
- universe of appearance; and
- identity.

These concepts embody four distinguishing features of Stone's work; they mark (1) the chronological development of his thought, (2) emerge out of a series of quantitative empirical studies, (3) reflect a continuity of interest in the intersection of social organization and social psychology, and (4) lay down markers that help to identify the larger intellectual problems that he was dealing with and to which these master concepts respond.

Although Stone did not mention it (and thus will not be included in this essay) he regularly gave lectures in undergraduate social psychology classes and in graduate seminars on other ideas and concepts that he did not write about or publish. Most notable, perhaps, is his development of a full-blown theory of motives that built on the earlier contributions of John Dewey (1922), Kenneth Burke (1936), and C.W. Mills (1940).

Although Stone's work extends over many subfields within sociology, my aim here is twofold: (1) to locate each of Stone's concepts in the problem-oriented scholarly dialogue from which it arose and (2) to discern the continuity and inner coherence of his work.

NONRANKED STATUS AGGREGATES

Upon arrival at the University of Chicago, Stone came under the wing of Lloyd Warner who, Stone surmised, had been contacted by Stone's Hobart mentor, Leo Srole. Although Warner had an ambiguous (and contested relationship to the department of sociology), he had been conducting a decade-long empirical

study of stratification systems in Newburyport, MA, a small, New England community. (The so-called Yankee City Series.) There, Warner had adopted a Weberian (as opposed to a Marxian) approach to the study of societal organization. Whereas Marx (1818–1883) had argued for the precedence of economics (and for the analysis of economic class struggle) over politics and sociability, Weber (1946), in his penetrating examination of class, status, and party, had argued for the relative autonomy of social, political, and economic institutional orders (and for the analysis of status politics). Following Weber (1864–1920), but ignoring the political and economic side, Warner focused exclusively on status groups and their usurpation and distribution of status and honor as a way of understanding how communities were organized. Based on extensive empirical research, Warner developed a rank-ordered model of social stratification. While he did not pursue an analysis of the structure of political power and economic class in the grand European sense, he did incorporate a hierarchical approach to the development of a model of the *social* order.

C. Wright Mills (1942) leveled a critique against Warner's work given its neglect of political and economic matters and provoked a dialogue that ensnared Marxists and Weberians alike in a debate over which network of elites (social, political, or economic) controlled the country. Stone and Form (1953) came to the conclusion that the debate was fruitless and that attention should focus on whether Weber's original conception of status group itself was adequate for an analysis of social order and whether it should be tied into an exclusively hierarchical model of that order. Stone's answer was no, on both counts. In general, he believed that a vertical model of any sort, whether of the social, political, or economic, orders was unable to capture the richness, flexibility, and nuance of sociocultural reality and, in fact, had hobbled the development of sociological theory. In particular, he believed that the notion of hierarchically ordered status groups should be replaced by that of *nonranked status aggregates.*

Stone came to this view after having conducted considerable quantitative empirical research. For example, Stone had used Warner's Index of Status Characteristics in an ongoing six-year study of clothing that began in 1950 and was sponsored by the (then) Michigan State College Agricultural Experiment Station and carried out by members of the sociology and anthropology departments. The research team had used Warner's instrument for describing and discriminating status in a community survey of Vansburg, Michigan, and came up with a very different picture of the social organization of that small, south-central, county seat of 10,000 than that anticipated by Warner's model.

Stone, (Stone, Form, & Strahan, 1954) and his collaborators, did not find a system of vertically ranked status groups, or a community ecology that reflected such a system; rather, they found that the broad middle range of the community had no discernible status reputation at all and that there actually was an ongoing status war at the very top of the community between an old line local elite and an invading horde of newcomers who recently had descended upon the community when the national-level corporations that they worked for located some divisions in a nearby area in order to take advantage of Vansburg's supply of cheap labor. Indeed, the new cosmopolitan elite identified with national-level

culture and fashion and began to set trends for the rest of the community. The status war that broke out between the old and new elites reverberated down through the community and made a shamble of what, at an earlier time, may well have been a settled status order (Stone, 1952). Instead of a vertical order, what Stone found was a configuration that looked like a "Y" that is a community bisected at the top with reverberations reaching down towards the bottom.

To interpret this situation, Stone introduced the concept "status aggregate" and distinguished it from "status groups." He thought it more useful for analysis because, for the large middle range of the population, it did not presuppose either frequency of contact or communality among members but rather occasional, episodic, encounters characteristic of middle-mass, urban society. Nevertheless, status aggregates still refer to agglomerations of individuals who enjoy the same amount and kind of honor in a community and who tend toward a limited degree of social closure or exclusiveness. This distinctiveness, however, comes to them more by default than design; subordinate groups emulate them. Unlike status groups, status aggregates maintain only a loose monopoly over their symbols of distinctiveness so that individuals who are not objectively in the aggregate may appropriate its symbols and thus render them unreliable as indicators of actual social position. People may learn and copy the lifestyle of a status aggregate without being part of it.

In consequence, in the anonymous situations that are typical of an urbanized lifestyle, and now infiltrating small towns and small cities not to mention large ones, the dignity and honor of a status aggregate might be borrowed by those who are not objectively entitled to it. Indeed, individuals may misrepresent themselves and pass without disclosure. This may be taken to the extreme in larger urban communities, where bars, department stores, and other consumer situations provide anonymous stages upon which individuals may assume identities and play roles that are outside their normal, everyday life. (Stone refers to these situations as "status platforms" or "status transformers.")

Stone's (1984) research led him to believe that there was more instability than stability in the status arrangements of the average community. He was impressed enough with the phenomenon of status instability that he theorized about three of its possible modes: horizontal competition among groups, vertical polarization between groups, and totally unranked groups. The evidence from his own empirical work led him to elaborate more fully on the last of these where he pointed out that unranked groups usually voluntarily withdraw to a marginal position on the outskirts of a community and hold themselves independent of the appraisals of mainstream groups. They adopt and display esoteric symbols of expressive and intrinsic value, cultivate taste, maintain internal solidarity, and rebuff the intrusion of outsiders. They typically place a higher value on status sentiment than on economic interest and often wind up setting trends and displaying symbols that other groups eventually appropriate. At the extreme, these groups often are the bohemian artists and intellectuals that other groups first revile and then imitate.

Stone's identification of at least three status configurations that either reflect or may precipitate community instability was a self-conscious attempt to counter

the conservative image associated with studies of social status as compared to the radical image associated with studies of economic class. He asserted that there are powerful dynamics for change inherent in status conflicts and discrepancies. For example, groups that are unable to achieve an esteemed position in the overall social organization of a community, nevertheless, as Mannheim had suggested, may continue to regard themselves with dignity and solidarity by looking toward a future with the hope of eventual redemption and fulfillment. And, when there is a wide discrepancy between a group's low objective position and its subjective claim to a higher position, the condition exists for what Everett C. Hughes (1949) called "status protest." And this may well produce a powerful challenge to a community's structure. Therefore, while it may be permissible to say that the status arrangements of communities *tend* toward a structure of hierarchy, it would be a mistake to underestimate the dynamic for change embedded in status instabilities especially in mass, urban environments where anonymity, ethnicity, and race magnify such instabilities.

Stone was quite clear in recognizing, however, that, even at the extreme, status instability and status protest are not the same as – and does not lead to – class struggle. To the contrary, as Thorsten Veblen's (1899) turn-of-the-century examination of the nature of conspicuous consumption had shown brilliantly, status groups jockey for position through emulation of those above them and exclusion of those below them. And they do this mainly through displays of consumption. People do not so much resent their betters as look up to, envy, and wish to be like them, or, at least, to have some of what they have. And this is the case, perhaps, even more so, with status aggregates.

And this insight was compatible with David Riesman's (Riesman, Glazer, & Denny, R. 1950) mid-century examination of the profound structural transformation of the United States, from a middle-class to a middle-mass society and from an inner-directed, producer-oriented to an other-directed, consumer-oriented society. The long-term effects of rapid and pervasive industrialization and urbanization when combined with explosive demographic growth had culminated in a people who had become susceptible to external manipulation and had surrendered to consumerism. What Veblen (1857–1929) had identified as the ornate, consumption rituals of turn-of-the-century elites, Riesman (1909–2002) saw as the animating spirit of middle-mass America.

Based on his own research, and the sociohistorical perspectives provided by Veblen and Riesman, Stone began to envision the specter of a middle-mass society held together in loosely organized status aggregates filled with individuals animated by consumer desires. While he could not turn his back on the data and the findings and was impressed and influenced by the powerful way in which both Veblen and Riesman had dramatized their respective historical epochs, he did not like the specter that was implied and emphatically believed that there was more to be said. For example, if industrialization, urbanization, and population growth had resulted in massification and anonymity, then more than anything else, Stone surmised that this would produce a counterreaction, a quest for personalized relationships, social identity, and a sense of being integrated into one's own community.