

Johan Cronehed 2020
School of Social Work, Lund University.
"Keys" to study and discussion regarding
The theorists in the book
Det Socialpsykologiska Perspektivet
(The Social Psychological Perspective)
Editors Jonas Lindblom, Jonas Stier, 2011.

Georg Herbert Mead: Interaction, taking the other person's perspective, meeting the other person's response linguistically and in social action, is the basis for us humans as community-building beings. Things also respond. The ability to be able to see oneself, outside oneself as a form of object is important. First, from childhood, includes responding/interacting to the "concrete others" in order to finally, as adults, be able to respond/interact via "general others". The previous can be defined as a society's attitudes and/or social institutions. There's also a form of inner totality consisting of a dialogue within ourselves. This dialogue is between "I" which is emotion based and "Me" which is based on rationally reasoning. Human maturity and development is about meeting both resistance, problems, and being able to overcome these. Being part of functioning normality's is about deeply socialized needs satisfaction and the ability to interact with the help of socially shared understandings of the general others.

A suggestion for questions to ask and problematizations to include in accordance with Mead's theories: The ability to take the other's perspective, how it works in different socially and psychologically complex arenas in our society consisting of both close social interaction and more distanced in the use of modern communication technology, where communication takes place in real time? An important basis for interaction is our needs satisfaction as individuals. In addition to the most primary needs, what needs are considered important to us in our Western society in its current state?

Erving Goffman: Interaction regarding the theatrical metaphor, it's based on the role register that is embedded in society on the social and psychologically constructed level. The interaction is about the collaboration that the actors doing, based on the roles with the associated context and the role expectation that exists in this interaction, which we all usually attempt to fulfill. The interaction can, accordingly, be understood as based on the meaning that the interaction creates and what role performances are required to achieve it. We interact both consciously and unconsciously. To be part of functioning normality is about responding with the right role expectation in relation to the societal context. In other words, we do our role performances based on the resources we have and the value that these roles have, assigned by society. This depend on both the situation and the social position. We have the ability see through the role performances of all actors with associated resources, which also includes our own actions, while, in the interaction with others we fulfill our own role performances based on role expectations. The meaning created in these forms of interaction is an important aspect of Goffman's way of reading our social existence.

A suggestion for questions to ask and problematizations to include in accordance with Goffman's theories: The control of the impressions we want to convey to others has always been an important component of our actions, how does it work today, for example via social media? How does it affect us in the form of, for example, representative identity and how important is it in its contemporary context?

Johan Asplund: Interaction links to the concept of "social responsiveness", ie human beings as socially responsive. In this there are parallels with Mead's approach to the stages of play and game, and that things also respond and that other peoples response are closely connected to your own action/interaction. Sociality is the social lifeform that exists in a society, visible and even invisible, though it's deeply mentally embedded in us. How a category of people acts and interacts with other groups depends on the context, the historical context based order that prevails in society. People who deviate from the norm also demonstrate/ explain the norm through their deviation from it. We humans may be involved in processes of fullness regarding social interaction and the amount of stimuli. We also have the ability to define ourselves through processes of reflection via the norm to fit in, but also to consciously deviate when needed. The roots of these ideas can be found in both Freud and Meads theories. Being part of societal normality is about our ability to define ourselves with the help of the norms that are valid in society.

A suggestion for questions to ask and problematizations to include in accordance with Asplund's theories: Find examples of deviant behaviors in everyday life, in our society, that support different forms of normality? In connection with this, can you also find examples of how we define ourselves in accordance with society's perception of normality? The following questions can also be linked to Garfinkel and his way of reading society through various forms of disturbance experiments, both created and naturally occurring in our everyday lives.

Erich Fromm: Interaction can be traced to how society works in concrete material terms, for example in how society's people support themselves as labor, how goods are produced and consumed, and the way in which trade takes place, etc. In scientific approach can this be linked to Marx and historical materialism, and functionalism. Fromm's reasoning also takes into account society's beliefs, it's political and religious nature. Taken together, the foregoing factors set the agenda for how people relate to reality and interact with each other. This can be read in "ideal types/social character types", which can be traced to Weber's way of functioning as a social theorist, where society's actors act in a market governed by different interests, orientations. Such a ideal type/social character type is for Fromm the business character in the consumer society whose driving forces for interaction, socially and psychologically, are based on short-term satisfaction of needs, and to ensure that he has sufficient purchasing power for the sort of stimulus consumption provides. The modern form of economic, social development means for the citizen a loss of the formerly close collective affiliation. Social normality can be set in relation to being part of the dominant character types with its associated lifestyle and living conditions that are valid for the historical eras in question. All of Fromm's different character types can be "balanced" if the parts of the main character type "the productive" can be included in them. The productive character type is in turn characterized by a high degree of independence and self-activity; where "love and giving" are important qualities that both demonstrate and provide personal growth and development.

A suggestion for questions to ask and problematizations to include in accordance with Fromm's theories: Think of some concrete examples where the productive character balances Fromm's other character types? What could be a possible future character type?

Eric Homburger Erikson: Interaction based on sociality that creates mental maturity regarding the person's eight different ages - developmental stages - included in the life cycle as a whole. Identity is shaped, socially and psychologically, in complex interaction with the surrounding society, which also includes identity crises, obstacles, and the ability to overcome these. A reasoning that can be linked to Freud and Mead. Inner drives, emotions, and social contexts are important in Erikson's analysis. Furthermore, the ability to acquire physical and mental skills which arise in social interaction. These new skills/abilities that are achieved at "the different ages" in our life cycle are linked to developmental stages that enable new forms of interaction and attitudes to their social environment. The Western family formation is a benchmark for his analysis. Normality is living and working within the existing social cycle of life, psychologically and socially.

A suggestion for questions to ask and problematizations to include in accordance with Erikson's theories: What do the age range's ages look like today and how stable are the identities within them, from young adults and older in relation to our social development, mainly in the western world?

Harold Garfinkel: Interaction as a member of the social order where deeply socialized values are what governs. "Trust" is important in the social and psychologically complex interaction, where norms are often automatically embedded in our actions, how we perceive and act according to the norms. Some of Goffman's thinking can be found here, where we all play the "interaction game" and at the same time are aware of what is required to do so. Ethnomethodology is a reaction against too simplified and distant theories about human existence, its development and action.

According to ethnomethodology, great consideration must be given to the actors' "own thinking and understanding of their own living conditions", not least in relation to the prevailing societal context. Normality is based on our ability to see and define what is deviant behavior, psychologically and socially.

A suggestion for questions to ask and problematizations to include in accordance with Garfinkel's theories: Think about, preferably based on your own experiences, how basically the same behavior gives rise to different forms of reactions in different socially and psychologically complex environments?

Jean-Paul Sartre: French structuralist, belonging to phenomenology, that phenomena's can be studied as separate beings embedded in the structure of society. It's about the ability to take the phenomena's perspective from a variety of different scientific schools. **Interaction** arises from the register of meaning that is embedded in the phenomena in question. The example in the book consists of the "gaze" when it comes to taking the perspective of the gaze, its pure perspective, which then lies outside the individual human being and is embedded in the structure of society outside the human being. For example, "the other person's gaze" is assigned a meaning whether it is concretely present or not, for example when we dress, make ourselves beautiful, or the opposite, from the other's point of view, whether it is present or not. The gaze is within ourselves, always, in our own existence, mentally. When gazes meet, these can also be part of a power struggle based on different values. The meaning we assign to things and ourselves are complex and unstable, and go through different forms of perception. The use of a thing gives it's meaning. An example, a weapon can be used both for death and vandalism, for attacks and defense, for power struggles, to threaten or to stop threats, to create fear or its opposite, to produce feelings of security. In addition, its meaning also exists independently outside human sociality and its meanings are deep-rooted in the possible and complex use, which is embedded in society as a whole. Normality, how we interact, educate, support ourselves, and how we use things, etc. are embedded in a society's historically bound context, based on its structural conditions. The variations are certainly many, but they are not infinite.

A suggestion for questions to ask and problematizations to include in accordance with Sartre and phenomenological theory formation: How do you think that a phenomenon, find a concrete one, in our society can be experienced by people who belongs to different scientific areas of activity?

Jonathan Potter: Discourse and language analysts, the focus is on us humans' use of spoken language. And, that it is the spoken language that gives sense to the discourses in which it is used. But also, that our use of spoken language can contribute to a new understanding of the surrounding reality and that the use of language/words have the opportunity to influence the reality. In this perspective, the spoken language is an active participant within a situation-specific discourse within an associated social psychological complex context, from conversations in one's own kitchen to conversations in courts, public debates and the meaning that language creates in these forums when used by various actors. As spoken language is the tool within an already constructed discourse and can be involved in the creation and construction of new discourses. Speaking to each other, using the language, in different socially and psychologically complex environments, thus **interacting with the language** as a tool and find out what sort of action patterns that this can give rise to, is important for the research of Jonathan Potter. Normality in this perspective constitutes of acting with words, linguistically within already known discourses. Breaking against these too abruptly can create deviations, which not fully are to be understood by others in it's present state, but these "deviations" can also in the long run, create new discourses. These discourses will then accommodate new forms of spoken language acts.

A suggestion for questions to ask and problematizations to include in accordance with Potter's theories: Think about different linguistic actors in our society and how these can affect the political debate with associated discursive approaches, how it in the long run affects us, both in thought and in the use of spoken language, and in terms of action?

Judith Butler: Our gender roles is more complex than society's definitions of it, therefore these definitions must be constantly critically examined in order to change. That is to say, gender roles are not stable but socially constructed based on how we are to be perceived as a woman or man according to the heterosexual matrix. In this way, we can understand how society's attitudes, and power relations have been incorporated within us from the moment we are born. Accordingly, **we interact** to gender roles in order how these have been determined by society. Deviating from a society's gender role pattern can cost in the form of an unclear identity, based on gender norms, but it can also provide future benefits in forming more dynamic gender role patterns. Judith Butler's gender-theory can be seen as progression in several stages.

A: We are subordinate to the heterosexual norm system, the power it has over our identity; the gestures and the language. Identity performances that constantly must be reproduced.

B: Once you have had your identity confirmed based on gender norms. You must continue on this path to be heard and understood. These are "tough structures", structures that constantly must be questioned and improved.

C: Stable identity is not possible. Simplified categorization approaches also lead to simplified inclusion and exclusion processes, often incorporated into ourselves. Normality; is about submitting to the norms of gender power that prevail in society, also, for these to be problematized, questioned.

A suggestion for questions to ask and problematizations to include in accordance with Butler's theories: There are great merits to a gender role structure that is in active negotiation and humane development in a society. This in relation to the possibility of "resting" in more stable forms of identity, is there any contradiction? In all branches of science, it is important to be able to see the difference between science itself based on a historical and societal context and how it is used in different forms of activism. Feel free to find examples of different scientific results and how these work within social and/or political movements?

The writers of the book, their texts, are the main sources for my summaries.

George Herbert Mead and the Resistance

(George Herbert Mead och motståndet)

By Elin Thunman and Marcus Persson

Erving Goffman: Surface, depth and sociality

(Erving Goffman: Yta, djup och socialitet)

By Sverre Wide

Johan Asplund: Between question and answer

(Johan Asplund: Mellan fråga och svar)

By David Redmalm

Social character and human liberation: Erich Fromm

(Social karaktär och människans frigörelse: Erich Fromm)

By Jonas Lindblom

Man, existence, identity: Erik Holmburger Erikson

(Människa, existens, identitet: Erik Holmburger Erikson)

By Jonas Stier

Harold Garfinkel and the immediate social order

(Harold Garfinkel och den omedelbara sociala ordningen)

Tomas Kumlin

Jean-Paul Sartre and the importance of the gaze

(Jean-Paul Sartre och blickens betydelse)

By Sverre Wide

But what are they doing? Jonathan Potter's Discursive Psychology

(Men vad är det de gör? Jonathans Potters diskursiva psykologi)

By Lennart E.H. Räterlinck

Judith Butler: Power and performativity

(Judith Butler: Makt och performativitet)

By Clara Iversen

The texts "Questions to ask and problematizations" are my own.