Introduction

1

Introduction

As scholarly perspectives and methods mature, the need is often felt to take stock and assess where they are and where they are going. Some of this reflective work is undertaken at conferences where academics meet to discuss their research and its relationship to existing and emerging scholarship. Handbooks are another place where such reflection takes place. They are less ephemeral than conference presentations, providing members of the field and others with retrospective debate, discussions of the 'state-of-the-field' and, usually, an attempt to project possible futures. Thus, handbooks act as a resource to orient new and established practitioners to a novel and changing field, and once published, they become a historical marker of the discipline.

This handbook follows in the footsteps of eminent scholars who, in the 1960s, 1970s and in the early 2000s, produced important summative accounts of interactionism.[1] Of particular note is Larry T. Reynolds and Nancy J. Herman-Kinney (2003)'s *Handbook of Symbolic Interactionism*, which is the most recent work of this type. Produced nearly two decades ago, the book serves as a thorough and detailed background on theories, methods, concepts and several subfields of interactionist studies. It is a landmark publication that brought together established and emerging scholars at the time of the book's production, and it remains a key text for many of us working in the field. Their expansive collection includes important chapters that contextualised interactionist theory in relation to early philosophical sources, traced the more recent intellectual influences shaping classic interactionism and expanded upon the contributions of such foundational figures as Charles H. Cooley, W.I. Thomas and G.H. Mead. Further, the collection reflected the wide scope of interactionist approaches, including studies by scholars who align themselves with the Chicago School, the Iowa School, the dramaturgical approach,

and ethnomethodology and conversation analysis. Contributors to the volume discussed methods of symbolic interactionism and a diverse range of concepts, from *mind*, *self*, and *society* to *role* and *social organization*. A core part of the handbook comprised studies of institutions, such as economic, military, educational and religious institutions, as well as the mass media and explored conceptual issues such as deviance, collective behavior, race and ethnic relations, as well as occupations and professions, and community and urban life. Finally, Reynolds and Herman-Kinney's handbook ended with an exploration of several areas of focus for interactionists: social problems, cultural studies, semiotics, pragmatism and narratives, as well as an assessment of future developments in the field. All in all, the book remains one of the most important collected texts in interactionist scholarship.

Why a new handbook?

Given the expansive reach and the substantial successes of this earlier handbook, one may reasonably ask why another is necessary. There are two main answers to this question. The first has to do with the instrumental purpose of handbooks – as a *toolkit* to make sense of a specific field of knowledge at a particular point in time. The present text is the result of an interrogation of the rapidly changing contemporary field of interactionism. Kent Sandstrom, Lisa-Jo van den Scott and Gary Fine in this volume point to three trends that define the current state of interactionism: a *diversity* of perspectives, increasing *fragmentation* regarding the theoretical nucleus of interactionism, and *internationalization*. In this introduction we address these trends with a slightly different focus: *theoretical diversity and expansion*, *an increasingly globalized field* and *broad dissemination of interactionist thought within the social sciences*.

First, there is a continuing tendency to embrace theoretical diversity, which has been a noticeable trend since before the publication of the last handbook. Since the last decade of the 20th century, scholars have merged or expanded interactionist insights with other frameworks,

such as cultural studies (Becker and McCall, 1993; Denzin, 1992), feminism (Kleinman and Cabaniss, 2019) and performance studies (Denzin, 2003) and have created novel ways of doing research, including those inspired by theoretical critiques of positivist scientific writing, such as autoethnography (Ellis et al., 2001; Richardson, 2016). In the first two decades of this century this trend towards theoretical diversity has continued. However, rather than pouring their ideas and research efforts into separate "silos" of intellectual activity, interactionists increasingly accept the diversity and interconnectedness of their perspectives, pushing further the theorization of new areas of research and new positions of critique.

An example of such developments is Leslie Irvine's chapter in this volume, which expands interactionist canon by exploring the connections between humans, nonhumans and the natural environment. Her chapter refutes what she characterizes as the anthropocentric framework of Meadian theory, which, she suggests, led interactionists to assume the centrality of human selfhood and to reject or ignore the self-experiences of other animals. A further illustration of theoretical innovation can be found in theorizations of the body: Lisa Jean Moore and Sumayra Khan's chapter shows the synergies between interactionism and several critique perspectives – such as Fatness Studies, Disability/Accessibility Studies, and Transgender Studies – in accounting for the embodied experiences of health and illness. As a final example, J.E. Sumerau's chapter on non-binary sex, gender and sexualities points out that interactionism has been one of the sociological perspectives that has supported the construction of a binary social world. She, however, notes that the interactionist tradition can correct this by exploring the social construction of sex, gender and sexuality at a much deeper level, questioning the binaries that appear in both social life and in social research practice.

The second trend in the field is towards the globalization of interactionism. In a special issue published the same year as the previous handbook, Philip Manning and David Maines (2003: 497) pointed out that "the future of symbolic interactionism is global, although its origins are thoroughly American." This certainly has come to be true, as interactionism is no longer an

American affair (see, e.g., Plummer, 2010; Vannini, 2008), with conferences focusing on interaction being held around the world and with an increase in topics of investigation that are of global significance (see, e.g., Knorr-Cetina, 2009) being studied in areas of the globe beyond the United States (see, e.g., Müller, 2015; To, 2013). In the recent past, interactionism has attracted enormous talent outside the territorial borders of North America. Scholars based in Europe now have an institutional anchor for their scholarship – the European Society for the Study of Symbolic Interaction – and have transformed interactionism by incorporating approaches embedded in their unique social contexts (see Engdahl and Müller, 2015; Müller, 2015). The current volume reflects this diversity with a third of the contributions coming from Europe and beyond.

The third trend is towards the increasing acceptance and influence of interactionist theories, concepts and methods within the social sciences. Again, this is not new, as Gary Fine (1993), and, later, David Maines (2001) argued, interactionist theory and method has become a mainstay of much sociological work to the extent that, in Atkinson and Housley's (2001) words, within sociology "we are all interactionists now". Indeed, interactionist treatment of concepts such as *mind*, *self*, *society*, *time*, *deviance* and *stigma* have become central to debates not only in sociology, but across the social sciences. For example, as Baptiste Brossard demonstrates in this volume, interactionism has been a key approach to the study of mental health, with landmark studies including Erving Goffman's *Asylums* (1961) and *Stigma* (1963), and Tom Scheff (1966)'s *Being Mentally Ill*. Interactionism has also greatly contributed to the study of emotion: while they were initially hindered by a focus on the cognitive aspects of the self in Meadian theory, contemporary interactionists have done much to break away from the limits of this framework (Collins, 2014; Ruiz-Junco, 2017; Turner and Stets, 2006). As Doyle McCarthy's chapter shows, the intersections of interactionism with cultural studies has given rise to diverse concepts for understanding emotions as normatively organized, interactionally situated, cultural (and semiotic) practices.

In summary, then, these three trends – theoretical diversity and expansion, an increasingly globalized field and broad dissemination of interactionist thought within the social sciences – warrant a text that can 'take stock', bringing together scholarly work that reflects the remarkable advances and diversity within our community. We think the fascinating collection of chapters that the authors have generously contributed to this volume do exactly that.

However, a further and critically important reason why we need a new handbook is because of the social and cultural changes that we have experienced over the past 17 years through rapid technological innovation. New technologies have thoroughly altered the nature of social interaction, and the types of resources available (both individually and institutionally) to make meaning about ourselves, our contexts and society at large (Couch, 2017). People's experiences are frequently mediated or even *constituted* by technology, with new ways of speaking, new forms of activity, and with individuals and institutions using an ever-changing and expanding range of resources that alter how we do our work, socialize, access and process information and, ultimately, how we make sense of ourselves and the others around us. New communication technologies and their impact on human interaction, or the increasing use of the 'terminal' as a form of transforming self-understandings (see Simon Gottschalk's chapter in this volume on the terminal self) are now important foci of attention for interactionist researchers. These and other related changes also present new challenges for us as scholars altering the nature of the ethnographer's gaze, our understanding of our engagement with social worlds as sensory spaces, and the practices that researchers use to represent knowledge (see Emilie Morwenna Whitaker and Paul Atkinson's chapter).

Given this, one of the key aims of this handbook is to survey the major frameworks within contemporary interactionist scholarship; to show how they are being used to shed light on current experiences/practices of self, identity negotiation and interaction; to reflect on the conceptual and methodological innovations made by scholars and the challenges we face as an

interdisciplinary field. We see this as a *continuation of* the work undertaken in the previous handbook and in the other collections referenced earlier.

A second aim of this collection is to provide an *interpretation* of the field of interactionism. This is an implicit function of all handbooks as their selection of content necessarily results in the construction of an interpretation and framing. Readers should not treat this (or any) handbook as representing the totality of a field, as collected works are always biased statements to some extent. Perhaps the most important feature of our own framing is the way we label the field and our definition of its boundaries. Readers will note that, in contrast to Reynolds and Herman-Kinney's (2003) text, we do not call this a handbook of 'symbolic interactionism', but of *interactionism*. This broader term is much more inclusive and enables us to include critically important areas of work, such as ethnomethodology and conversation analysis that sit uneasily in the more specific symbolic interactionism framing. This is not a new move within interactionism, as major statements on interactionism such as Reynolds (1993) and Atkinson and Housley's (2003) articulations (the latter published in the Reynolds and Herman-Kinney handbook) chose to discard the term 'symbolic', seeking an expansive lens from which to re-imagine the field. In our case, the choice is as an attempt to embrace a plurality of perspectives in an increasingly global and interdisciplinary landscape. As we discuss later, we see interactionism as a family of perspectives that, while diverse, have a key common concern with people's meaning making practices in social life (cf. Dingwall et al., 2012).

In spite of this, readers will encounter variation in the terminology used by the authors in these chapters, with some referring specially to 'symbolic interactionism' and others opting for the more generic term 'interactionism'. Similarly, there is variation in the ways that authors refer to people, using terminology such as 'actors' and 'members', which can carry quite specific conceptual implications. The label 'actor' is more strongly associated with symbolic interactionist theories that draw attention to notions of 'role taking' and the relation between social selves and society. In contrast, 'member' comes from Harold Garfinkel's work and its

emphasis on people's own practices/methods of meaning-making of the contexts in which they find themselves. In this introduction, we use the more common term 'people' to avoid the implications that the specific terms carry. However, we have decided not to impose this restriction on the contributors, and we regard the variation in the conceptual language across the chapters as a reflection of exactly the diversity that we are concerned to represent.

Structure of the handbook

The handbook is organized around six themes: *varieties of interactionism* (which encompasses an analysis of key theoretical ideas in the field); *self, identity and emotions*; *social organization*; *media and the Internet*; *research method*s and *reimagining interactionism*. As we discuss in more detail later, we see these themes as major areas of work over the last two decades. In selecting the content for these sections, we have avoided reproducing content that was comprehensively covered in the 2003 volume. So, for example, we have not included a focused discussion on the Chicago School, which has been the subject of much scholarly attention (see Bulmer, 1984; Chapoulie, 2020; Fine, 1995; Musolf, 2003). Similarly, we have not included a chapter on the antecedents of symbolic interactionism that were covered in detail by Prus' and Reynolds' chapters in 2003. We do not include statements solely focused on G.H. Mead's theory or the Chicago School because we aim to avoid reducing the pragmatist strand of interactionism to G.H. Mead's thought: as Frithjof Nungesser's chapter in this volume argues, the study of social interaction must include a full array of interdisciplinary research and pragmatist ideas (beyond Mead's) in its understanding of how people adapt to their changing environments.

Given our interests in articulating an inclusive field, we have intentionally avoided prioritizing one particular strand of interactionism over others. Indeed, as we will explain, we are critical of narrow conceptions of interaction that privilege particular strands of thought over others. Instead, we have explicitly sought chapters that show how the field has advanced over the

past 17 years and that reflect on new developments in the thinking about the history of interactionism. Our intention has been to include representative perspectives that explore the contemporary significance and the potentials of interactionist arguments that resonate with current debates about sex and gender, the body, race and racialization, the natural environment and animals, time and space, the Internet and social media, as well as institutions such as the media and the police. Suffice it to say that, while we have tried to be as inclusive as possible in our selection of topics, the obvious limitations of space mean that neither the theoretical/conceptual approaches nor the empirical areas that we cover here exhaust what interactionism has to offer.

Varieties of interactionism

Interactionism can be thought of as a family of perspectives and methods within the social sciences and humanities that are applied to the study of a wide range of diverse topics (cf. Dingwall et al., 2012). As we have said, the common assumption that interactionism can be equated with symbolic interactionism is problematic, as the interactionist family is much larger than that.

There are several key features that these diverse areas have in common. First, the notion that human interaction is the context for the emergence of role-taking and is the basis of the social self has dominated the landscape of interactionist thinking since its early pragmatist roots (see Nungesser in this volume). Further, interactionists examine how people orient to the world around them according to the meaning it has for them; they consider that meaning arises from interaction, and they view interpretation as a process that is ongoing in interaction as people build and modify meaning in concrete situations (Blumer, 1969; Garfinkel, 2006/1948). From these general premises, interactionist research explores how relationships between people arise and how people maintain, experience, develop and change their sense of self in social relationships. It investigates society and the 'social self' by analyzing how social situations are

organized through peoples' actions and interpretive acts and how this organization structures relationships between individuals in society. In the following paragraphs, we wish to show in more detail how these themes intersect, as well as the ways they have been developed as distinct approaches.

Probably the most widely known interactionist perspective outside of sociology is symbolic interactionism. The term was coined by Herbert Blumer (1900–1987), who provided a landmark statement on the conceptual character of the perspective, which drew substantially on the work of G.H. Mead (1863–1931) (Blumer, 1969). Blumer's account of symbolic interactionism gave rise to an extremely successful research program and, as Thomas Morrione aptly discusses in his chapter, provided a clear agenda for sociologists, offering invaluable tools for the study of the human condition in terms of peoples' perspectives, identities, and actions as *emergent* developments rather than as inflexibly determined by outside forces. In Morrione's view, Blumer's approach is not just a 'micro' perspective but is, rather, a holistic endeavor that also encompasses macro-aspects of society. Symbolic interactionism grew in the United States at a moment of innovation for the discipline of sociology, and at a time when American society was subject to tremendous social changes, Blumer opened a theoretical space for the conceptual and empirical study of diverse and changing social settings and practices in a way that had been missed by the dominant framework of the time, structural functionalism (Low and Bowden, 2020).

The founder of structural functionalism, Talcott Parsons, was the doctoral advisor of another 'founder' of interactionism, Harold Garfinkel (1917–2011). Garfinkel began his PhD at Harvard at the time that Blumer was developing symbolic interactionism in Chicago and Berkeley. As Jason Turowetz and Anne Rawls note in this volume, Garfinkel took from Parsons an interest in the classic tradition of Émile Durkheim and Max Weber. However, Garfinkel (2006/1948) rejected the social-scientific perspective underlying Parsons' approach and began to develop his own sociological attitude that would eventually be formulated as the perspective of

ethnomethodology (Garfinkel, 1996, 2002). Ethnomethodology has a strong affiliation to phenomenology and in particular to the social phenomenology developed by Alfred Schutz (1967; Rawls, 2002, 2006; vom Lehn, 2014). Like symbolic interactionism, ethnomethodology is closely related to the pragmatist philosophy as developed by Peirce, James, Dewey, Addams and Mead (Emirbayer and Maynard, 2011). As Nungesser's chapter brilliantly illustrates, classic interactionists – specifically Dewey and Mead – understood interaction from the standpoint of an organism that relates and adapts to a specific environment. Relatedly, Garfinkel (2002) argued that sociology should prioritize the point of view of societal members and that it should aim to reveal the *organization of concrete everyday social practices*. In his 'tutorial exercises' (Garfinkel, 1967, 2002), which in textbooks are often called 'breaching experiments' (Giddens, 2009), Garfinkel explored and demonstrated that people approach social situations with expectations about how they should be conducted. Through its 'progeny' discipline of conversation analysis (CA), ethnomethodologists have discovered the detailed practices and methods through which people orientate to the problem of creating mutual understanding in concrete situations. By examining audio recordings through detailed transcriptions, conversation analysts reveal the organization of talk and demonstrate the social and collaborative accomplishment of people's problem-solving efforts. An underlying principle of ethnomethodology is that the coordination of social actions is possible because people mutually render their orientation toward shared practice *witnessable to others*. The theoretical focus on the possibility of coordinated action stems from ethnomethodology's concern with the study of society from the perspective of "the social fact tradition," to which the classic European theorists that influenced Garfinkel belonged (see Turowetz and Rawls in this volume).

With the development of CA, ethnomethodologists demonstrate their interest in practice by providing an understanding of 'language in use' that bears affinities to Mead's (1967/1934) theoretical discussion of 'communication' and of the production of 'meaning' through a 'conversation of gestures'. Further, Garfinkel's (1967, 2002) analysis of tutorial exercises show

how people deploy 'situated creativity' to deal with problems they encounter in the everyday, an argument that is cognate to Joas's (1996) analysis of 'creative action'. More recent ethnomethodological research using video recordings as principal data for the analysis of everyday interaction in work and public places add to those discussions by highlighting the interplay of vocal, visual and bodily action with the environment (Heath and Luff, 2000; Heath et al., 2010). This analysis relates to Mead's pursuits in the 'Philosophy of the Act' (1967/1938) as well as to research undertaken by Carl Couch (1925–1994) and colleagues at the New Iowa School of Symbolic Interactionism (Couch and Hintz, 1975). While less widely influential than ethnomethodology, the New Iowa School was founded by Carl Couch as a response to the original Iowa School of Symbolic Interactionism, led by Manford Kuhn (1911–1963). Kuhn's approach shifted the methodological emphasis of symbolic interactionism away from the more interpretive, ethnographic current associated with Blumer's approach. As Michael Katovich and Shing-Ling S. Chen point out in their chapter, Couch developed an alternative approach to Kuhn's, aimed at systematically pursuing symbolic interactionism's interest in the dynamic nature of social selves through video and audio recordings of behavior in laboratory settings. The New Iowa School of symbolic interactionism is further illustration of the diversity of ways in which the general commitment to studying meaning-making as a social process has been pursued.

Two further theorists that are important to mention are Anselm Strauss (1916–1996) and his student Erving Goffman (1922–1982): two giants of interactionism whose work is discussed here by Adele Clarke and Greg Smith, respectively. Although Strauss is perhaps best known for his introduction of grounded theory in contemporary qualitative research, Clarke's chapter in this volume showcases a richer Straussian toolkit for the students of interactionism, focused on the concept of negotiated order (Strauss et al., 1963) and its subsequent developments. Clarke distinguishes two periods of theoretical elaboration by Anselm Strauss and collaborators such as Susan Leigh Star (1956–2010): the first period spanned the 1960s to 1990, and the second from

1990 until 2020. The foundational idea of this perspective is the concept of *negotiated orders*, which Clarke defines as 'sets of *temporary* processual arrangements among various social actors that must be actively sustained or renegotiated' (P.?). Working to dissolve dualistic thinking, Clarke contends, Strauss moved from the basic processual idea of negotiated orders to the theorizing of structural concepts, such as *social worlds* and *arenas*. Providing interactionist researchers with an understanding of structure, *social worlds* constitute groups with a common standpoint that grounds their shared identities and joint actions, while *arenas* bring together several social worlds with the implication of complex collective action. In the last part of her chapter, Clarke covers the extension of the Straussian perspective into three conceptual frameworks emerging in the second period: *boundary objects*; *infrastructures, classifications and standards* and *situational analysis*. This work represents not only a theoretical achievement but a methodological one, as Carrie Friese, Rachel Washburn and Adele Clarke's chapter in Part 6 of this volume attests.

Like Strauss, Goffman also provided a powerful framework for interactionists. From his *dramaturgical principles* to his elaboration of *frame analysis*, Goffman gave interactionists not only ethnographically based concepts to nurture or expand through their research but, more importantly, an original and fascinating mode of doing research. In particular, Greg Smith's chapter discusses the three conceptual pillars of the dramaturgical approach: *dramaturgy*, *impression management* and *presentation of self*. As Smith convincingly argues, Goffman's dramaturgical principles, fully outlined in his classic *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (Goffman, 1959), would later remain important sources for Goffman's intellectual work in subsequent years. Smith views dramaturgy not as a phase in Goffman's work but, rather, as a perspective that Goffman used throughout his career and thus as an integral part of Goffman's overall theoretical strategy. Goffman's oeuvre remains a rich resource for contemporary researchers of interaction in the social sciences and the humanities, and, as the chapters by

Hannah Ditchfield and Xiaoli Tian and Yui Fung Yip show, is central to the analysis of technologically mediated interaction.

As the previous discussion shows, as well as strong similarities, there are also substantial differences that exist between the perspectives of interactionism, and we by no means intended to diminish these critically important variations. Rather, in giving emphasis to the interconnectedness between them and their substantial points of overlap, our intention is to create inter-perspectival dialogue that can, we hope, advance interactionism and strengthen its influence.

Self, identity and emotions

Interactionists have arguably paid much more attention to the topics of *self, identity and emotions* than to any other topic. The previous handbook provided excellent chapters focused on the elaboration of these ideas, acknowledging their centrality within the evolution of interactionism. This focus is understandable given the central role that Mead's social psychological ideas have played in interactionist theorizing, particularly his premise that the self develops in interaction with others. In Mead's theory, the self (and related experiences/enactments of emotion and identity) must be understood as being constructed through communication and through participation in society – an idea that is also found in another interactionist founder, Charles Cooley (see Ruiz-Junco and Brossard, 2020). This social construction occurs in a wide array of communicative patterns, which, through Mead's influence, have been traditionally characterized in terms of the process of 'role taking' – that is, taking the role of others in interaction to build an understanding of the context and the implications of certain actions for oneself and for others. However, as Kent Sandstrom, Lisa-Jo van den Scott and Gary Fine remark in this volume, interactionists have not reached consensus over the meanings of self and identity. Instead of trying to settle this by offering definitive definitions ourselves, our objective has been to include chapters that discuss crucial changes in interactionist

conceptualization of these ideas from new frameworks – see, for example, Lisa Jean Moore and Sumayra Khan in this volume, who expand theoretical conceptions of self by drawing on *critical body studies* and *affect studies* – and through their application to new topic areas, such as Rachael Ironside's chapter on the supernatural.

The chapters in this volume help to highlight three areas of change or development in the theorization of self, identity and emotion. The first development addresses transformations in contemporary self-experiences due to the rise of communication technologies. Today, the interaction order is no longer simply defined by the face-to-face communication patterns that so interested Cooley, Mead and, more recently, Goffman. Simon Gottschalk explores how our use of digital technologies (cell phones, computers, tablets, etc.) has ushered in the "terminal self." This term refers to the self/body adjustments that people make as a result of interacting with other humans via terminals and with terminals. Terminal selfhood entails deep changes in self-experience, involving bodily and emotional attitudes based on the constant use of digital technologies. More importantly, it alters the nature of our connection to the people with whom we interact and our capacities to understand others and to be understood. Gottschalk offers interactionists a critical angle from which to analyze these hypermodern online/face-to-face interactions, dominated by the presence of terminals, and where people increasingly find their need for what Axel Honneth theorized as *recognition*, problematically transformed.

The second development affects the contours and concept of selfhood. Traditionally in interactionism, conceptions of the self were dominated by anthropocentric, linguistic and cognitive understandings. As we have previously mentioned, Leslie Irvine's chapter extends interactionist theory of the self, breaking free from the highly engrained assumption that meaning-making only happens in humans. As Irvine shows, this logo-centric assumption has led researchers to ignore four fundamental characteristics of selfhood among nonhuman animals: *agency*, *coherence*, *affectivity* and *self-continuity*. Working against the Meadian belief that mastery of human language is necessary for the self to emerge, and drawing on research on

human infants, Irvine shows that nonhuman animals demonstrate the four interrelated features of selfhood: for instance, when they signal they want to play; when they indicate their understanding of their embodied presence or absence in relation to others; when they emote, whether engaging in 'categorical' emotional behavior (e.g., feeling fear), or by expressing 'vitality affects', denoting the degree of feeling (e.g., high excitement at the prospect of play) and when they evince remembrances of experiences by acting accordingly (e.g., avoidance behavior when close to the animal clinic).

Rachael Ironside adds to these debates by exploring how subjective experiences – such as feelings, the sense of a presence, out-of-body experiences or paranormal dreams – feature in interaction between people. Because supernatural phenomena often are not visible or audible, it can be challenging for people to share the experience of the supernatural with others. In her chapter, Ironside introduces the qualities of supernatural and subjective experiences by examining a typical event from her data corpus of video recordings of Ouija Board sessions. During this event, the participants in the session discuss the presence or absence of a ghost. Ironside inspects the talk and bodily actions of the participants to reveal how they communicate and share their experiences with each other and thus uncovers the role of the self in supernatural encounters.

In their chapter, Lisa Jean Moore and Sumayra Khan turn to examine how people socially construct shared social facts about 'healthy' and 'sick' bodies. Their chapter begins with a review of key terminology in critical body studies, medical sociology and interactionism to then explore the proliferation of 'contested illnesses', like ADHD, obesity and body dysmorphia. The authors reveal that processes of medicalization of deviance and the stigmatization of illness sustain the cultural supremacy of a normative order, namely, the normativity of a 'healthy body', defined in limited and unattainable terms. In their analysis, Moore and Khan discuss how stratification based on race, class, gender, sexual identity and ability are reproduced and sustained in our constructions and management of health and illness.

In her chapter, Doyle McCarthy turns to 'emotional culture' to discuss selfhood in emotional terms. McCarthy defines emotions as '*cultural objects of human action*', implying that they are mechanisms of reflexive understanding and expression and of self-control. McCarthy's chapter sheds light on contemporary emotional culture and how it manifests itself in all spheres of society. In the United States, she argues, this culture involves treating one's emotions as the legitimate grounds for deeper self-understanding and identity verification. Markedly influenced by Romanticism, this culture valorizes intense, spontaneous and authentic *experiences*. As an illustration, McCarthy discusses how *emotional intensity* operates as an ideal, motivating people to enhance their sense of closeness and intimacy with others, and to reproduce this logic in a wide range of areas of social life, from personal relationships to politics and the economy.

The final development we wish to highlight involves the study of identity as a site of power and resistance. Interactionists increasingly scrutinize how systems of social categorization and labeling – particularly those of race, class, gender and sexuality – function as structures of oppression. This volume stresses several areas in which this critique has been developed. In their chapter on racial identity, Matthew W. Hughey and Michael L. Rosino reject a limited and de-politicized view of identity as a dimension of a person's sense of self. Combining interactionist ideas with other sociological literature, the authors view racial identity operating as part of *racialization*: a complex process of boundary-making involving multiple levels of sociological analysis – from the micro to the macro. In their view, racialization processes are ideological, institutional, interest-based and interactional. The authors note the racialized interaction order represents a sphere where people at the same time act on their experience of others' racial identity and the related understanding of (un)belonging, (de)humanization, and prestige or stigma. Their chapter stresses how interactionism contributes analytic tools to explain and critique racial oppression. Relatedly, Sumerau's chapter shows that interactionism's critical take on identity construction can be fruitfully mobilized against sex/sexuality/gender oppression. As Sumerau argues, interactionism's commitment to revealing the constructed nature of identity

provides a compelling resource to critique binary reifications of identity based on sex, gender and sexuality. Drawing on interactionist literature on 'identity work,' Sumerau suggests researchers may expand their current frameworks by questioning binaries, such as the construction of non-binary gender identities, including how others (e.g., transgender and cisgender people) view non-binary gender identities, and the marginalization of non-binary sexualities and sexual fluidity.

Social organization

Interactionists have arguably always had a deep interest in *organisations and institutions*, but, as Patrick McGinty's chapter highlights, they have approached their study in varying ways, with a divergence between approaches that study them as either the *context* for action or as *objects* of study – that is, as larger structures where action takes place, or as the result of processes of action/interaction. McGinty (2014) finds that the majority of interactionist (inspired) research is focused on organizations and organizational culture while only a minority of studies looks at institutions as interactionally constituted. McGinty promotes this latter approach, pointing to the incredible value of research that focuses on how people organize the social world in interaction with each other. In this way, McGinty draws attention to work that treats organizational/institutional phenomena as a "going concern" (Hughes, 1984: 37) and encourages investigations that exploit the strength of the interactionist approach to uncover the processes that bring about organizations and institutions. McGinty, argues for studies of the *organizing practices and processes* through which organizations are created and continually renewed (cf. Dingwall and Strong, 1985).

Implicit in McGinty's chapter is a rebuke of those who criticize interactionism for having an 'astructural bias', that is, for ignoring power relationships and other structural influences on social relationships (see also contributions in Musolf, 2016). Unfortunately, 'these presumed interactionist biases actually served to promote an emergent interactionist perspective with little

or no interest in institutional, structural, or organizational concerns' (McGinty in this volume, P.). This argument has been taken up by Stacey Hannem, whose chapter tackles these issues head-on by showing how interactionists have responded to these debates how interactionist concepts can be used to reveal and analyze power and structure. Using the example of the #MeToo movement, Hannem's analysis demonstrates that power and structure are embedded within symbolic interactionist concepts and research topics and that they are central to our concerns.

One area where structure and power have been of particular concern to interactionists is in the study of health and medical contexts, which have been key topics of study at least since the publication of Goffman's (1961) *Asylums*. Baptiste Brossard adds to this important body of research by discussing interactionists' investigations of mental health, distinguishing four areas of contribution: (1) generating non-judgmental accounts of the experiences of mental health problems; (2) theorizing the role of diagnostic labels in the production of mental health issues; (3) studying how mental disorders make sense, exist and are embedded only within specific interaction settings and institutions and (4) understanding the mechanisms of social control weighing on our mental functioning. Through his detailed discussion of these four areas, Brossard shows possible avenues for the development of interactionist research on mental health.

In addition to health care, the police are another institution where power and structure are of key concern. For years, the Black Lives Matter movement has responded to the killing of Black people by the police, denouncing implicit and explicit racism within the police and calling for radical societal changes to end racial oppression. This reminds us that these issues are not just theoretical but of real practical consequence and of the most serious kind. Over the years, interactionist studies have made an important contribution to discussions about policing and police reform by investigating the day-to-day work of police officers (Bittner, 1967; Meehan, 1993) and the language and 'social organization of policing' (Manning and van Maanen, 1978). Recent work has shown how the police have increasingly used computer technology and other

technologies for the profiling of suspects and the creation of crime statistics (Meehan and Ponder, 2002), and it has explored how such technologies have been embedded within the existing organization of their work (Manning, 2008). Watson and Meehan (in this volume) consider the use of video recordings of police work, and how these are used to make judgments about cases of police violence against civilians. Through an ethnomethodological lens, they examine an arrest video-recorded by a security camera and a transcript of a subsequent civil legal action against the arresting officer. The analysis explores 'the viewing frameworks' and the endogenous reasoning within the settings under investigation, showing the situated practices of making sense of the recorded scenes as a course of adjudicative work, which, in Watson and Meehan's view, is 'the objective of a truly interactionist sociology'. With their chapter, Meehan and Watson exhibit the strengths of ethnomethodological research in unpacking the social organization of action through which participants interpret and assess the actions of others, and they show the important consequences that participants' meaning-making processes have for their and others' lives.

In addition to institutions, interactionists have also had a long-standing interest in the ways that social life is produced as an organizational structure, and several of the chapters in this section take on this topic. Robin Smith's chapter addresses the concept of space from an interactionist perspective, emphasizing that space is never just a 'container' or context for action but is itself *configured* by dynamic social relationships. In the past, interactionists have often focused on the relationships between people in urban environments by describing them as an 'ecology' (Park and Burgess, 1964) and by examining how people structure and use urban spaces, particularly in the light of population growth and changing political circumstances (Burgess, 1967; Rodner et al., 2019). Smith discusses the notion of space through the history of interactionist scholarship, from early Chicago School ethnographies to contemporary work that explores people's engagement with landscapes (Vannini, 2012). Through his detailed discussion

of past and recent research, Smith powerfully shows that space and mobility are not just topics to which interactionists occasionally turn, but they are central to all interactionist endeavors.

Smith's chapter hints at the importance of the natural environment as a topic for interactionist research, a topic that is the central concern of Anthony Puddephatt's chapter. Puddephatt rebukes scholars who criticize interactionism for neglecting nature and the environment in their research and, through a detailed examination of interactionist writings from classic scholars onwards, Puddephatt brilliantly shows that nature and the environment have always featured in interactionist research. He uses his analysis to explain how a more materialist form of interactionism based on G.H. Mead's theory can open up a wide range of research trajectory for contemporary interactionist scholars.

Another major area of concern in considering organizational processes is the construction of temporality. For the past three decades or so, Michael Flaherty has been at the forefront of the development of interactionist study of time and has explored how human interaction and social relationships are underpinned in different ways by time as a means to socially organize actions (Flaherty, 2011). In his chapter, Flaherty carefully discusses these contributions in relation to interactionist theory and research, highlighting the complex ways in which social interaction is interwoven with and organized by an orientation to time and is interlinked with larger forms of social organization.

The final chapter in this part of the handbook continues the discussion of time by looking at how studies of collective memory can contribute to our understandings of the operation of social worlds. Lisa-Jo van den Scott argues that memories are *negotiated*, *constructed* and *reshaped* in interaction. Memories are the result of interaction processes that van den Scott likens to 'generic processes' (Prus, 1987), that is, 'processes of generating, maintaining, and manipulating collective memory [that] can be studied across groups'. However, as van den Scott explains with reference to Milligan's (2007) study of the preservationist movement, the *content* and *form* of collective memories is constantly shaped and reshaped in interaction. For example,

the buildings that people select for preservation change considering the circumstances in which the selection takes place. When collective memory has been created, people use it to interpret the present and imagine the future. In her chapter, van den Scott not only demonstrates that interaction processes are critical for the production of collective memory but also shows the importance of interactionist approaches to understanding the social processes through which collective memory is created, (re-)shaped and sustained.

Interaction, media and the Internet

One of the most dominant themes in the political landscape of recent years has concerned the consumption of information and the construction of 'truth' and 'facts'. We have seen the consequences of the ways that private companies, political interest groups, nation states and others manipulate information to construct and mobilize specific sentiments for their own interests (and often for nefarious purposes). The manipulation of elections; the incitement of hate crimes; the trivializing or rejection of scientific and other specialist opinion and knowledge – these are all real and increasingly common practices of contemporary social life.

The mass media have become a fault-line for these debates, with print and broadcast journalism regularly being challenged over their objectivity and partiality. David Altheide's fascinating chapter looks at how media content is used and made meaningful through the institutionalization and internalization of 'media logic'. This logic enables the creation of specific cultural meanings that are in turn used as mechanism of power to shape social agendas. Altheide's chapter helps to reflect on the relationship between corporate (and other) interests and processes of media consumption and use. Joel Best's chapter takes these ideas forward by reflecting on the ways that interactionists can conceptualize the relationship between audience experience and media content. Drawing on the notion of 'fear' in the context of moral panics and other media scares, Best warns against the simplified analysis commonly found in the broader discipline of sociology, which presumes specific emotional reactions on the parts of diversified

audiences. Instead, Best points to the necessity of following interactionist ideals of studying meaning as a localized construction. Together, these chapters show the importance of a continued engagement with the topic of media consumption and production.

Of course, traditional media's social role and practices have radically changed through the introduction of social media, and interactionist research has played and continues to play a hugely important role in this area. All kinds of institutions use media in the course of their work. One example of this is police work that is examined by Chris Schneider's chapter in this volume. Schneider examines how the police use social media and how it has altered the practices of police work. Essentially, social media works as *a mechanism of social control*, enabling the police to understand things about people and crime that they may have previously found hard to explore. Further, as with individual users, the police use social media as a tool for self-promotion and for constructing an image and a relationship with the communities they 'serve'. These issues are of particular concern considering the previously discussed demonstrations against institutionalized racism in police forces. Schneider's chapter shows the immense contribution that interactionists can make to understanding the practices and systems of meaning that are embedded within these institutions, an area of study that must surely play a substantial part in any meaningful debate about the police.

Another area of practice that has been radically re-shaped through social media and internet technologies is computer game play. David Kirschner's chapter looks in detail at self-performance and meaning-making in these sociocultural domains and how the real and virtual worlds intersect in complex ways. Kirschner shows the wide influence that interactionists have had in this field in terms of the study of the meaning-making processes within game play and in game communities and the importance of interactionist concepts for understanding the complexity of gaming.

Digital interaction through social media is a core area of interactionists' work. As we have seen, Simon Gottschalk in this volume uses the concept of the 'terminal self' to describe the

process and consequences of using technology as a medium of interaction, drawing attention to the physical/perceptual skills of using such technologies. There is also uncertainty about the audience(s) of online interaction (what Tian and Fung Yip describe in their chapter as the 'n-adic' dilemma), where one's digital traces may be picked up, reacted to and used by all manner of unknown others. Certain institutions or cultural groups may pressure or even require people to have an active public presence on social media and websites, and a substantial body of research is concerned with the impact of this on practices of self-presentation (see Tian and Fung Yip's chapter for a comprehensive review).

As Tian and Fung Yip's chapter makes clear, Goffman's work continues to be a key resource for researchers of online interaction, particularly in terms of understanding practices of self-presentation. One of the many areas where this influence can be seen is in the study of 'celebrity', which is integral to the discourses of participation in YouTube, Twitter and the like (Blank, 2006; Marwick and boyd, 2011; Schneider, 2016). The uses of social media by celebrities as a feature of brand building have been well documented, such as how they use it to construct a sense of intimacy with fans by revealing aspects of their 'backstage' behavior and by using forms of speech that display 'informality' and 'closeness' with their interlocutors (Marwick and boyd, 2011). Kerry Ferris's chapter shows that social media is used for interaction with celebrities even after their deaths. Taking the example of fans' interactions with Michael Jackson on Twitter, Ferris illustrates that cultural icons and the meaning around them are managed and negotiated by fans and the cultural industries more broadly. Ferris shows how the organizations that represent dead celebrities (often for substantial profit) continue to use and build the brand and that through such organizations, fans engage with the celebrity as an 'agentic' actor, and in doing so, they continue to construct their legitimacy as celebrities and icons.

Another use of Goffman's work is shown by Ditchfield's chapter, which demonstrates how Goffmanian concepts, such as facework and presentation of self, can be usefully combined

with CA and with discursive approaches to look at the ways people manage the self in real-world conversations. Ditchfield's fascinating analysis explores how participants in Facebook message chats composed and edited their messages in real time and how their editing decisions help us understand their practices of 'facework' as a *lived* communicative practice.

New developments in methods

Since its earliest origins, interactionism has had a sustained impact on methodological debates and practices in the social sciences. From the 'urban ethnographies' of the Chicago School to CA attention to the 'micro' features of spoken talk, interactionists have shaped the landscape of qualitative research practice. Herman-Kinney and Verschaeve's chapter in the previous handbook gave a clear overview of the methods in symbolic interactionism, showing their emergence and variety and giving emphasis to the importance of careful empirical and conceptually grounded theory. Given that this history is well told, rather than provide an overview of methods within interactionist scholarship, our aim in this handbook is to include chapters that advance the discussion about the study of interaction in contemporary society.

It would be extremely remiss of us not to begin our discussion of methods without recognizing the groundbreaking work of Kathy Charmaz, one of interactionism's central figures in the last few decades who, sadly, passed away in 2020. Kathy had done more than anyone to advance the practices and uses of grounded theory (GT), helping to continue the sustained influence of the method across the social sciences (Bryant and Charmaz, 2007), including areas as diverse as marketing (Goulding, 2002), management and organization studies (Gioia et al., 2013), nursing (Schreiber and Noerager Stern, 2001) and information systems research (Wiesche et al., 2017). Originating in the collaborations of Glaser and Strauss's ethnographies of caring for the dying (Glaser and Strauss, 1966), grounded theory has since been developed substantially by these and other authors (Glaser, 2000; Charmaz, 2006; Holton and Walsh, 2017; Strauss and Corbin, 1997; Konecki, 2011; Redman-Maclaran and Mills, 2008). But it was Kathy who saw

the importance of rescuing the approach from its realist implications – its implicit obsession with bias and objectified knowledge and method – and with developing an approach that takes account of contemporary social theory, such as feminism and postmodernism.

We are delighted that Kathy has been able to contribute to this handbook in one of the closing chapters, which we will discuss in more detail later. But her work is also shown in Carrie Friese, Rachel Washburn and Adele Clarke's chapter, which explores the development of GT in *situational analysis*. Continuing on from Kathy's work, situational analysis also intersects with critical perspectives, such as feminism and post-colonial theory, and continues to develop the pragmatist (critical) roots of symbolic interactionism. Friese, Washburn and Clarke's chapter gives a practical guide through the *mapping techniques* of this method, showing how they can be used to explore difference in perspective, examine power and create collaborative and *useful* research.

Aside from GT, interactionists have been a driving force in advancing the understanding, popularity and influence of ethnographic methods in the social sciences. The urban ethnographies of the Chicago School and the phenomenological studies of praxis in ethnomethodology continue to be central methods for learning about diverse worlds, shedding light on life and work that remains hidden from public view and from traditional sociological analysis (Goffman, 2015; Desmond, 2017; Duck, 2012; Stuart, 2018, 2020). René Tuma's chapter looks at the intersection of interpretive ethnographic inquiry with video methods developed from EMCA. Tuma outlines the emergence of video methods in interactionist research before showing the particular components of *videography*, where ethnographic knowledge and careful methodical analysis of interaction inform each other. Video-based studies of interaction have been important since the 1960s and have become extremely influential in the analysis of work and organization through sub-disciplines such as workplace studies (Heath and Luff, 2000; Luff et al., 2000; Szymanski and Whalen, 2010). Tuma's chapter continues debates in these areas by giving an example of how ethnography and video work come together in the

analysis of a specific work setting. Through this, Tuma helps us to think about the connection between 'micro' data and broader ethnographic contexts of inquiry, which is a key topic at a time when video and audio data are increasingly easy to capture.

The subject of ethnography is also taken up by Michael Dellwing, whose chapter looks at practices of online ethnography, pointing to the huge diversity in methods and approaches that can be found in this area. Using the example of researching online games, Dellwing shows the importance of flexibility in online ethnography, being able to engage with online participants in the range of communication forms they themselves use. His discussion shows that naturalistic research online brings up distinctive issues, such as the question of whether 'lurking' online is equivalent to unobtrusive non-participant observation in face-to-face contexts.

This final point helps to foreground a set of issues that are of increasing importance for contemporary researchers, which is *how to negotiate the shifting political terrain of research ethics while maintaining flexible and meaningful research strategies that enable us to understand the world from peoples' own points of view*. The final chapter in this section, from Deborah and William van den Hoonaard, addresses this, proposing an approach to ethics that draw on interactionist principles by narrowing the gap between researcher and researched; recognizing the cultural complexity of participants' lives; having flexibility in the research process and the methods used (rather than rigidly sticking to pre-determined plans); and maintaining a key interest in protecting and fostering the dignity of research participants. The chapter offers an important contribution to the ongoing interdisciplinary conversation around ethics, on which interactionism must continue to have a substantial influence.

Reimagining interactionism

The chapters in this handbook illustrate that interactionism remains a vibrant research tradition comprising an abundance of creative scholarship that continues to advance theories, methods and substantive areas of study. The final section of the handbook examines the possible futures of the

field, with the contributors providing powerful and thought-provoking commentaries on interactionism's relevance.

Emilie Whitaker and Paul Atkinson's chapter explores advancements in the collection and analysis of data for interactionist work. Drawing on the claim that interactionism's most substantial contributions have been empirical, Whitaker and Atkinson look at how the ethnographic gaze – so central to our discipline – can be extended by paying attention to the materiality of embodied sensory interaction to the ways that social media (and other technologies) extend interaction over time and across spaces. The chapter makes the strong case that methods are there to pursue disciplinary questions and topics – that *method* is only a means to an end, and that our overall aim should be to use advancements in methods to extend our sociological understanding.

Martyn Hammersley's chapter addresses what he characterizes as the *antinomies* within interactionist thinking: the tensions between focusing on process versus structure and between epistemic versus pragmatic conceptions of meaning. Hammersley's fascinating discussion reflects on how interactionism may come to grips with these tensions, but it also asks whether these tensions are simply areas we must learn to accept, whether they are productive for the advancement of our discipline or are actually impediments to advancement.

Kent Sandstrom, Lisa-Jo van den Scott, and Gary Fine recognize interactionism's internal divisions. For these authors, interactionism finds itself in the midst of an "identity crisis," which cannot be overcome until interactionists drop what they characterize as the attitude of a 'resistance movement' and desist from fighting over dominance to define the 'central mission' of interactionism. Instead, they suggest that interactionism should embrace a commitment to 'a pragmatic and richly interpretive approach to social life – highlighting meanings, symbol creation, and interaction' (P.).

Finally, Linda Belgrave, Kapriskie Seide and Kathy Charmaz argue a different point. Their chapter endorses a revised pragmatism – based on a critical gaze to address the limitations

of its founders – particularly in terms of their [at best] 'color blindness' – and proposes the application of constructivist grounded theory and situational analysis to advance social justice goals. The authors propose two forms for this advancement: systematically questioning taken-for-granted meanings that reproduce systems of oppression (particularly in relation to neoliberalism) and making the perspectives of marginalized communities a central focus by combining interactionist methodologies with other methodologies.

In sum, the final section of this handbook points to three distinct paths to reimagine interactionism: working to resolve its antinomies or epistemological (and political) tensions; preserving its essence while letting go of the struggle for theoretical dominance and purity and reviewing and renewing its agenda and its methodological frameworks on the basis of the pursuit of social justice. The coming years will tell which of these paths are followed and how we develop and change as a discipline along the way.

Note

References

Adams, Tony E., Stacy Holman Jones, & Carolyn Ellis (2014). *Autoethnography*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Atkinson, Paul, & Housley, William (2003). *Interactionism* (1st ed.). London and Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Becker, Howard S., & Michal M. McCall (Eds.) (1993). *Symbolic Interaction and Cultural Studies*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Bittner, Egon (1967). The Police on Skid-Row: A Study of Peace Keeping. *American Sociological Review,* 32(5), 699–715.

Blank, Grant (2006). *Critics, Ratings, and Society: The Sociology of Reviews*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Blumer, Herbert (1969). *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Bryant, Antony, & Charmaz, Kathy (Eds.) (2007). *The SAGE Handbook of Current Developments in Grounded Theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bulmer, Martin (1984). *The Chicago School of Sociology: Institutionalization, Diversity and the Rise of Sociological Research*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Burgess, Ernest Watson (1967). *The Growth of the City: An Introduction to a Research Project*. New York: Bobbs-Merrill.

Chapoulie, Jean-Michel (2020). *Chicago Sociology*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Charmaz, Kathy (2006). *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide through Qualitative Analysis*. SAGE Publishing.

Collins, Randall (2004). *Interaction Ritual Chains*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Couch, Carl J., & Robert A. Hintz (1975). *Constructing Social Life: Readings in Behavioral Sociology from the Iowa School*. Stipes Publishing, LLC.

Couch, Carl J., & Robert A. Hintz (2017). *Information Technologies and Social Orders* (Mark D. Johns and Shing-Ling S. Chen, Eds., 2nd ed.). London and New York: Routledge.

Denzin, Norman K. (1992). *Symbolic Interactionism and Cultural Studies: The Politics of Interpretation*. Oxford and New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

Denzin, Norman K. (2003). The Call to Performance. *Symbolic Interaction,* 26(1), 187–207.

Desmond, Matthew (2017). *Evicted: Poverty and Profit in the American City*. Penguin.

Dingwall, Robert, DeGloma, Thomas, & Newmahr, Staci (2012). Editors' Introduction: Symbolic Interaction – Serving the Whole Interactionist Family. *Symbolic Interaction,* 35(1), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1002/symb.6.

Dingwall, Robert, & Strong, Phil M. (1985). The Interactional Study of Organizations. *Journal Of Contemporary Ethnography,* 14(2), 205–231.

Duck, Waverly (2012). *No Way Out: Precarious Living in the Shadow of Poverty and Drug Dealing*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Emirbayer, Mustafa, & Maynard, Douglas W. (2011). Pragmatism and Ethnomethodology. *Qualitative Sociology,* 34(1), 221–261. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11133-010-9183-8.

Engdahl, Emma, & Müller, Thaddeus (2015). The European Contribution to Symbolic Interactionism. *Symbolic Interaction,* 38, 431–441. https://doi.org/10.1002/symb.173

Fine, Gary A. (1993). The Sad Demise, Mysterious Disappearance, and Glorious Triumph of Symbolic Interactionism. *Annual Review of Sociology,* 19, 61–87.

Fine, Gary Alan (Ed.) (1995). *A Second Chicago School? The Development of a Postwar American Sociology*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Flaherty, Michael (2011). *The Textures of Time. Agency and Temporal Experience.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Garfinkel, Harold (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Garfinkel, Harold (1996). Ethnomethodology's Program. *Social Psychology Quarterly,* 59(1), 5–21. https://doi.org/10.2307/2787116.

Garfinkel, Harold (2002). *Ethnomethodology's Program: Working Out Durkheim's Aphorism*. Lanham, Boulder, CO, New York and Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Garfinkel, Harold (2006/1948). *Seeing Sociologically: The Routine Grounds of Social Action*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Giddens, Anthony (2009). *Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gioia, Dennis A., Kevin G. Corley, & Aimee L. Hamilton (2013). Seeking Qualitative Rigor in Inductive Research: Notes on the Gioia Methodology. *Organizational Research Methods,* 16(1), 15–31. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428112452151.

Glaser, Barney, & Strauss, Anselm (1999/1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. New Brunswick, NJ: Routledge.

Goffman, Alice (2015). *On the Run: Fugitive Life in an American City*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Goffman, Erving (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Doubleday.

Goffman, Erving (1961). *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and other Inmates*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Goffman, Erving (1963). *Stigma.* Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Goulding, Christina (2002). *Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide for Management, Business and Market Researchers*. London and Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Heath, Christian, & Luff, Paul (2000). *Technology in Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holton, Judith A., & Isabelle Walsh (2017). *Classic Grounded Theory: Applications With Qualitative and Quantitative Data*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Hughes, Everett C. (1984). *The Sociological Eye: Selected Papers.* New York: Transaction Publishers.

Joas, Hans (1996). *The Creativity of Action*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Kleinman, Sherryl, & Cabaniss, Emily R. (Eds.) (2019). Toward a Feminist Symbolic Interactionism. In Michael Hviid Jacobsen (Ed.), *Critical and Classical Interactionism: Insights from Sociology and Criminology* (pp. 119–137). London: Routledge.

Knorr-Cetina, Karin (2009). The Synthetic Situation: Interactionism for a Global World. *Symbolic Interaction,* 32(1), 61–87. https://doi.org/10.1525/si.2009.32.1.61.

Konecki, Krzysztof Tomasz (2011). Visual Grounded Theory: A Methodological Outline and Examples from Empirical Work. *Revija Za Sociologiju,* 41(2), 131–160.

Low, Jacqueline, & Bowden, Gary (2020). An Embattled Yet Enduring Influence: Introduction to a Special Issue on Blumerian Symbolic Interactionism. *Symbolic Interaction,* 43(4), 575–596. https://doi.org/10.1002/symb.519.

Luff, Paul, Hindmarsh, Jon, & Heath, Christian (Eds.) (2000). *Workplace Studies: Recovering Work Practice and Informing System Design.* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Maines, David (2001). *The Faultline of Consciousness: A View of Interactionism in Sociology.* New York: Routledge.

Manning, Peter K. (2008). *The Technology of Policing: Crime Mapping, Information Technology, and the Rationality of Crime Control.* New York: New York University Press.

Manning, Peter K., & John Van Maanen (1978). *Policing: A View from the Street.* Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear Publishing.

Manning, Philip, & Maines, David R. (2003). Editorial Introduction: Theory and Method in Symbolic Interactionism. *Symbolic Interaction,* 26(4), 497–500. https://doi.org/10.1525/si.2003.26.4.497.

Marwick, Alice, & boyd, danah (2011). To See and Be Seen: Celebrity Practice on Twitter. *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies,* 17(2), 139–158. https://doi.org/10.1177/1354856510394539.

McGinty, Patrick J. W. (2014). Divided and Drifting: Interactionism and the Neglect of Social Organizational Analyses in Organization Studies. *Symbolic Interaction,* 37(2), 155–186. https://doi.org/10.1002/symb.101.

Mead, George Herbert (1967/1934). *Mind, Self, and Society from the Perspective of a Social Behaviorist.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Mead, George Herbert (1967/1938). *Philosophy of the Act by George Herbert Mead.* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Mead, George Herbert (2002). *The Philosophy of the Present.* Amherst, NY: Prometheus.

Meehan, Albert J. (1993). Internal Police Records and the Control of Juveniles: Politics and Policing in a Suburban Town. *The British Journal of Criminology,* 33(4), 504–524. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.bjc.a048356.

Meehan, Albert J., & Michael C. Ponder (2002). Race and Place: The Ecology of Racial Profiling African American Motorists. *Justice Quarterly,* 19(3), 399–430. https://doi.org/10.1080/07418820200095291.

Meltzer, Bernard N., Petras, John W., & Reynolds, Larry T. (1975). *Symbolic Interactionism: Genesis, Varieties Critics'.* London, Henley and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul Books.

Milligan, Melinda J. (2007). Buildings as History: The Place of Collective Memory in the Study of Historic Preservation. *Symbolic Interaction,* 30(1), 105–123. https://doi.org/10.1525/si.2007.30.1.105.

Müller, Thaddeus (Ed.) (2015). *Contributions from European Symbolic Interactionists: Conflict and Cooperation.* Bingley: Emerald.

Musolf, Gil Richard (2003). The Chicago School. In Larry T. Reynolds & Nancy J. Herman-Kinney (Eds.), *Handbook of Symbolic Interactionism* (pp. 91–117). Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Musolf, Gil Richard (2016). *The Astructural Bias Charge: Myth or Reality?* Bingley: Emerald.

Park, Robert E., & Burgess, Ernest W. (1967). *The City.* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Plummer, Ken, & Turner, Bryan S. (2000). A World in the Making: Symbolic Interactionism in the Twentieth Century. In *The Blackwell Companion to Social Theory* (pp. 193–222). Oxford and New York: Blackwell.

Prus, Robert (1987). Generic Social Processes: Maximizing Conceptual Development in Ethnographic Research. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography,* 16(3), 250–293. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891241687163002.

Rawls, Anne W. (2002). Editor's Introduction. In Anne W. Rawls (Ed.), *Ethnomethodology's Program: Working Out Durkheim's Aphorism* (pp. 1–64). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Rawls, Anne W. (2006). Respecifying the Study of Social Order – Garfinkel's Transition from Theoretical Conceptualization to Practices in Details. In Harold Garfinkel (Ed.), *Seeing Sociologically* (pp. 1–97). Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Redman-MacLaren, Michelle, & Mills, Jane (2015). Transformational Grounded Theory: Theory, Voice, and Action. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods,* 14(3), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1177/160940691501400301.

Reynolds, Larry T., & Herman-Kinney, Nancy J. (Eds.) (2003). *Handbook of Symbolic Interactionism*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Reynolds, Larry T., Herman-Kinney, Nancy J., Knottnerus, John David, Meltzer, Bernard N., Musolf, Gil Richard, & Prendergast, Christopher (1993). *Interactionism: Exposition and Critique* (3rd ed.). Dix Hills, NY: AltaMira Press.

Richardson, Laurel (2016). *Seven Minutes from Home: An American Daughter's Story*. Sense Publishers.

Rodner, Victoria, Roulet, Thomas J., Kerrigan, Finola, & Lehn, Dirk vom (2019). Making Space for Art: A Spatial Perspective of Disruptive and Defensive Institutional Work in Venezuela's Art World. *Academy of Management Journal,* 63(4), 19054–1081. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2016.1030.

Rose, Arnold M. (Ed.) (1971/1962). *Human Behavior and Social Processes: An Interactionist Approach*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Books.

Ruiz-Junco, Natalia (2017). Advancing the Sociology of Empathy: A Proposal: Advancing the Sociology of Empathy. *Symbolic Interaction,* 40(3), 414–435. https://doi.org/10.1002/symb.306.

Ruiz-Junco, Natalia, & Brossard, Baptiste (Eds.) (2020). *Updating Charles H. Cooley*. London and New York: Routledge.

Scheff, Thomas J. (1999). *Being Mentally Ill: A Sociological Study* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Schneider, Christopher J. (2016). *Policing and Social Media: Social Control in an Era of New Media*. Boulder, CO: Lexington Books.

Schreiber, Rita, & Stern, Phyllis Noerager (2001). *Using Grounded Theory in Nursing*. First Edition. New York: Springer.

Strauss, Anselm C., & Corbin, Juliet M. (1997). *Grounded Theory in Practice*. London: SAGE Publishing.

Strauss, Anselm C., Schatzman, Leonard, Erlich, Danuta, Bucker, Rue, & Sabshin, Melvin (1963). The Hospital and its Negotiated Order. In Elliot Friedson (Ed.), *The Hospital in Modern Society*. New York: Free Press.

Stuart, Forrest (2018). *Down, Out, and Under Arrest: Policing and Everyday Life in Skid Row*. London and Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Stuart, Forrest (2020). *Ballad of the Bullet: Gangs, Drill Music, and the Power of Online Infamy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Szymanski, Margret, & Whalen, Jack (2010). *Making Work Visible: Ethnographically Grounded Case Studies of Work Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

To, Sandy (2013). Understanding *Sheng Nu* ("Leftover Women"): The Phenomenon of Late Marriage among Chinese Professional Women. *Symbolic Interaction,* 36, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1002/symb.46

Turner, Jonathan H., & Stets, Jan E. (2010). *The Sociology of Emotions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vannini, Phillip (2008). The Geography of Disciplinary Amnesia: Eleven Scholars Reflect on the International State of Symbolic Interactionism'. In Norman K. Denzin, James Salvo, &

Myra Washington (Eds.), *Studies in Symbolic Interaction 32* (pp. 5–18). Bingley: Emerald. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0163-2396(08)32002-X.

Vannini, Phillip (2012). *Ferry Tales*. New York: Routledge.

vom Lehn, Dirk (2014). *Harold Garfinkel: The Creation and Development of Ethnomethodology*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Wiesche, Manuel, Jurisch, Marlen C., Yetton, Philip W., & Krcmar, Helmut (2017). Grounded Theory Methodology in Information Systems Research. *MIS Quarterly,* 41(3), 685–701. https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2017/41.3.02.

---

[1] Examples for such accounts of interactionism are *Human Behavior and Social Processes: An Interactionist Approach*, edited by Arnold Rose in 1962 and the collection *Symbolic Interactionism: Genesis, Varieties Critics*, edited by Bernard N. Meltzer, John W. Petras and Larry T. Reynolds in 1975.