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PERFORMANCE

Performance, as understood in the context of the social sciences, is a process by which individuals (actors) display for others (the audience) the meaning of their social situation. During the last decades, the term *performance*, which originates from the theatrical context, has become extremely prevalent in various fields and disciplines such as art, literature, and the social sciences. In the United States it has even developed into a specific field of scholarly work, with departments specializing in performance studies. However, performance remains a highly contested concept, one that raises disagreements and divides among scholars.

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

The idea that all social behavior is at least partially a performance is hardly new. It has been with us since the time of the ancient Greeks and the Greek theater, reemerging as a central motif during the Renaissance and the Baroque periods. One of the most famous speeches in William Shakespeare’s play *As You Like It* reflects this understanding, opening with the words:

All the world’s a stage,
And all the men and women merely players;
They have their exits and their entrances,
And one man in his time plays many parts.

This insightful metaphor was developed into an academic subject of study during the second half of the twentieth century, mainly by the fields of anthropology and sociology. The subject of “cultural performance” (a term coined in 1959 by Milton Singer) became a matter of increased interest among anthropologists during the 1960s. Victor Turner stands out as the anthropologist who probably made the most important contribution to the convergence of culture and theater, with his concept of *social drama*. This concept, based on the early-twentieth-century work of anthropologist Arnold Van Gennep, expanded the use of drama as a metaphor for nontheatrical cultural manifestations. Working closely with Turner, Richard Schechter, who came from a theatrical background, called for an infusion of theater theory with the work of the social sciences and suggested that traditional drama tends to echo the stages of social drama. Other prominent anthropological contributions to the field were made by Clifford Geertz, who suggested a distinction between “deep play” and “shallow play” in performance; and by Dwight Conquergood, who represents a shift from the anthropological preoccupation with the performer and the performativc act to a greater consideration of the audience, the reporter, and the social and political implications of the performance.

ERVIN GOFFMAN AND DRAMATURGY

Sociological interest in the application of theatrical concepts to social life emerged in the second half of the twentieth century. While not the first to write on the theatrical aspects of everyday life (Nikolas Evreinoff, for example, published in 1927 a book named *The Theatre in Life*, and Kenneth Burke has also importantly written on the subject), it is the work of sociologist Erving Goffman that has really paved the way for the study of social performance. In his seminal and still highly influential book *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (written in 1956 and reprinted in 1959), Goffman expands many of the ideas discussed by his predecessors. He organizes these ideas into a coherent and well-written dramaturgical analysis of social life in its entirety as a theatrical performance. In this view, we are all actors, playing a role on changing stages in front of various others, who themselves serve simultaneously as our audience and as actors who play a role, to which we are audience. Goffman takes the metaphor of the theater even further. He claims that, as in the theater, social life is guided by scripts and is divided into “front-
stage,” where one performs in the presence of others, and “back-stage,” where the individual practices his act.

This presentation of things begs a subsequent question: Why are we all acting instead of just “being ourselves”? To this Goffman offers a clear answer: It is in our interest to perform in a way that guarantees that others will assess us favorably. In other words, we are constantly working on what Goffman calls impression management, in which we seek to influence the collective definition of the situation by convincing others to accept a positive impression of ourselves. Furthermore, according to Goffman, the self (or rather selves) is shaped and constructed through interactions with others and the various roles one plays in these interactions.

While the dramaturgical perspective seems to convey the idea that people are constantly seeking to deceive others, Goffman does not hold such a position. Rather, he believes that there is nothing inherently fake or inauthentic about the roles we play. In fact, in his view these roles are often part of who we really are. Moreover, the acting itself is not always conscious. People convey impressions both knowingly and unknowingly, and the fact they are always acting does not mean that they are always aware of their act (in fact, all too often they are not). Since there is a mutual dependency between actors and audiences, it is the goal of both sides to protect the performance and maintain its integrity, not to expose its failure.

In later writings (mainly in his 1974 book, Frame Analysis) Goffman expands his analysis, introducing the concept of frames—principles by which the social world is organized, which constrain and limit the possible range of performances and definitions of the situation. By this Goffman expresses the understanding that people cannot simply choose whatever performance they wish and fashion it according to their whim, but are rather constrained by the social context and their position in the social world.

**RECENT DEVELOPMENTS**

The writings of Turner and Goffman still offer the foundations of performance studies in the social sciences. But other scholars have suggested criticisms and extensions to their pioneering analyses. Most notably, Turner and Goffman were both criticized for focusing on the point of view of the actor and neglecting that of the audience (a challenge that was partially met by the work of Dwight Conquergood and of semiotic perspectives, most notably those of Umberto Eco). Goffman was also criticized for not expanding his theory enough to macrosociological domains and to the mass media. Scholarly work has since attempted to confront some of these challenges and expand the usage of performance ideas in the social sciences. (For example, Jeffery Alexander in a 2006 co-edited volume, *Social Performance*, offers an innovative cultural analysis of social performance.)

Turning to other disciplines, the contribution of Judith Butler emerges as an original break from former work of Goffman and other sociologists. In her well-known book *Gender Trouble* (1990) and in subsequent writings, Butler, who takes Goffman as her point of departure, uses the ideas of performance to explore the issues of gender and sexuality. Rejecting naturalistic notions of inherent sexual or gendered essences, Butler argues that the distinctions between homosexual and heterosexual and those between female and male are no more than social constructions. Since they are not based on a real essence, these distinctions are always at risk of disruption and subversion and must be maintained through recurring sexual and gender performances. In other words, rather than simply being a girl or a boy, people constantly act these parts and maintain the distinctions through repetitive performances. Unlike Goffman, Butler emphasizes the discursive parts of performance rather than the actions of individuals. For her there is no self or ontological body, which precede the performance. Thus, in her analysis she uses the term *performativity,* rather than performance.

The ideas of social performance were also stretched to the study of racial identities and constructions (Majors and Billson 1992), to the study of organizational and political behavior, and to other fields. Many of these accounts reveal an important aspect of social performance—through performance, previously silenced individuals and groups may receive a voice and become visible. As the study of performance continues to evolve, such issues will surely remain at the heart of the debate.
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PERIOD EFFECTS

Researchers who investigate human development or social trends face the difficulty of disentangling various effects that lead to change. In such analyses, scientists note that change may occur for three reasons. The first type of change involves social and environmental forces related to the passage of time. These changes are termed secular effects; in this context, secular simply refers to the passage of time and does not imply a contrast with religion or a lack of religion. The second type of change is due to age effects, reflecting physiological changes in individuals. The final type of change relates to cohort effects, the macro conditions that birth cohorts experience over the life span. Because of the close interconnection between age, period, and cohort effects, researchers have noted the importance of teasing apart the relative contributions of these effects. Each effect can contribute independently to change, and there may be interactions among the effects that are not predictable from age, period, and cohort effects individually.

Scientists have developed a number of approaches to identifying the varying causes of change. In some research, investigators may ignore one effect (e.g., age), instead focusing only on the other two (e.g., cohort and period). The obvious drawback here is that one cannot always safely assume that the effect being ignored has not influenced the outcome measure. In other cases, the investigators may examine two of the three effects successively, one effect being temporarily ignored. In this approach, one can identify the relative contribution to an outcome measure by noting whether an effect’s absence in one of the models changes the adequacy of a prediction of the outcome.

One frequent topic associated with age, period, and cohort effects is the prevalence of suicide. An example of such research that reveals the importance of period effects, differentiated from age and cohort effects, compared suicide rates in Australia, the United States, and Canada. John Snowdon and G. E. Hunt (2002) identified an increase in suicide rates for successive cohorts in the United States and Canada in the mid- and late twentieth century. A change in Australian legislation limiting the availability of sedatives led to a different pattern. The historical change regarding therapeutic drugs, a period effect, is important in understanding suicide rates in the population. When such period effects were taken into account, estimates of suicide rates among certain cohorts were comparable in the three countries.

In much of the research, the cohort identified is the birth cohort. Some research creates different categories within the birth cohort. Studies of suicide are again instructive in this regard. In the United States blacks have traditionally been at relatively lower risk for suicide than some other groups in the United States (e.g., whites). Since the early 1980s, however, the rate of attempted and completed suicide has risen among blacks. Research has revealed a higher rate among younger black cohorts, as compared to older cohorts perhaps, as Sean Joe (2006) suggests, because of changing religiosity and greater acceptance of suicide.

With any complex social dynamic, however, period effects are not sufficient to characterize all aspects of a phenomenon. For example, in assessing alcohol consumption across the life span, researchers have documented that drinking decreases as people get older. Some of this effect is attributable simply to age. At the same time there is also evidence that cohort effects are important because of socialization factors. Finally, period effects emerge as important; relevant factors can include, as Mary Gilhooly (2005) notes, availability of alcohol, changes in drinking age, the extent of discretionary time in which to drink, and price.

Psychological and sociological studies have used age-period-cohort analysis, but other disciplines also consider these effects. For instance, research has revealed a cohort-period interaction in the voting patterns of citizens of countries formerly part of the Soviet Union. The data showed that, with the fall of communism, older voters tended to resist change, voting for candidates from the old regime. Younger voters, in contrast, embraced a more liberal approach in their voting. In this case, the period effect related to the introduction of a new economic system. Age as a factor was important, but only, as Sara Schatz (2002)