social actions and interactions that occur in the shared world of communication and social action. Sixth, the timelines of actors intersect with the overarching timeline of society.

Another important social theorist concerned with the concept of the lifeworld is Jürgen Habermas (b. 1929). Although Habermas is focally concerned with free and open communication and communicative action more generally, he has also contributed greatly to the concept of the lifeworld. Habermas contrasts the lifeworld, seen as the world from the perspective of the subject acting within it, with the system, or the world from the perspective of an uninvolved observer. Although two different concepts, Habermas does contend that there is only one society, and that the system and the lifeworld are simply different ways of looking at that singular society.

The lifeworld is where speaker and hearer meet (Habermas is especially interested in communication) and where it is possible for them to reach agreement or understanding. There is a wide range of unspoken presuppositions and mutual understandings that must exist and be mutually understood for such communication to take place.

A major concern for Habermas is what he termed "the colonization of the life-world" (1987). This implies that the system and its (formally) rationalized imperatives are increasingly coming to dominate and do violence to the lifeworld. This "violence" against the lifeworld by the system is most clearly evident in the ways in which communication is restricted and increasingly less directed toward a goal of consensus. In turn, this violence also produces a series of "pathologies" and crises within the lifeworld that cause serious social problems.

The goal of the future, according to Habermas, should be a world in which the system and the lifeworld are able to enrich one another (are recoupled) and neither is dominated by the other. The two ways of looking at society need once again, as they were in primitive society, to become intertwined. The easiest way of achieving this goal is promoting more free and open communication and resisting the increasing rationalization forced upon the lifeworld by the system. This action has already been undertaken by many social movements that arose at the borders between the system and the lifeworld. Habermas also suggests implementing "restraining barriers" that restrict the effects of the system on the lifeworld and "sensors," which would enhance the effects of the lifeworld back on the system. Although he doubts the possibility of saving the lifeworld in the United States, Habermas does hope that Europe has the possibility of creating a world in which both lifeworld and system are able to coexist without doing violence to one another.

— Michael Ryan

***See also*** Habermas, Jürgen; Phenomenology; Schütz, Alfred

### FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

Habermas, Jürgen. 1987. *The Theory of Communicative Action.* Vol. 2, *Lifeworld and System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason.* Boston, MA: Beacon.

Schütz, Alfred. 1973. *Collected Papers.* Vol. 1, *The Problem of Social Reality.* The Hague, Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff.

## LINDENBERG, SIEGWART

Siegwart Michael Lindenberg was born in Munich in 1941 and educated in both Germany and the United States, receiving an MA in sociology from the Mannheim School of Economics in 1966 and a PhD in sociology from Harvard in 1971. His first faculty position was assistant professor of sociology at Princeton from 1969 to 1973. He then moved to Groningen University, where he is currently professor of sociology. While at Groningen University, he cofounded and codirected the Interuniversity Center for Social Science theory and Methodology (ICS), a major research graduate education center focusing on developing and extending formal social theory, and making that theory relevant to public policy issues.

The range of Lindenberg's work is broad, including macro-social analyses of revolts and social revolutions, the role of the state in structuring market economies, determinants of group solidarity, and female labor market participation. It also includes organizational-level analyses of cooperation and conflict in contractual relationships, governance of employment relationships, and contributions to the new institutional economics. Finally, it includes microsocial-level analyses of preferences and preference formation, selective attention, and short- versus long-term rationality. Despite the diversity of these topics, Lindenberg's body of work is based on a tightly integrated theoretic core, and thereby demonstrates the broad scope of this body of theory. The key ingredients of this core are a theory of bounded rationality (Lindenberg 2001a) and a theory of interdependencies and groups (Lindenberg 1997). There is only room to present the former in limited detail.

His analyses depart from the core assumption of behavior as goal-oriented activity, an orientation that places him within the theoretic domain of rational choice. He fleshes out this conception in ways that represent a stark departure from the rational maximizing models of neoclassical economics. A consistent theme running through all of Lindenberg's work is the challenge of reconciling rigor with realism. That is, how to construct models simple enough to remain analytically tractable while not being so unrealistic as to be trivial. To provide guidance in striking an appropriate balance, he introduced what he terms the "method of decreasing abstraction" (Lindenberg 1992a), a

theory construction principle that underlies much of his work. This principle is based on two insights. First, it is incorrect to merely dismiss the economist's conception of rationality as incorrect, because there are identifiable contexts within which it fits quite well, including some of the traditional explanatory domains of economics and even some areas of traditional concern to sociologists. Instead, analyses should identify the contexts in which these simpler, unbounded, conceptions of rationality are appropriate (e.g., generally conditions where information is abundantly available and motives are instrumental) versus contexts in which they break down and more complex bounded concepts of rationality are needed. Second, he emphasizes the need to do more than merely contrast the (generally) unrealistic instrumentally oriented economic view of social actors with an equally (generally but not always) unrealistic stereotype of social actors as oversocialized creatures who absorb their beliefs and preferences from those around them. Instead, he proposes a sequential form of analysis in which simple rational maximizing approaches are the models of first resort. They are given this position of priority because of their superior tractability. If they fail to provide an adequate explanation, as can generally be expected to be the case, the analyst does not then switch to an oversocialized view of actors, but instead draws from a hierarchically arranged menu of options for making the model both more complex and more realistic. In essence, this menu involves fleshing out the vague conception of bounded rationality propounded by Herbert Simon, based on specific mechanisms by which rationality departs from simple optimizing. It is in identifying these mechanisms that Lindenberg made his contributions to microsocial analysis, and it is in applying these principles to larger-scale phenomena that he has made important contributions to organizational and macrosocial analysis. Having these fleshed-out conceptions of bounded rationality also allows one to judge how bounded even the simplest model must be in any particular analysis (using what he calls "the principle of sufficient complexity"; see Lindenberg 2001a).

One mechanism identified by Lindenberg as underlying bounded rationality is selective attention, for which he proposed a theory of "framing" (2001a). Though the theory defies brief exposition, the essential idea is that the multiple goals that could potentially govern behavior compete for control. For example, goals such as earning money, enjoying leisure, helping friends, and fulfilling religious ideals may offer conflicting guides to action. The goal that wins this contest moves to the foreground and thereby determines the frame-governing action, including determining what aspects of the situation are relevant (i.e., selective attention) and what pieces of knowledge become mobilized. As a result, the orientation of action is self-seeking or altruistic, cooperative or competitive. However, the subordinate goals do not wholly lose influence, for depending on their weight relative to the dominant goal, the subordinate goals influence the selection of alternatives, thereby skewing choices in a predictable way from exclusive pursuit of the dominant goal to the direction of the subordinate goals.

This theory of framing has been tested in a variety of contexts, and also provides the basis for analyzing other aspects of bounded rationality, including orientations toward short- or long-term rationality, which is treated as determined by whether the contest to control framing is won by long- or short-term-oriented goals. Of particular interest are three "master frames," that is, abstract dominant goals. The strongest such frame is the *hedonic* frame (with the goal "to feel good/better"), followed in strength by the *gain* frame (with the goal "to improve one's scarce resources"). The a priori weakest frame is the *normative* frame (with the goal "to act appropriately"). A stronger frame will displace an a priori weaker frame unless the latter is supported by social, structural, or institutional flanking arrangement. This allows a new look at institutional analysis (see Lindenberg 1992b). This theory of framing also provided the basis for a more nuanced theory of intrinsic motivation than that which has dominated the social psychological literature (Lindenberg 2001b).

A second basic mechanism upon which Lindenberg focuses is preference formation and change (the so-called theory of social production functions, SPF; see Lindenberg 2001a). Like many of Lindenberg's theories, this takes the form of a hierarchy, in which each level represents resources for higher level goals. The highest-level *substantive* goals are universal, including preferences for subjective, physical, and social well-being. These resemble Gary Becker's concept of general preferences, which are also seen as part of the human condition. Below the highest-level goals are levels of (socially determined) instrumental goals, the most important of which are multifunctional (for example, they serve both physical and social well-being, such as a good partner relationship). Individuals are assumed to seek "improvement" in goal realization rather than "maximization," which renders social reference points essential for goal pursuit. For this reason and because of the socially determined instrumental goals, most preferences are grounded socially rather than psychologically, changing with social conditions. In fact, his theory of bounded rationality can be seen as a theory of "social" rationality (as opposed to "natural" rationality). Though as presented in this manner, Lindenberg's approach to preference change may appear excessively abstract, its applicability to explain macrosocial phenomena is nicely illustrated by the explanation it and his theory of framing provide of revolts and social revolutions (Lindenberg 1989). The basis for revolution, he argues, is created by a state crisis—generally including a fiscal crisis—in which the social production functions are changed to the detriment of multiple groups,

eventually producing a shift of frame. Revolution then becomes, at first, not the product of collective action organized at the group level, but instead, parallel sets of individual collective actions, thereby explaining how revolutions can appear centrally coordinated in the absence of unified leadership or control. In this way, Lindenberg offers a theoretic account of macrolevel social change that is grounded in microlevel social action and cognitive processes, combining action and structure within the one theoretic account.

— Douglas Heckathorn

***See also*** Social Movement Theory; Social Rationality; State

### FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

Lindenberg, S. 1989. "Social Production Functions, Deficits, and Social Revolutions: pre-revolutionary France and Russia." *Rationality and Society* 1:51–77.

———. 1992a. "An Extended Theory of Institutions and Contractual Discipline." *Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics* 148:25–54.

———. 1992b. "The Method of Decreasing Abstraction." Pp. 3–20 in *Rational Choice Theory: Advocacy and Critique,* edited by J. S. Coleman and T. J. Feraro. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

———. 1997. "Grounding Groups in Theory: Functional, Cognitive, and Structural Interdependencies." *Advances in Group Processes* 14:281–331.

———. 1998. "Solidarity: Its Microfoundations and Macro-Dependence. A Framing Approach. Pp. 61–112 in *The Problem of Solidarity: Theories and Models,* edited by P. Doreian and T. J. Fararo. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Gordon & Breach.

———. 2000. "It Takes Both Trust and Lack of Mistrust: The Workings of Cooperation and Relational Signaling in Contractual Relationships." *Journal of Management and Governance* 4:11–33.

———. 2001a. "Social Rationality Versus Rational Egoism." Pp. 635–68 in *Handbook of Sociological Theory,* edited by J. Turner. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.

———. 2001b. "Intrinsic Motivation in a New Light." *Kyklos* 54:317–42.

———. 2003. "The Cognitive Side of Governance." *Research in the Sociology of Organizations.* 20:47–76.

## LOGOCENTRISM

The term *logocentrism* is derived from the Greek word *logos,* which means word, speech, or reason. The term most commonly refers to philosophy's relentless search to find true meaning within the realm of theory and ideas. Concomitant with this search is a disdain for the material world of practice. Synonymous with logocentrism is phonocentrism (the favoring of speech over writing) and the metaphysics of presence (the belief in a reliable, apparent relationship between signifier and signified). The French thinker Jacques Derrida (b. 1930) (along with his deconstructionist followers) developed the concept of logocentrism in an effort to critique, relativize, and contextualize Western philosophy.

One of the main features of the structuralist approach to society and philosophy, as advocated by thinkers such as Claude Lévi-Strauss (b. 1908) and Ferdinand de Saussure (1857–1913), is the discovery of binary oppositions that organize life and how we understand it. Examples of this are reason/superstition, order/chaos, male/female, and so forth. In each one of these binaries, one term is dominant over the other, adding a hierarchical dimension to the structuralist approach. This privileging of one term over the other is another way in which logocentrism is understood.

Logocentrism is not only the privileging of one idea or social category over another but also the favoring of one word over another word, which may imply the favoring of one kind of reasoning or argumentation over another. The structuralists, along with the rest of philosophy and science since Plato, have distanced their writings from literature by claiming to place an authoritative meaning behind the language they use. Reading science or philosophy then becomes theological in the sense that we are constantly in search of what the author "really meant." Given the ambiguities that exist when a reader independently interprets a text, philosophy has always favored speech over the written word, viewing the latter as an unfortunate necessity. In a lecture, for example, one can seemingly explain, field questions, and clarify with ease. Philosophy has always operated in the binary hierarchy of speech over writing but has never realized that both are equally subject to the whims and limitations of language. Meaning can never be truly and reliably expressed if one plays with language (whether spoken or written) enough. This deconstructs yet another binary that has always been assumed as true, namely, meaning over language. Inextricably linked with logocentrism, Derrida calls this disdain for the written word and favoring of the speech act phonocentrism.

Logocentrism implies that the binary oppositions that organize our lives are reliable and descriptive of how things really are. For example, consider the West/East dichotomy. The West has often been associated with progress, science, reason, and culture, while the East is often characterized as backward, mystical, superstitious, and natural. This method of understanding the world has been called the metaphysics of presence. In other words, some form of putatively pure presence (e.g., speech or the male genitalia) is assumed to be superior to its purported binary opposite (e.g., writing or the female sex organs). According to deconstructionists, this metaphysics has always been the basis of philosophical