

*Theory, Culture & Society*, 6/1 (Febr. 1989): 95-123.

## **FLIGHT ATTENDANTS AND THE SOCIOLOGY OF EMOTIONS: HOCHSCHILD'S MANAGED HEART**

Cas Wouters

In recent years growing attention and appreciation has been paid to the sociology of emotions and emotion management. Following reprints of Erving Goffman's works, a growing number of books and articles on the subject have appeared<sup>1</sup>, and the American Sociological Association has formed a special section on the sociology of emotions. Because of its wide resonance, *The Managed Heart, Commercialization of Human Feeling*, by Arlie Russell Hochschild, (Hochschild 1983/85) might be taken to represent this kind of sociology. Hochschild's book appeared in 1983, and in the same year it received the *New York Times* Book of the Year Award. Later it received other awards, and it is now being translated into German. And indeed, the book reads very well, although from a comparative-historical perspective its contents is disappointing. Hochschild pretends to present a "new social theory of emotions", based on the works of Dewey, Gerth and Mills, Goffman, Darwin and Freud, but to me her description of flight attendants and of the demands on emotion management raised in their work is more interesting.

In this review article I will attempt to contribute to the sociology of emotions by comparing Hochschild's theoretical approach with that of Figurational or Process Sociology<sup>2</sup>, and by comparing the results of her study of flight attendants in the USA with the data I gathered in a small similar study in the Netherlands. In such a theoretical and empirical comparison the outlines of a sociology of emotions may become sharper.

### **1. THEORY**

#### *Hochschild's Book*

*The Managed Heart* offers cultural criticism in an American way. Hochschild refers to the works of Christopher Lasch, Richard Sennett, Phillip Slater, Lionel Trilling and Ralph Turner – among others – and elaborates upon them. A. de Swaan characterizes some of this cultural criticism as follows:

What is socially permitted only serves to exploit and control the people better – a continuation of Marx – and what is socially allowed can never be essential, a nod to Psycho-Analysis. (Swaan 1979)

In Hochschild's book this perspective takes the form of a combination of Goffman's dramaturgical perspective with an American branch of Marxism. It is capitalism and commercialization that threaten the "real self" and "a healthy sense of wholeness". Particularly the "commercialization of human feeling" forces people "to accept as normal the tension they feel between their 'real' and their 'on-stage' selves" (p.185). This tension is also at the roots of "The Search for Authenticity" – the title of the book's conclusive chapter.

Hochschild claims her book to be "a set of illustrated ideas of how society uses feeling" (p.17), but it soon becomes clear that to her society means capitalism. The two concepts are often used synonymous, both referring to commercial behaviour, behaviour with a profit motive:

Smiles, moods, feelings and relationships have become 'products', thus belonging more to an organization and less to the self. (p.198)

Of all the organizations that possibly manufacture these 'products', organizations like families, schools, churches and states, she limits herself to commercial ones. Of all the social constraints that might account for changes in the standards of behaviour and feeling, demanding more of emotion management, she only considers commercial constraints seriously.

In passing she once says that "the engineering of a managed heart is not unknown to socialism" (p.11), but for the rest Hochschild's picture of capitalism remains within the borderlines of the USA.

Briefly and in passing, Hochschild refers twice to the dangers of acting upon *unmanaged* feeling, for instance: "managing feeling is an art fundamental to civilized living, and I assume that in broad terms the cost is usually worth the fundamental benefit" (p.21). For the rest of her book she solidly frames a magnifying glass on the *costs* of emotion management and on how these costs are enlarged by a "commercialization of feeling", in the process of which feelings become "subject to the rules of mass production" (p.198).

In attempting to demonstrate these "human costs", Hochschild uses two conceptual distinctions, one between a 'true' or 'real' self and a 'false' self, the other between 'private'

and 'public'. Since these distinctions are fundamental to her argument, and are also widely used by others, I will discuss them first.

### *True and False Self*

Hochschild distinguishes two kinds of 'false selves', either what she calls a "healthy false self – the unclaimed (not-really-me) self that enables one to offer the discretion, the kindness and the generosity that Noble Savages tend to lack" – or an "unhealthy false self", either the narcissist, who "feeds insatiably on interactions" or the altruist, who is "overly concerned with the needs of others" (p.195). This formulation raises the question whether any 'real' self is possible at all and what it would mean. Hochschild's answer is that the difference between the false self and the true self lies not in "the actual content of feelings, but in whether we claim them as our own" (p.195). Thus, true selves are true in the eyes of the beholders.

However, these beholders are not highly respected when dealing with the question: "how can I feel really identified with my work role and with the company without being fused with them?" Referring to her interviews with flight attendants she answers:

In resolving this issue, some workers conclude that only one self (usually the nonwork self) is the 'real' self. Others, and they are in the majority, will decide that each self is meaningful and real in its own different way and time. (p.132/3)

Here we may conclude that Hochschild claims to know better than the majority of 'true self' claimers: they do *not* make the distinction between 'real' and 'false' self at all. For this majority, she continues, "the idea of a separation between the two selves is not only acceptable but welcome to them," thereby clearly referring to the distinction between private and public self. Here, where her empirical evidence invalidates her use of the distinction between 'true' and 'false' self, she simply changes to the private-public one. This is a telling example of her inclination to use the two distinctions interchangeably.

### *Private and Public Self*

The whole book is designed on the basis of this distinction: the first part deals with the private sector, the second with the public domain of work. In the first part, Hochschild combines a

dramaturgical perspective on private life with exchange theory: emotion management is “guided” by feeling rules and “applied” in “interpersonal exchanges” and “taken together, emotion work, feeling rules and interpersonal exchange make up our private emotional system” (p.76). A basic idea of her book is that private emotional systems of private individuals are taken to the public market. In private life, the “individual navigation of the emotional waters ... has the purpose of welfare and pleasure” (p.119). When this navigation takes place in the public domain, “a profit motive slips in” and it becomes “processed, standardized and subjected to hierarchical control” (p.153). So it seems that Hochschild has selected the private self to be the real ‘real’ self.

“In describing the private and public face of an *emotional system*, and showing how it works” (p.12) – the declared aim of this book – Hochschild uses the private-public distinction as a morally laden dichotomy. An ideal-image and a bugaboo are opposed to each other:

In private life we are free to question the going rate of exchange and free to negotiate a new one. If we are not satisfied we can leave; many friendships and marriages die of inequality. But in the public world of work, it is often part of an individual’s job to accept uneven exchanges, to be treated with disrespect or anger by a client... (p.85)

In reality this dichotomy is a continuum: in private life too one quite often has to accept disrespect or anger, and in the public world of work the going rate of exchange is often questioned and a new one negotiated. Most marriages and friendships do *not* die of inequality and more or less foster a *figuration ideal of harmonious inequality* (Stolk and Wouters 1983/85, Wouters 1986). In another context, Hochschild too describes most marriages as being unequal, for instance when she writes “unlike other subordinates, women seek primary ties with a supplier... in marriage” (p.196). Furthermore, in many cases one may feel more free to quit a job than to break up a friendship or a marriage. Probably most people live through a larger number of jobs than marriages. In another chapter Hochschild herself says that the freedom to negotiate in private life is limited, since family life “imposes emotional obligations of its own” (p.69). “In fact,” she says, “the deeper the bond, the more emotion work, and the more unconscious we are of it. In the most personal bonds, then, emotion work is likely to be the strongest” (p.68). In another context the importance of institutions like church, school and family for emotion management -not the state- is acknowledged in a note (p.13). Here she implicitly admits that in private life the management of emotions also happens according to

standardized social forms, thereby muddling the private-public distinction. But there is more. For instance when she speaks of a “private emotional system” the term private can only mean individual. This happens in many instances. There is even more confusion in formulations like: “This emotion system works privately, often free of observation. It is a vital aspect of deep private bonds and also affords a way of talking about them” (p.56). Here, all connotations of private as opposed to public, of individual as opposed to social, of alone as opposed to together and of a selective and reflexive inner process as opposed to an “outer context” (p.37) are entangled.

### *Construction of Argument 1: Dichotomies*

In order to maintain her austere distinction between private and public, Hochschild had to build some artificial constructions into her argument. In the first place, there is the suggestion of a pre-institutionalized private self, an area where individuals escape the pressures of institutionalized emotion management: “in private life ... the person is the *locus* of the acting process. ...when institutions are involved, ... various elements of acting are taken away from the individual ... the locus of acting, of emotion management, moves up to the level of the institution” (p.49). Here, as elsewhere, Hochschild clearly presents herself as defending the ‘free’ and ‘real’ and ‘private’ emotional life against attacks by big corporations in order to keep at least some of it “forever wild” (p.22). It is for this ‘cause’, that private life is stripped from the pressures of institutions.

Also the public world is simplified to fit this ‘cause’. In the first place it is reduced to capitalistic enterprises whose profit motive leads to “the exploitation of the bottom by the top” (p.12). Furthermore, Hochschild dichotomizes the interests of (airline) companies and workers, while neglecting those of clients or customers: “smiling is separated from its usual function, which is to express a personal feeling, and attached to another one - expressing a company feeling” (p.127) and, “They are not selling themselves, they are selling the company” (p.109). Dichotomous formulations like these deny that workers, customers and companies to some extent *do* have common interests and they depict flight attendants as perfect company robots.

### *Construction of Argument 2: "The True Professions"*

A similar construction is the limitation of emotional labour jobs to those that require "the monitoring of emotional labor by supervisors." Thus the labour of "the true professions" (p.156) -doctors, lawyers, social workers, salesmen, teachers, therapists, alongside people working for the media, marketing and public relations - is excluded, because these people "supervise their own emotional labor" (p.153). But, why not argue that, next to prostitutes – who also do not work with "an emotion supervisor immediately on hand" (p.153) and whose "emotional style of offering the service is part of the service itself" (p.5) – *all* these people *pre-eminently* perform emotional labour jobs? People who supervise their own emotional labour obviously have jobs which put stronger demands on their emotion management. This exclusion is especially hard to understand since Hochschild starts out by clearly considering and discussing *all* emotional labour jobs (p.11). Only near the end of the book does one discover that she theoretically disregards most of them.

People who supervise their own emotional labour are generally considered to be well off. Their income and reputation might decrease the impressiveness of the 'exploitation' and the 'costs' of emotional labour, and perhaps that is why they are excluded. This interpretation is strengthened by Hochschild's justification of selecting "exaggerated cases" as representations of the public world of work: "it gives sharper point to the general case about emotion work in public life. The reason for exaggerating the case is to show just how far the demands for emotional labor can go" (p.13/4).

### *Construction of Argument 3: Transmutation*

Hochschild's whole theory is built to serve her 'cause': it is because the public world exploits the private that there is a need for "a theory that allows us to see how institutions control us through not only surveillance of our behavior but also of our feelings: a social theory of emotion" (p.218).

In building this theory, after having separated the private and the public world into artificial extremes, she was obliged to construct a conceptual tool that could function as a bridge. No wonder the tool she presents is artificial too, and this may explain why she refers to it as a "grand word" or, "the grand phrase 'transmutation of an emotional system'" (p.19). This

‘transmutation’ takes place when the ‘private emotional system’ comes to “fall under the sway of large organizations, social engineering, and the profit motive” (p.19).

One of the places where the artificiality of the concept of transmutation becomes apparent, is her exposition - in a chapter on differences in emotion management according to gender, social class and child rearing practices - of the family as a “training ground for the transmutation” (p.156). Drawing upon the work of Melvin Kohn, who found that middle class parents are “more likely to sanction what they later infer to be a child’s feeling and intent whereas working class parents are more likely to sanction behavior itself” (p.158), she concludes that middle class children “learn that it is important to know how to manage feeling” and how to “make feelings into instruments we can use” (p.158/9). This they learn in the family, in private, mostly from their fathers<sup>3</sup>: “big emotion workers tend to raise little ones” (p.156). Here the private-public direction of the transmutation momentum is contradicted: it goes the other way around. Kohn demonstrated “that fathers whose own jobs entail self-direction value self-direction in their children whereas fathers whose work requires conformity and close supervision value obedience” (p.258). In other words, middle class children have a greater opportunity to become themselves the supervisors of their emotion management, whereas working class children, also later in life, will stay more dependent upon “an emotion supervisor immediately on hand” (p.153).

In this description a social inheritance of self-regulation between generations along the lines of social class is implicit. This view is not compatible with that of a ‘real self’ hidden somewhere in private life or self. Hochschild seems to conceal this contradiction by writing: “How feelings are dealt with in families may be determined not so much by social class as by the overall design of emotional labor...” (p.159). What exactly she means by this *overall design* remains in the dark; she says no more. What she does say however, is: “If jobs that call for emotional labor grow and expand ... the emotional system itself -emotion work, feeling rules and social exchange, as they come into play in a ‘personal control system’ - will grow in importance as a way through which people are persuaded and controlled both on the job and off” (p.160). This she casually calls a *general social track*.

Here, for a moment, Hochschild came close to a developmental perspective, to a perception of structured changes in patterns of drive and affect control in society at large. But, a dynamic approach to emotion systems changing collectively in a “general social track” would

endanger her own theoretical framework. Only once she almost secretly and certainly without any theoretical elaboration seems to account for a reverse gear, a 'recycling':

The transmutation of emotional life ... already fans out across the whole class system. Commercial conventions of feeling are being recycled back into individual private lives; emotional life now appears under new management. (160)

Here Hochschild has decidedly chosen the private egg as predecessor of the public hen.

In discussing feeling rules she also seems to perceive social changes and pressures that go beyond the transmutation from private to public. Feeling rules, she writes, are "socially variable and historically changing" (p.250), and "it is mainly the authorities who are the keepers of feeling rules" (p.75). Authorities range from fathers and mothers to "the very top of the upper class," people of whom Hochschild observes: "their notions of what is funny, what to beware of, how grateful to feel, and how hostile one should be to outsiders will become an official culture..." (p.155). In this process these notions may become part of the dominant code of behaviour and feeling, of etiquette and 'deep etiquette', or, as Hochschild once calls them: "society's guidelines, the promptings of an unseen director" (p.85). Hochschild does not elaborate upon this process, or upon its implications for her theory. The egg-hen sequence from private to public is simply presupposed, and contradictions in this relationship are left for the reader to solve.

### *Theory of Emotions*

In an Appendix to the book, called "Models of Emotion: From Darwin to Goffman," indicating how much she owes to the latter, Hochschild formulates her theory of emotions. She starts out to present a review of research and theories on emotions, on which she builds her "new social theory of emotions." In this building process she borrows from here, adds elements from there and rather abruptly sums it all up, declaring to be "joining three theoretical currents" (p.222). What exactly is summed up and how it is done, remains implicit. Also the relation between this appendix-theory and her theoretical concept of a 'private emotional system' -used to structure the book- is not made explicit. The reader has to find out for himself or take a guess.

A more fundamental problem in Hochschild's theorizing stems from the fact that she hardly considers learned, internalized controls of emotions. Both in her theory and in the

theoretical concept, emotions are not, or not clearly related to a person's learned self-regulation. Her theory simply does not allow for different balances of emotional impulses and counter-impulses. On the whole she tends to locate emotional controls *outside* the individual. In most of her formulations she creates an image of a free and independent individual with a natural self-regulation of his own, only helped by some outside guidance. She thereby suggests that, if societies and institutions could only be stopped doing this, the natural self-regulation of individuals would become liberated. But, compared to other animals, human beings are born with very little natural self-regulation. Their natural or unlearned forms of steering conduct are - or better, have become - subordinated to learned forms, developed in earlier generations. They *do* have a natural disposition to learn to regulate themselves, but in order to become fully functioning human beings, they have to learn to regulate themselves according to the *social habitus*<sup>4</sup>, i.e. the learned social standards of controlling one's drives and emotions. On every level, this learned self-regulation takes the form of a tension balance between emotional impulses and emotion controlling counter-impulses. In Hochschild's theoretical approach these counter-impulses appear as feeling rules that 'guide'; there is no balance, the learned social standards are reduced to "the company's Standard Practices Division" and to "social factors [that - from outside (C.W.)] influence what we expect and thus what feelings 'signal'." (222) Her "three-part account of emotion" (p.223) and her "private emotion system" are rather heavily built upon an image of human beings that Norbert Elias has called 'homo clausus': "a human self-image according to which the true self of a person is hidden deep inside - one cannot be quite sure inside of what" (Elias 1987a: 356).

### *Is There a General Social Track?*

Hochschild uses a short-term perspective that in some respects is misleading. In a long-term perspective, the private-public distinction on which the book is based, is a very recent one. Even today there are many societies in earlier stages of development, where it has little or no meaning for its people. For instance the social importance given to privacy - the wish to be alone for a while - is only a few decades old and is almost completely limited to complex, industrial societies (cf. *From Social Distance to Privacy* in Wouters 1987:419-22). Reading Hochschild's book, one would believe they are ubiquitous.

In other respects Hochschild writes as if she deals with recent novelties, while in fact she is concerned with developments that have been on-going for millennia. For instance when she writes “it is not simply individuals who manage their feelings in order to do a job; whole organizations have entered the game” (p.185), she suggests that only recently have organizations taken over from individuals. Formulations such as these obviously neglect the general social track in which such organizations have been expanding for centuries. The organizations of tribal chiefs, kings, warriors and priests, of statesmen, diplomats, mayors and other magistrates were all deeply involved in ‘the game’ of controlling emotion management. Even during the ages in which people learned to control fire there must have been some form of social organization and social control. The fire could only be kept burning and yet cause no damage, through social organization, and thus through the social control and self-control that getting organized and controlling the fear of fire required (cf. Goudsblom 1987). The same goes for the Agrarian and Industrial Revolutions. The people in charge of the organizations involved in these long-term processes met all the requirements that Hochschild sets for ‘emotional labor jobs’: the social planning and organizing (1) required lots of face to face contacts, (2) wherein emotional states in other persons were to be produced and (3) a degree of social control over emotional activities of all concerned was needed. In the ‘general social track’ of differentiation and integration of social functions and expanding inter-dependency networks, more and more people came to have emotional labor jobs, also people in non-leading positions - like flight attendants.

Developments in standards of behaviour and feeling do not stop at the borders of either public or private life; to live up to them signifies overall demands on emotion economy, an overall pattern of self-regulation, sort of an “overall design of emotion management.” Hochschild only deals with the process of commercialization in this century. In the more remote past she apparently visualizes a more ideal society: “what was once a private act of emotion management is now sold as labor” and “what was once a privately negotiated rule of feeling or display is now set by the company’s Standard Practices Division” (p.186). But, such an ideal society never existed. Emotion management was never only a private act, nor were rules of feeling ever only privately negotiated.

### *The Civilizing of Emotions and Informalization*

Hochschild's outlook can be confronted with one that is almost diametrically opposed to it, a view in which the rules of feeling and display have changed rather in the opposite direction. There is enough empirical data to show that during approximately the last hundred years the models of emotional exchange have become more varied, more escapable and more open for idiosyncratic nuances, thus less rigid and coercive (Wouters 1977,1986,1987; Swaan 1979/81). These changes are generally referred to as the "permissive society", sometimes as the "Expressive Revolution"<sup>5</sup> and they are also conceptualized as *informalization*. This informalization contrasts sharply with Hochschild's conclusion that "emotional exchanges that were once idiosyncratic and escapable are now standardized and unavoidable" (p.186). Insofar as she means that social constraints toward self-constraints and demands on emotion management have increased and intensified: indeed they have. But, this was exactly the basis for the considerable increase of behavioural and emotional alternatives in this century. Before that time the dominant standards of behaviour and feeling moved toward a decrease in alternatives, toward stricter demands on emotion management. A remark by Caxton in his "Book of Curtesye", "Thingis somtyme allowed is now repleuid" (quoted in Elias 1978: 82) symbolizes this formalization. From the end of last century on, the opposite "things formerly repleuid are now allowed" expresses the direction of the civilizing process: the dominant modes of social conduct, symbolizing institutionalized power relationships, came to be more and more ignored and attacked, leading to growing negotiability and leniency in the ways people oppose and cooperate with each other. In this respect this long-term informalization can be interpreted as a reversal of a long-term trend, while it is a continuation as far as demands on affect economy and management of drives and emotions are concerned. Only stronger, more even and all-round self-restraints allow for greater sensitivity and flexibility in social conduct.

Although Hochschild magnifies the first and belittles the latter, yet she makes insightful remarks about the way in which individuals learn to regulate themselves. While learning to manage emotions "we contribute to the creation of it," she writes. "If this is so," she continues, "what we think of as intrinsic to feeling or emotion may have always been shaped to social form and put to civic use" (p.18). There are many moments of "emotive dissonance" (p.90). Indeed, "The task of managing an estrangement between self and feeling and between self and display" (p.131) has to be performed. If the required behaviour is refused or when it is too

obviously not done ‘in the right spirit’, straightforward punishment or other forms of sanctioning may be expected. Therefore, Hochschild’s observation “when display is required ... it is usually feeling that has to change” (p.90) seems to be generally valid. ‘Usually’, that is, when the dominant codes require to overcome the tension between feeling and display “the essential problem is how to adjust one’s self to the role in a way that allows some flow of self into the role but minimizes the stress the role puts on the self” (p.188). Indeed, one may find a balance “either by changing what we feel or by changing what we feign” (p.90) and the risks are “losing the signal function of feeling” or “losing the signal function of display” (p.21). The tension seems to balance between managing the heart or being managed by it, between detachment and involvement. The tensile force of this tension balance coincides with the ways in which people allow themselves to give in to their impulses and the needs of self-interests, while at the same time giving in to the need and the coercion to take others into account. Norbert Elias conceptualized this as a *We–I Balance*<sup>6</sup>. In Hochschild’s account, this tension only seems to create individual problems that will spread together with commercialization. The limitedness of this stand is demonstrated already by the majority of interviewed flight attendants who reduced or resolved the tension between a ‘real’ and ‘acted self’ by deciding “that each self is meaningful and real in its own different way and time” (p.133). Moreover, my study of the emotion management of flight attendants may serve as an example of the fact that in recent decades more and more people have acquired greater skills in narrowing or closing the gap between feeling and display – an aspect of the process of informalization. In expanding and differentiating interdependency networks people have pressured each other to a stronger tensile force of their *We–I Balance*. A small excursion on this point may enhance the understanding of the changes in the working conditions in the microcosms of airplanes.

### *Avoidance Behaviour and Social Mixing*

Behavioural codes expressing social distance and distinction changed when established groups had to accommodate. Where once representatives of these classes either avoided each other or related to each other in relative strict and hierarchical ways, all were gradually forced to take more of each other more into account. At the end of last century avoidance behaviour was still very marked, and openly advocated: ‘The Englishman STERNE very aptly commented: bad

and uncivilized company is like a muddy dog that makes you dirtier and dirtier the more affectionate it gets' (Handboek: p.86). Social mixing contained the "danger of contamination" – an expression of status anxiety. Anyone who did not attend to this code of avoiding and consorted with inferiors was eventually cast out. Downward transgressions were felt as 'betrayals'.

Around the turn of the century, as social classes came to be more dependent upon each other and social dividing lines lost rigour, the established forms of avoidance behaviour became problematic, and the problems created by this unavoidable social mixing were dealt with in etiquette books – the advisories for people trying to live up to the dominant codes:

In public conveyances, one is not always confronted with the finest company. Sometimes farmhands, fishwives or other such people sit down next to you. Cringing in your seat with a gesture of alarm, or looking down at them with an expression of contempt, such behaviour does not testify to your upbringing in the least. You yourself could have been born into that class, and although one naturally does not associate *en frère et compagnon* with people like that, they are human beings just as we are, and as such they are deserving our respect. (Stratenus: p.139)

The strength of the feeling of superiority as well as the humiliating aspect of avoidance behaviour, are expressed in the emphatic statement that certain groups are human beings too; up until then, there obviously had been certain doubts. The statement was heard in the liberation struggle of all kinds of outsider groups throughout the century.

Next to the "danger of contamination", social mixing was also considered dangerous because it could threaten one's self-control and offend one's sensibilities:

...if one belongs to the more sensitive and the more refined in one's subtle aesthetic feelings, one must refrain from many things which a person of coarser sensibilities can indulge in without objection. (van Zutphen van Dedem: p.160)

If one could not avoid persons "of coarser sensibilities" and "low forces tried to pull one down", the 'gentleman' had to "strictly uphold his self-control" and "defend himself by 'freezing'." Self-control and sensibility were seen as closely connected, and as virtues worth protecting. The rather strict and hierarchical codes had this function.

When more and more people in positions of higher rank and power were forced by the rise

of lower social strata to maintain some kind of friendly relation with their inferiors, open displays of aggrandizement or contempt in avoidance behaviour became unacceptable. Avoiding as well as direct commanding diminished. In order to be able to deal and negotiate successfully with each other, the established had to conquer their 'fear of falling' and the outsiders their 'fear of rising'. All concerned had to come out more into the open, face the dangers and control their fears of them. Willingly or not, involved as they were in this process, all tried to improve their ability to behave in less rigid and hierarchical ways – and more direct, playful and ingenious ways of living with (and relating to) each other developed. In informalization processes, avoidance behaviour, this old way of keeping one's distance, gradually came to be experienced as 'forced' and 'constrained'. As people had to exert more individual control over their fears of crossing the old social dividing lines, many of these fears ceased to exist. Others were recognized as part of a collective emotional make-up.

The new types of social mixing demanded a stronger identification with each other, and a higher level of Mutual Expected Self-restraints. A similar process took place when the segregation between the sexes diminished. Already at the beginning of this century traces in this direction can be observed:

The greater confidence one has put in unsupervised contacts and relationships between unmarried men and women also makes these relationships more confidential, and at the same time less dangerous. (M.: p.180)

Here too, a decrease in the dangers and fears of confrontations with people on the other sides of social dividing lines went hand in hand with attaining higher levels of mutual identification and Mutual Expected Self-restraints. These connections are probably valid not only for developments in the relationships between the sexes and social classes, but also for those between generations and states.

### *Knowledge and Self-regulation as Ranking Criteria*

In the above mentioned social and emotional movements more and more people were forced to make 'discoveries' about their changing social world and also about their changing selves: a rising degree of *awareness* of emotion management came to be demanded. In Hochschild's words: "people are made increasingly aware of incentives to *use* feeling" (p.198). With the

help of this greater awareness also their *ability* to use emotions and emotion regulations as instruments for orienting and manifesting themselves has increased. For instance the rising appreciation of a higher levelled balance of directness *and* tactfulness has made emotion management more important.<sup>7</sup> This means that in processes of democratization and informalization, the criteria used for ranking, for defining the situation, the relation and the course of interaction were also in flux. Proximity to the established centres of violence(-control) and money-making, to the managerial and commercial centres, certainly still dominates the criteria for social ranking, but in the welfare states a relatively high level of physical safety and material security has enlarged and differentiated the spectrum of ranking criteria. Social clues like a person's framework of orientation, taste and style of emotion management have gained weight. At the same time the centres of orientation and knowledge also expanded and differentiated. Within shrinking religious domains and in expanding centres of social orientation, the competition for advanced means of orientation and knowledge intensified. There and elsewhere people pressured each other to experiments in developing more pronounced and recognizable styles of behaviour and emotion management, in between the boundaries of running wild and having to draw in one's horns.

In succeeding waves of democratization and informalization, forms of inherited superiority and positional authority were put to a test and opposed to individual achievement and personal authority, the latter was more and more defined by knowledge and self-regulation as these gained importance. Between the extremes of being too direct (or brusque) and too diplomatic (or shy) – corresponding to the risks of running amok and retiring into oneself – socially accepted and respected individual varieties and nuances increased.

### *Hochschild and Informalization*

As said before, in Hochschild's sociology of emotions these developments are not taken into account, but sometimes she makes excursions outside her theory and in them she uses some expressions that might be used to describe the process of informalization. Thus one could say that "straight exchanges", in which one simply behaves according to the rules, have come to be less appreciated, while "improvisational exchanges", in which the rules are presupposed and played with or called into question and changed, have gained importance. The latter she calls aptly "the jazz of human exchange" (p.79). Moreover, "sometimes improvisational exchanges themselves become crystallized into custom" (p.80). The social pressure toward social

experiments and informalization might be inferred from her diagnoses that “coping with the costs of emotional labor calls for great inventiveness” and stimulates attempts “to reclaim the managed heart” (p.197). According to Hochschild, the search for ‘the unmanaged heart’ and the increased appreciation for authenticity imply that “the point of interest has moved inward. What fascinates us now is how we fool ourselves” (p.192). Indeed, with the rising social importance of self-knowledge we have become more *inner*-directed, to use Riesman’s concept, but this is only one side of the coin. We also have become more *other*-directed; self-knowledge and social knowledge rose in importance. The tension between other- and inner-directedness has intensified and moved to a higher level, a higher level We–I Balance.

### *Civilizing Processes and Spontaneity*

In education too, this development can be observed: behavioural and emotional alternatives for children have increased. Parents came to treat their children’s drives and emotions with greater care. Commanding children and presenting them with a *fait accompli* came to be seen as dangerous: to “break their spirit”, once a pedagogical advice, has become a bugaboo. Parents have come to be more and more prepared to channel the emotions of their children into moulds that are expected to lead to an optimum of spontaneous behaviour, that is a spontaneity that does not harm the children nor anyone else.

Hochschild writes that today spontaneity is “raised as a virtue” (p.22), but it is only non-violent and not too hostile spontaneity that is raised as such. Her exclamation “the more the heart is managed, the more we value the unmanaged heart”(p.192) is also one-sided. An “unmanaged heart” would be deadly dangerous and not really viable. At the very most one may attribute it to new-born babies, but for the rest they never existed in any society. It may be projected onto Noble Savages, Children and in some vague, idealized Past, as Hochschild tends to do, but then one writes a kind of ‘praise-sociology’ (in her case combined with a ‘blame-sociology’ as far as commercialization is concerned) that only creates the frustration of an unattainable ideal: it remains locked in a paradise lost. However, one might find a ‘backdoor to paradise’ or regain some of its grace in a further development of knowledge, consciousness and self-regulation. In this spirit, Heinrich von Kleist wrote: “Paradise is sealed off and Cherub is behind us; we have to travel around the world, and see, whether somewhere round the back

it happens to be open again.” In the conclusion to this essay he comes back to this metaphor: “we should eat again from the Tree of Knowledge in order to slide back into the state of innocence.” This he calls “the last chapter of the history of the world” (Kleist: pp.88-92).<sup>8</sup>

Informalization presupposes an ‘emancipation of emotions’; the liberation and exchange of these emotions in informal contacts may bring some pleasurable tension and relaxation. Today the search for such excitement – a ‘quest for excitement’ – is no longer restricted to separate domains like sports and arts, but it has spread into all spheres of life to such an extent that one might say that life as a whole has become a sport or an art, the sport and the art of everyday life.

## **2. RESEARCH: Flight Attendants**

Hochschild’s concentration on the costs of emotional labour and her neglect for processes of informalization also distorted her empirical results, as may become clear in the now following comparison of her data on flight attendants with mine.<sup>9</sup> Her information about the demands on emotion management of people doing this job certainly is rich and lively, illuminated with nice anecdotes like the one in which a flight attendant successfully claims the “personal right to her facial expressions” (all my – Dutch – respondents knew the story):

A young businessman said to a flight attendant, ‘Why aren’t you smiling? She put her tray back on the food cart, looked him in the eye, and said, ‘I’ll tell you what. You smile first, then I’ll smile.’ The businessman smiled at her. ‘Good’, she replied. ‘Now freeze, and hold that for fifteen hours.’ Then she walked away. (p.127)

This lively way of writing cannot make up for the inadequacies in her theoretical framework, of which her lack of attention for changes and processes is mostly distorting her empirical study. Although the subtitle suggests a focus on changes, her report is predominantly static, a “still”. The results of her investigation into the kind and intensity of emotional investments needed to do the job to the satisfaction of the company and passengers are by implication compared to some past, but the comparison is far from systematic. Hochschild does speak of industry speed-ups in the early 1970s and 1980s and of a stronger union hand in limiting the company’s claim on emotion management, but according to her this only created a service worker ‘slow down’: worked-up warmth of feeling was replaced by put-on smiles (p.90) and

the 'slow down' amounted to a reduction in job satisfaction (p.93). By these speed-ups, according to Hochschild, the work of flight attendants became more specialized and standardized, the outcome of which is "deskilling. ...the field of choice about what to do is greatly narrowed" (p.120). On this basis she tries to make believe that since "the cruise ship has become a Greyhound bus" (p.129), the emotion management of flight attendants has become more "processed, standardized and subjected to hierarchical control" (p.153). Here she distorts the facts: this development went in the opposite direction. If she had restricted these remarks to the technical part, to the tasks and subtasks of the cabin crew, than they certainly would have been valid. But, the company's demands with regard to sex, age, beard, weight, jewellery, dress, make-up, shoes, hair, smile and behaviour to passengers have loosened. She mentions some of these changes herself (p.126/7). Although the industry speed-ups have shortened the time available for contacts with passengers, the range of possible emotion management and of behavioural alternatives has definitely increased.

One of the important changes in the airline business is that passengers in the fifties were still predominantly rich men in each other's 'good company', while an airplane now has become a melting pot, not only of nationalities but also of social classes. Behaviour in contacts between flight attendants and passengers correspondingly had to become less uniform or standardized and more varied and flexible: a similar process to when classes on the ground were socially mixing. Informalization did not stay on the ground, it was also taken up in the air. In the words of one of Hochschild's respondents: "What the passengers want is real people. They're tired of that empty pretty young face" (p.108). This respondent refers to the kind of artificial, phony behaviour that has come to be defined as such by more and more passengers, and also read aright sooner. The traditional reserved and subservient behaviour more and more became a shibboleth: it sufficed no longer in dealing with the motley crowd of passengers, who not only came to behave less uniformly, some of them even act rudely and aggressively – drunk or sober. Flight attendants had to learn to put up with that behaviour, if only because a plane has no communication cord to pull and jumping out of it would be more painful. There is no avoidance behaviour possible. The increased necessity of being able to command respect in all these various contacts brought about a decline in the old type of servility. Now in each contact there is a need to attune one's behaviour to the style of emotion management of the individual passenger, and while the range of styles has greatly expanded, the worker in each

case feels obliged to find a pleasant or agreeable balance between formal and informal behaviour, between social distance and intimacy. Variations abound. For instance, passengers from New Zealand are reported (by members of KLM cabin crews) to “have difficulties in understanding the swinging atmosphere of Europe” and a minister of state who was addressed “your Excellency” replied that he did not like such formalities. According to all eight Dutch respondents, the code of behaviour on the whole has become less hierarchical and less formal. “But,” as one added,

easier as this may seem, in fact it is more difficult: correct behaviour may create a distance that is understood as hostile, while a more personal approach may provoke them into trying to use you as the doormat.

In order to hold their own, flight attendants – probably even more than other workers (and non-workers) – had to learn flexible and subtle ways of attuning their behaviour to rapidly changing miscellaneous groups of people. And although both company and passengers require of them that they know when and how to yield, there is a limit to that:

They have to show some respect. If one of us is pawed between her legs and she replies by slapping the guy in the face when he does it again, we back her up. We let nobody walk over us.

When confronted with this example, another respondent said: “I’ve never heard of it and I would prefer to command respect in a different way, but yes, the message is clear.”

The disappearance of subservience is not limited to contact with passengers. Already in the 1960s, flight attendants were protesting against the habit of introducing themselves before the flight to the captain. Why should women do that? It should be the other way around, they argued. The result was that the captain came to them at the moment when the purser held his ‘briefing’ and then, by way of introducing himself, gave a little speech.

Industry speed-ups have also diminished the hierarchical distance between members of the cabin crew. Again and again new combinations of people have to form a team that has to cooperate smoothly. Because of the ever-changing composition of the crew, a purser easily gets more back-answers in the air than he or she would get on the ground. For this reason, a purser’s authority is difficult to maintain; also because, as one said, “switching from rendering services to rendering orders is terribly difficult.” Under these conditions cabin crews have developed

self-confident informal ways of relating to each other.

As the job and its training changed, the selection of flight attendants changed accordingly. Until the 1960s quite a few girls from rich families liked to become stewardess. Today, they come from the middle classes and the old type of rich man's daughter has become a very small minority. "They now select the spontaneous, unruffled and open types of persons," said one KLM official, and another one added: "an important selection criterion now is extravertness – they have to be able to react fast."

A development in the same direction is reported as occurring in all larger companies, with national variations and differences in tempo.

Toward the end of her book Hochschild summarizes "the human costs of emotional labor" and she does this by elaborating upon "three stances that workers seem to take toward work, each with its own sort of risk:

In the first, the worker identifies too wholeheartedly with the job, and therefore risks burnout. ... The human faculty of feeling still 'belongs' to the worker who suffers burnout, but the worker may grow accustomed to a dimming or numbing of inner signals. And when we lose access to feeling, we lose a central means of interpreting the world around us...

In the second, the worker clearly distinguishes herself from the job and is less likely to suffer burnout; but she may blame herself for making this very distinction and denigrate herself as 'just an actor, not sincere.'

In the third the worker distinguishes herself from her act, does not blame herself for this, and sees the job as positively requiring the capacity to act; for this worker there is some risk of estrangement from acting altogether, and some cynicism about it – 'we're just illusion makers.' (p.187/8)

The first risk has an old fashioned ring about it. Who will identify with his work too wholeheartedly today? Not the majority of Hochschild's respondents. Moreover, precisely those respondents who identified mostly with KLM said explicitly that they would not like to tell anything that might harm the image of the corporation. They said this by way of explaining their defensive attitude: "now don't think that..." Their public and private selves were not at all 'fused' and they were obviously aware of their impression management. Moreover, now that instant 'feedback' has become a stronger part of custom, one is quickly *made* aware. A strong

identification with the job or, in other words, a high level of involvement, apparently does not exclude detachment and awareness of acting; this tension balance may get to high levels. Indeed, “people are made increasingly aware of incentives to *use* feeling” (p.197) and in complex societies like ours, it is very unlikely that anyone will *not* become aware of ‘using feeling’ and will *not* develop “an instrumental stance toward feeling, in and off the job. This is exactly why the ‘dramaturgical perspective’ and the interest in emotion management have spread widely, both in sociology and in society.

Moreover, if “middle class children learn to make feelings into instruments they can use” (p.158) and flight attendants “are selected on a certain type of outgoing middle class sociability” (p.97), then why does Hochschild write as if they come in with a private and public self ‘fused’, as if they still had to learn an “instrumental stance toward feeling”?

The second risk, that of blaming oneself for acting, is also hardly realistic. Yes, one may blame oneself for acting upon an impulse of superiority or inferiority, or upon a wrong impression of a situation in which one has been either too open, informal and ‘authentic’ or too formal and guarded. One may also denigrate oneself for being a *poor* actor, but in *all* these cases not acting itself is at stake, but one’s ability to act, to use feeling, and one’s motivation to do so.

The third risk – estrangement, cynicism – is hardly avoidable for anyone. Because no one is able to be constantly aware of the terminality and all the ambivalences of one’s bonds, every new confrontation with this reality may trigger cynical or uprooted feelings: ‘What idle puppetry is this? What am I doing here?’ – or worse. The art of avoiding, diminishing or surmounting this risk is strongly dependent upon the art of emotion management. The majority of Hochschild’s respondents apparently had sufficient skill and motivation in this respect; they considered both their private life and their work as meaningful and real, each “in its own different way and time.” How large this majority is, Hochschild does not say. What she does tell is that “they talk of their feelings not as spontaneous, natural occurrences but as objects they have learned to govern and control” (p.133). But from the examples she gives it becomes clear that these women see their feelings *not only* as spontaneous occurrences, but *also* as impulses they have learned to govern and control. As indicated before, working conditions require such an attitude. This attitude also allows them – and not only them – to perceive their job as creating an atmosphere of pleasant illusions, without being cynical about it, just as they

may throw a Christmas party without being religious.

Hochschild's preoccupation with the 'costs' of emotion work not only leads to a one-sided and moralistic interpretation of the working conditions of flight attendants, it also hampers understanding the joy the job may bring. In the words of one of my respondents:

I like to put people at ease and then see how far I can go in building up playful exchanges, using all my imagination. It's enjoyable to find out how one can play together, especially with people who have a good go at twitting and playing too. It cheers everyone up and adorns the situation. I even need to do it, because otherwise the flight is terribly boring... But I always find an outlet.

Here this respondent added:

Now don't think that it's easy. Before you can do it well, you ought to have imagined yourself in the shoes of a lot of people and have analysed an awful lot.

Developing the skill of playful flexibility not only has the purpose of pleasure, it is also experienced as utterly useful and even as an all-round necessity:

I don't allow anyone to pull me down. There are so many ways to function as a police officer; you almost always find a way, if only you carry your mind into the people. ... I expect myself to adjust immediately to anything that occurs unexpectedly. In the air this is a necessity, but I do also demand this from myself in everyday life. At times when I do not get this right, it gnaws at me. Life changes all the time, so one has to stay manoeuvrable.

With regard to organizational demands on emotion management, one of my respondents said:

If they tell me how to recognize and contain trouble spots, as the jargon goes, they clearly mean to be open for all possibilities, and therefore I do not feel manipulated. I still might be, but manipulation is not always bad, is it?"

Another one said:

Of course I am manipulated. That would be a problem if I would not know it. But I know what KLM wants, how they expect you to behave. On the whole their expectation is what we all desire: a skill in dealing with people resulting in a pleasurable flight for all and mutual appreciation. I also know what I think myself and I feel free to act

accordingly and to tell them. The corporation even likes that. They now want every person to use his own personality and to do the job with a personal touch, provided of course you know what you're doing.

In the last few years there have been "service workshops" of two days for all flight attendants. These are reported to be directed at improving motivation and to demand little or no memorizing. Opinions on their usefulness vary, but all agree that they have diminished the distance between the company and its personnel. The latter at least express the feeling of being taken more seriously, and, according to staff members of the Personnel Division, they *are* taken more seriously. These members stipulated that the cabin crew's own initiatives and solutions today are stimulated more than before. Crewmembers are expected to be fully accountable themselves for their own "intangible service aspects". Knowing oneself, one's limitations and talents, is mentioned as a condition for functioning well. Accordingly, ideas taken from Transactional Analysis and related schools have influenced the design of the workshops.

This small piece of research shows that Hochschild's theoretical stance toward feeling makes her see costs where there are none or hardly any. At the same time she must have ignored some other demands on the emotion management of flight attendants, 'costs' and dangers that were mentioned with great apprehension by all my respondents: the fact that flight attendants have difficulties in maintaining a regular private life and that they have to work together in crews that are never the same. On Fridays the working schedule for the next week is released, and therefore it is hard to make appointments with friends and acquaintances. At the beginning of a flight, after being employed for some time, one will recognize one or two members of the new crew (usually 12 people), but even this group is likely to split somewhere along the line. Under these conditions it is hard to develop or maintain stable relationships. The danger is symbolized in the story of one respondent who was once invited to a birthday party of a colleague where she found only crewmembers of the last flight present. It is the danger of *social promiscuity*, of a multitude of very open and very disengaged short-lived relationships as a working condition, combined with great irregularity and uncertainty about working and non-working hours. A staff member:

The volatility and the escape in many open and intimate but short-lived contacts in the air and at stop-overs may bring a sensation of freedom and independence, but the bill is

presented when they stop flying. It sometimes happens that after only a few days on the ground people ask to be posted as soon as possible because they feel to be living in a void.

A flight attendant:

Everyone flying gets sort of a freedom feeling, like ‘well, I’ll call you sometime’. One gets used to being pleasantly close for a while and then saying good-bye. But I can’t stand it any more, having to say good-bye all the time. In a few months I’ll start working part-time.

The same respondent had experienced very cynical reactions from some colleagues when she told them she had fallen in love: “Oh, that will pass” and “don’t worry, you’ll get over it soon enough.” So the danger of becoming cynical exists, but this cynicism concerns the chance of developing deep and stable relationships, not acting or having to act, as Hochschild has in mind.

The wages of flight attendants are not impressive at all, but flying as a job means seeing a lot of the world, luxurious hotels (at stop-overs), good food and when the flying condition of social promiscuity creates an emotional whirl in which one is totally caught up, then one might become an inmate of a total institution of no fixed abode.

The number of KLM flight attendants living like this is probably small. Many are aware of this danger and have found ways to defend themselves. An indication may be the increase in the number of women with children working as stewardess; the wish to establish a nursery for children of KLM personnel is no longer only whispered. Two ways of defending oneself may be mentioned. More and more flight attendants have bought a telephone answering machine as an aid in maintaining their intimate relationships at home. The other way is described best in the words of a respondent:

In the cabin it is requested to give more of yourself than you get back, and when I stop working my reaction to that is to become extra-self-assertive; at home I have to catch up.

At Delta Airlines (studied by Hochschild), the danger of social promiscuity is most probably bigger, since there the “recruits were housed at the airport, and during the four-week training period they were not allowed to go home or to sleep anywhere but in the dormitory. At the same time they were asked explicitly to adjust to the fact that for them, “home was an idea without immediate referent. ... As one pilot advised: ‘Don’t put down roots...’” (p.99/100).

During a five-week training program, KLM claims its recruits only during office hours. Also as an organization KLM limits the danger of social promiscuity by a policy directed towards creating more part-time jobs; from circumstantial evidence I gather that at Delta Airlines such a policy is long in coming.

Hochschild has written a very stimulating book, but also a strongly irritating one. 'Estrangement' and the "widespread trouble" (p.197) of distinguishing between a 'real' and a 'false' self are postulated, 'discovered' and exaggerated. In this way she exploits feelings like powerlessness and discomfort, an example of a commercialization of feelings.

By focusing on these feelings they may become more fully faced and explored – a necessary condition for developing an emotion management that is not dominated by them. Hochschild's exploration aims in that direction, but her view is not detached enough. She points a blaming finger at society, capitalism and commercial institutions as if only there, *outside* the individuals who form these institutions the sources of these negative feelings are to be found. Such a one-sided and exaggerated accusation more likely stimulates the nourishment of these feelings (and the illusion that 'others' or 'society' could dispel them) than the further development of personal control over them. Such a moral enterprise rather encourages rancour or lethargy than an emotion management that promises more gratification, both from an individual as from a social point of view. The sociology of emotions might contribute to the instigation of such an emotion management by undertaking historical and international comparative studies of self-regulations, We-I Balances and tension balances of involvement and detachment. By way of a summarizing conclusion, some keynotes of such a sociology of emotions can be formulated.

### **THEORY AGAIN: The Sociology of Emotions**

Emotions are both ingredients and instruments for managing life, a management that predominantly consists of subjecting emotions here and now to emotions in the future. One's pattern of behaviour can therefore be conceived of as the result of a process of checking emotions – the individual civilizing of emotions. In this sense an individual can never be more intelligent than his emotions (and genes) allow him to be. This individual civilizing process is more or less attuned to the dominant code of behaviour and feeling in a society – to its level

and pattern of civilization. The dominant pattern of emotion management contains and sets the boundaries of all *social definitions*, for instance of what can be validated as being ‘rational’ or ‘moral’. (In this sense a human being can never be more intelligent than social definitions allow him to be.) Not only what can be made operative as rational or moral, but also as truth, beauty, justice and taste depends upon the dominant social definitions, or upon the *social habitus* of a society – shorthand for its dominant pattern and level of self-regulation and emotion management. The same goes for the social definition of respect, virtue and all other criteria people use in evaluating themselves and each other. The criteria for social ranking are closely related to what appear to be basic or survival functions in a society, that is, to the posture of dangers and chances, emotions (anxieties *and* passions) and controls – sort of a *trias sociologica*. In this perspective, changes in peoples likes and dislikes, in their mutual valuation and its resulting social hierarchy are also *collective emotional movements* indicating changes in power relationships and in the ‘trias sociologica’.

I wish to thank Arthur Bogner, Stephen Menell and Nico Wilterdink for their advice.

## REFERENCES

- Elias, Norbert (1978) *The Civilizing Process* Vol I, Oxford.
- Elias, Norbert (1982) *The Civilizing Process* Vol II, Oxford.
- Elias, Norbert (1987a) On Human Beings and Their Emotions: A Process-Sociological Essay, *Theory, Culture and Society* 4(2/3)
- Elias, Norbert (1987b) *Die Gesellschaft der Individuen*, Frankfurt a.M.
- Goudsblom, Johan (1987) The Domestication of Fire as a Civilizing Process, *Theory, Culture & Society* 4(2/3), 457-476.
- Handboek der Wellevheid* (Handbook of Courtesy), Leyden (undated)
- Hochschild, Arlie Russell, *The Managed Heart*. Commercialization of Human Feeling, University of California Press, Berkeley/Los Angeles/ London 1983 (first Paperback Printing 1985).
- M., E.C. v.d. (undated,1919) *Het Wetboek van Mevrouw Etiquette*, Utrecht.
- Martin, Bernice (1981) *A Sociology of Contemporary Change*, Oxford.
- McCall Jt., Morgan W. and Lombardo, Michael M. (feb.1983) What makes a top executive? *Psychology Today*, 17(2):26-31.
- Stolk, Bram van and Wouters, Cas (1983/85) *Vrouwen in Tweestrijd* (Women Torn Two Ways), Deventer.
- Stratenus, Louise (undated,1909) *Vormen*, Gouda.
- Swaan, Abram de (1979) Uitgaansbeperving en Uitgaansangst. Over de verschuiving van bevelshuishouding naar onderhandelingshuishouding, *De Gids*, 142(8): 498. A shorter version, called The Politics of Agoraphobia, was published in *Theory and Society* (1981)

10(3):359-86.

Wouters, Cas (1977) Informalization and the Civilizing Process, in P.R. Gleichmann, J.

Goudsblom, H. Korte, *Human Figurations*, Amsterdam, 437-455.

Wouters, Cas (1986) Formalization and Informalization: Changing Tension Balances in

Civilizing Processes, *Theory, Culture & Society* 3(2).

Wouters, Cas (1987) Developments in the Behavioural Codes between the Sexes: The

Formalization of Informalization in the Netherlands, 1930-85, *Theory, Culture & Society*

4(2/3).

Zutphen van Dedem, Mevr. van (1928) *Goede Manieren*, Amersfoort.

## NOTES

1 For example, in alphabetical order: F.G. Bailey, *The Tactical Uses of Passion*, Ithaca and London 1983; Norman K. Denzin, *On Understanding Emotion*, San Francisco etc. 1984 (In this book Hochschild is highly praised and she is quoted almost as frequently as Goffman is); most of Norbert Elias's work, but explicitly Elias 1987a; Nico H. Frijda, *The Emotions*. Studies in Emotion and Social Interaction, Cambridge and Paris 1986; T.J. Scheff, Toward Integration in the Social Psychology of Emotions, *Annual Review of Sociology* (1983) 9, 333-354.

2 Cf. *Theory, Culture & Society* (1987) 4(2-3), a double issue on Norbert Elias and Figurational or Process Sociology.

3 This seems to contradict Hochschild's opinion about men and women: "Men in general have not been trained to make their emotions a resource and are therefore less likely to develop their capacity for managing feeling." (165) The question how men attain the great majority of established power positions -in the public as well as in the private world- if *not* by using their feelings as instruments of orientation, is not raised.

4 Cf. Elias 1987b, particularly part three, pp 307-316. The concept Social Habitus is already frequently used in the original German edition of *The Civilizing Process*, for instance in Vorwort (1939), p. LXXVIII, but usually translated as 'social makeup'.

5 Bernice Martin (1981) popularized this term, coined by Parsons. In their disillusionment about the search for authenticity and spontaneity, and in their disgust of commercialization, Hochschild and Martin are two of a kind. Martin belittles the changes that took place in the codes of behaviour and feeling during the Expressive Revolution, while magnifying "the limited and self-defeating nature of the symbols of anti-structure, especially if they have to use institutions as vehicles of expression." (p.197) She sees the Punk movement as "the permanent marketability of colourful disillusion," (178) but does not her book meet the same description?

6 Cf. Elias (1987b), esp. part III Wandlungen der Wir-Ich-Balance. The experience of self which is at the basis of the distinction between 'real self' and 'false self' is extensively dealt with in this book.

7 The ability to combine directness and tactfulness also seems to be a dominant constituent of top executives. Cf. McCall and Lombardo (1983).

8 I am grateful to Norbert Elias; from him I heard the expression “backdoor to paradise” and on inquiry he recommended Kleist’s essay.

9 I interviewed 5 flight attendants (Hochschild 25), one being a member of the board of KLM.’s Cabin Crew Union, and three staff members including the manager of Passenger Services Training. I am grateful to all.