

Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann: The social construction of reality

Introduction: the problem of the sociology of knowledge

Reality and knowledge	Long history of philosophical inquiry. Also in sociology > Sociology of knowledge: dealing with how knowledge of reality comes to be socially established as reality.
Object of study	The analysis of the social construction of reality. Differs from the traditional sociology of knowledge.
Previously	Explicate in what way and why, Berger and Luckmann deviate.
Max Scheler	Wissensoziologie. Germany 1920s. Philosophy. Aim to clear away the problem of relativity. See point 1, 2 and 3 below.
General agreement	Concerned with the relationship between human thought and the social context within which it arises. The problem of the vertigo of relativity.
1. Marx	Man's consciousness is determined by his social being. Ideology and false consciousness. Substructure/superstructure.
2. Nietzschean ideas	Anti-idealism. Social significance of deception and self-deception, and of illusion as a necessary condition of life. The art of mistrust: seeing through the facades of social structures.
3. Historicism	Esp. Dilthey. The relativity of all perspectives on human events, the inevitable historicity of human thought.
Karl Mannheim	Key concern: Ideology > no human thought immune to the ideologizing influences of its social context.
Relationism	(as opposed to relativism): No capitulation of thought before the socio-historical relativities, but recognition that knowledge must always be knowledge from a certain position.
Spacing ideology	Not eradicated completely, but mitigated by the systematic analysis of as many positions as possible. Belief in the intelligentsia – free of class interests.
Robert Merton	Seeks to integrate sociology of knowledge with structural-functional theory.
Traditional empirical focus	The sphere of ideas, of theoretical thought.
Berger and Luckmann's project	Not concerned with such epistemological and methodological problems. Rather the sociology of knowledge has to concern itself with everything that passes as knowledge in society. Hence not theoretical ideas, Weltanschauungen. What people know as reality in their everyday lives. In short the social construction of reality.
Influences	Marx, Alfred Gehlen, Helmuth Plessner. Durkheim (the nature of social reality); Marxian dialectical theory of society; Weber (the constitution of reality through subjective meanings), George Herbert Mead (social-psychological presuppositions).

I. The foundations of knowledge in everyday life

1. THE REALITY OF EVERYDAY LIFE

The object of sociology	The empirical world as we interpret and perceive the reality.
Intersubjective	Necessary to clarify the foundations of knowledge in

commonsense of the world	everyday life. As we come to share an intersubjective understanding of the everyday reality.
> Phenomenological analysis	As a descriptive method. Refrains as such from causal and genetic hypotheses. Uncover various layers of experiences and structures of meaning.
Spheres of reality	E.g. dreamworld vs. everyday reality: “different objects presents themselves to consciousness (...)”
The reality of everyday life	Reality par excellence. Presents itself as an objective, a priori reality: “imposes itself upon consciousness in the most massive, urgent and intense manner.” Self-evident and compelling facticity.
Closeness/remoteness	Experienced around the “here” of my body and the “now” of my present. From this closeness to spatially and temporally remoteness. Zones of reality.
Intersubjective world	Shared with others. Sharply differentiated from other realities (such as my dreamworld). Ongoing communication processes of meanings. > Commonsense knowledge.
Sectors of everyday life	Everyday routines and sectors of interruptions/problems. Interruptions of routines > the reality of everyday life seeks to integrate the problematic sector into what is already unproblematic.
Excursions to other realities	Theater, dreamworld. The return to the everyday life appears as coming home from excursions. Back to the real world. “Endemic producers of finite provinces of meaning”
Spatial structuration	Attention is turned away from the reality of everyday life. Has a social dimension < my manipulation zone intersects with that of others.
Temporal structuration - coercive	An intrinsic property of the consciousness. Temporally ordered consciousness. Temporal dimension of the intersubjectivity of everyday life. My own life and my own projects have to be correlated with this temporal structure of everyday life.

2. SOCIAL INTERACTION IN EVERYDAY LIFE

Face-to-face situations	definitely privileged as situations where people really can learn to know each other. “The prototype of social interaction”. This sub-chapter is clearly of great interest in a discussion of personal media and social interaction. F2F encounters > full access to the other’s “symptoms”: the other is fully real.
The other as more real than myself	“What I am” is not so available. The need for deliberate contemplation upon myself. Makes me think of Foucault’s notebook and obviously personal media as tools for the self.
Typifactory schemes	Used also in F2F encounters. But more flexible and apt for change than in less proximate encounters.
Social structure	Continuum of typifications, progressively more anonymous as they are removed from the “here and now” of the F2F situation. Social structure as the sum of these typifications.

3. LANGUAGE AND KNOWLEDGE IN EVERYDAY LIFE

Objectivation	Human expressions objectified. The reality of everyday life is dependent of objectivations.
Signification	Human production of signs. With explicit intention to serve as an index of subjective meanings. Available beyond the expression of subjective intentions “here and now.”
Detachability Language	from immediate expressions of subjectivity. as obviously the most important sign system. Language only

as far as vocal expressions have become capable of detachment from the immediate “here and now” of subjective states. An understanding of language is required in order to understand the reality of everyday life.

Language as detached	< 1. as technically mediated < 2. its capacity to communicate meanings that are not direct expressions of subjectivity “here and now.” Accumulations of meaning and experience.
Materialised speaking/writing	“I hear <i>myself</i> as I speak. My subjective meanings become “more real” to me. Again clearly parallels to Foucault’s technologies of the self. “Ready-mades” > objectification of my experiences. Transcends the “here and now”.
Transcendental	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bridges different zones within the reality of everyday life, integrates into a meaningful whole. • Transcends the reality of everyday life altogether: like writing down one’s dreams.
Relevant knowledge	Our everyday life consists of knowledge that is relevant to our own lives, our own situations. As long as we do fine with this, there, wider knowledge is irrelevant, unnecessary. However, leaves the world behind our immediate relevance as opaque. We need not have detailed knowledge about this world.
Relevance structures	My relevance structures intersects with the relevance structures of others > We have interesting things to say to each other.

II. Society as objective reality

1. INSTITUTIONALIZATION

a) Organism and activity	World-openness: man’s relationship to his environment. Not pre-determined by biological equipment.
Becoming human	A continuous process, not completed in the mother’s body. Continuing socially determined interference. Human beings construct their own nature, produce him/herself. Plasticity of human nature/organism. Thus the self has to be understood in relation to the encompassing social environment.
Social enterprise	“Homo sapiens is always, and in the same measure, homo socius.”
Stability and social order?	How can there be stability if the human being is characterised by world-openness? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A given social order precedes any individual organismic development. In what order does social order itself arise? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2) Social order is an ongoing human production. Social order exists only as a product of human activity.
b) Origins of institutionalization	Human activity is subject to habitualization : frequently repeated actions > patterns. Narrows choices, frees energy to concentrate on other decisions. Habitualization precedes institutionalization.
Institutionalizations arise	Whenever there is a reciprocal typification of habitualized actions by types of actors. Shared typifications. Institutions imply historicity and control.
Control human conduct	Predefined patterns of conduct. Channels human action. Social control through institutionalization.

A and B example	Illustrates how habits evolve. When passed from generations: institutions <i>in nucleo</i> .
Appears as natural	and objective. All institutions appears as given, unalterable and self-evident. Institutional worlds are experienced as objective reality.
Humanly produced objectivity	The objectivity of the institutional world is humanly produced, constructed objectivity. Objectivation: the process by which the externalized products of human activity attain the character of objectivity.
Dialectical relations	Between man, the producer, and the social world, his/her product. Externalization Objectivation Internalization Society is a human product. Society is an objective reality. Human is a social product.
Requires legitimization.	Ways by which it can be explained and justified < Historical reality: the same story must be told. Consistent and comprehensive formulas.
Knowledge about society	Realization in a double sense: 1) apprehending the objectivated social reality 2) ongoingly producing this reality
The constructed reality	“It is learned as objective truth in the course of socialization and thus internalized as subjective reality. This reality in turn has power to shape the individual.”
c) Sedimentation and tradition	A small part of human experiences are retained, and saved as recognizable and memorable entities. Individual sedimentation. Intersubjective sedimentation: when these experiences are shared > common stock of knowledge.
Detached experiences	Sedimented experiences are detached from their original context < Language/objectively sign system. Experiences are transmittable. Objectivates the shared experiences, makes them available to all within the linguistic community (40 years later, blogs seem to be relevant in this discussion).
Sedimentation and institutions	Sedimented institutional meanings. Formula character to ensure their memorability: Conceived and communicated as knowledge. Various mnemotechnic aids.
d) Roles	Typification of forms of action, objectified linguistically: developed role-vocabulary. Performers of objective, generally known actions. Roles when typification occurs in the context of an objectified stock of knowledge common to a collectivity of actors.
Origins of roles	Lie in the process of habitualization and objectivation (as the origins of institutions). All institutionalized conduct involves roles.
Roles represent institutional order	Takes place on two levels: 1) Performance of the role represents itself: e.g. the judging individual is not acting “on his own” but as a judge. 2) The role represents an entire institutional nexus of conduct.
Roles and knowledge	Roles makes institutions a real presence in our experiences. Institutions are further represented by their linguistic objectifications. Roles as mediators of specific sectors of the common stock of

e) Scope and modes of institutionalization	knowledge. Implies a social distribution of knowledge: what is generally relevant and what is relevant only for specific roles. The scope of institutionalization depends on the generality of the relevance structures > Ideal-typical extremes to illustrate variations.
Differentiation	< degree of division of labour with concomitant differentiation of institution. Specialized knowledge. < Economic surplus, makes possible a specialization and segmentation in the common stock of knowledge. Theoretical knowledge.
Relationships between institutions? Subuniverses of meaning	In differentiated societies. Problem of integrating meanings within the entire society > Propaganda to convince other. In institutionally segmented societies. Result from accentuations of role specialization: role-specific knowledge becomes esoteric against the common stock of knowledge. Subuniverses must be carried by a particular collectivity.
> Complexity	Subuniverses of meaning > variety of perspectives on the total society. Different Weltanschauungen. Increasingly inaccessible to outsiders.
Reification of social reality	The manner in which the institutional order is objectified. The apprehension of human phenomena as if they were non-human. This sort of bears resemblance to Feenberg's argument concerning technical codes. How we do not see the human values therein. Reification as an extreme step in the process of objectivation: fixated as a non-human inert facticity. "Typically, the real relationship between man and his world is reversed in consciousness."
Reification of social roles	Roles reified in the same manner as institutions. "I am just doing my job". Narrows the subjective distance that the individual may establish between him/herself and his/her role-playing.
2. LEGITIMATION (derived from Weber)	
a) Origins of symbolic universes	
Legitimation	How we come to live in the same world? Symbolic universes are legitimated and appear as the most "real world." "second-order" objectivation of meaning. Produces new meanings, integrated with disparate institutional processes.
Integration on two levels	(and correspondingly the question of subjective plausibility): 1. The totality of the institutional order should make sense to participants in different institutional processes. 2. The totality of the individual's life must be made subjectively meaningful. Plausible subjective biographies.
The problem of legitimation	Arises when the objectivations of the (now historic) institutional order are to be transmitted to a new generation. When the unity of history and biography is broken. Legitimation in order to explain and justify.
Legitimation's way of explaining	Explains the institutional order by ascribing cognitive validity to its objectivated meanings. Cognitive as well as normative element. Knowledge precedes values in this legitimating process.
Analytical levels of legitimation (overlaps empirically)	1. Incipient legitimation: present as soon as a system of linguistic objectifications of human experience is transmitted.

2. **Theoretical propositions in a rudimentary form:**
ex. explanatory schemes relating sets of objective meanings. Pragmatic schemes, directly related to actions.
3. **Explicit theories:** by which an institutional sector is legitimated in terms of differentiated body of knowledge. Frames of reference for the respective sectors of institutionalized conduct. Begin to move beyond mere pragmatic application > “pure theory”.
4. **Symbolic universes:** Bodies of theoretical tradition that integrate provinces of meaning and encompass the institutional order in a symbolic totality. Symbolic processes (of signification): refer to realities other than those of everyday experience. All sectors of the institutional order are integrated in an all-embracing frame of reference. Encompasses all socially objectivated and subjectively real meanings.

Crystallization of symbolic universes	follows processes of objectivation, sedimentation and accumulation of knowledge. Social products with a history.
Universes and biographies	How symbolic universes operate to legitimate individual biography and institutional order.
Nomic/ordering function	provides order for the subjective apprehension of human experience. All experiences are incorporated into a whole. The world as more intelligible (and meaningful?).
Nomic function for individual experience	Puts everything in its right place, and allows one to return to reality (when being in marginal situations).
Integration	for discrepant meanings actualized within everyday life. Symbolic universe orders and integrates all meanings, roles, priorities by placing them in a general context.
Ordering biography	Different phases, periodization. Made intelligible.
Subjective identity	The legitimating function of symbolic universes > pertain to correctness of individual identities. “True self” as an ultimately real entity. “(...) legitimation again integrates all conceivable transformations of identity with the identity whose reality is grounded in everyday life in society.” A hierarchy of self-apprehensions of identity.
Social significance of symbolic universes	Paralleled to that of individual significance. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide the delimitation of social reality: what is relevant in terms of social interaction. • Orders history
Makes comprehensive	Comprehensive integration of all institutional processes. The entire society makes sense.
Threat	Continually threatened by the presence of realities that are meaningless in its terms.
Human existence as externalization	“As man externalizes himself, he constructs the world into which he externalizes himself. In the process of externalization, he projects his own meanings into reality.
b) Conceptual machineries of universe-maintenance	The symbolic universe is theoretical. Still, one lives typically naively within a symbolic universe. Taken-for-granted, not reflected upon.
Legitimation to the second degree – sophisticated	Theorizing about the symbolic universe. Such legitimizations described as machineries of universe-maintenance.
Necessary when	Universe-maintenance becomes necessary when the symbolic universe has become a problem (otherwise self-legitimizing) < inevitable tensions of the processes of institutionalization.

Universes transmitted	All social phenomena are social constructions. That is, symbolic universes are incipiently problematic. From one generation to another. But, socializations are never complete – always idiosyncracies.
Conceptual machineries	The need for repression of deviances/against heretical challenge. Conceptual machineries both legitimizes and modifies symbolic universes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heretical challenge from within society • When confronted with another society with a very different history: demonstrates that one’s own universe is not inevitable.
Conspicuous types	Mythological, theological, philosophical, scientific
1. Mythology	Represents the most archaic form of universe-maintenance. Closest to the naïve level of symbolic universe and not too far removed from the level of what is generally known.
2. Theology	more canonical mythologies. Distinguished from mythology in terms of greater degree of theoretical systematization. Further removed from the naïve level. The body of theological knowledge is hence for difficult to acquire. Specialist elite (as also for philosophy and science).
3. and 4. Philosophy and science	Removed from the naïve level. Specialists. Secularization and sophisticated universe-maintenance.
Therapy	To ensure that actual or potential deviants stay within the institutionalized definitions of reality. Appropriate specialists. Internalization of a conceptual machinery.
Nihilation	Denies the reality of phenomena and interpretations that do not fit with the concurrent symbolic universe. Assigning an inferior ontological status to deviant definitions.
c) Social organization for Universe-Maintenance	Socially constructed universes change < product of human activity. Definitions are always embodied: individuals/groups serve as definers of reality. The question is “says who?”
Specialization of knowledge	< the division of labour. More complex forms of knowledge emerge + economic surplus: <i>experts</i> society
Consequences	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the emergence of pure theory 2. strengthening of traditionalism in the institutionalized actions thus legitimated. > Inertia: resistance to change. Limiting the flexibility of human actions.
Occasions for social conflict	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • between experts and practitioners: may lead to emergence of rival definitions of reality, and the appearance of new experts. • Between rival groups of experts. Problematic when theories do not have pragmatic applications. Cannot really be tested.
Power	Includes the power to determine the power to produce reality: determine decisive socialization. “Highly abstracted symbolizations are validated by social rather than empirical support. It is possible to say that in this manner a pseudo-pragmatism is reintroduced.”
Competition	between rival definitions of reality are constant. Often connected to different spheres/social groups. Theory is demonstrated to be pragmatically superior by its applicability to the social interests in the group that is its “carrier”. Pseudo-pragmatism.
Universal experts	With an effective monopoly over all ultimate definitions of

	society. Single symbolic tradition. Primitive societies. Unified power structure. Liquidating strategies to deal with deviances: physically destroyed; integrated within the tradition itself; or segregated within the society and made harmless. Ex. Medieval Christendom.
Monopolistic situations	Presuppose a high degree of social-structural stability. Moreover functions structurally stabilizing.
Ideology	When a particular definition of reality becomes attached to a concrete power interest. Must be modified to suit the specific interests and values it must now legitimize. A process of selection and addition. Ex. Constantine's involvement in the Christological controversies.
Most societies are pluralistic	Shared core universe and different partial universes coexisting.
	Presupposes an urban society, highly developed division of labour, differentiation of social structure, high economic surplus. Thus complex societies.
Pluralism and change	Pluralism accelerates change. Helps to undermine the change-resistant efficacy of traditional definitions of reality. Encourages both scepticism and innovation.
Subsystem	Intellectuals. Deviants. Lack of theoretical integration within the social universe of society. Counter-expert. Sub-universes, sub-societies. Counter-definitions – counter-societies.
Dialectical processes	Between theories/ideas and their sustaining social processes.

III. Society as subjective reality

1. INTERNALIZATION OF REALITY

The dialectics of society	ongoing dialectic process: moments of externalization, objectivation, internalization. – but not in a temporal sequence. “(...) to be in society is to participate in its dialectic.”
Inducted into participation	Beginning point: internalization. “Taking over” the world in which others already live.
Socialization	The comprehensive and consistent induction of an individual into the objective world of a society or a sector of it. Primary and secondary socialization.
a) Primary socialization	First childhood socialization. Becoming a member of society.
Significant other	Every individual is born into an objective social structure. Encountering the significant others, in charge of the socialization > constitutes the specific objective social world. Significant others mediates a world, but also modifies it.
Learning and emotion	Identification with significant others in emotional ways. “internalization occurs only as identification occurs.” Take on roles and attitudes of significant others.
Dialectic process	between identification by others and self-identification. Between objectively assigned and subjectively appropriated identity. Subjective appropriation of identity/subjective appropriation of social world – two aspects of the same process of internalizing, mediated by the same significant others.
Generalized other	Abstraction of roles and attitudes – identification with a generality of others, i.e. with a society. Self-identification attain stability and continuity, and identity in general.

Objective/subjective	Symmetrical relationship between objective and subjective reality, but not a complete relationship. Never a total internalization of the objective social world, and subjective biography never fully social.
Language	various motivational and interpretative schemes are internalized as institutionally defined.
First world	Constructed with primary socialization. Stable world < the inevitability of the individual's relationship to his/her first significant others. Objective social world appears as massively and indubitably real.
End of primary socialization	When the concept of the generalized other has been established in consciousness.
b) Secondary socialization	The internalization of institutional or institution-based "subworlds".
Division of labour	> extent of secondary socialization. Increases with increasing complexity.
Role-specific	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge • Require role-specific vocabularies: internalization of semantic fields structuring routine interpretations.
Legitimizing apparatus	Required. > subjective identification with the role and appropriate norms.
Primary and secondary socialization	Secondary socialization always presupposes primary s. Must deal with already formed self and internalized world. Problem of consistency > presupposes conceptual procedures to integrate different bodies of knowledge.
Biological limitations	The foundational structure of specific knowledge. The order of learning things.
Institutional context	Usually apprehended within secondary socialization. School-system with teachers performing institutional functions of transmitting knowledge. Possible to detach part of the self and its reality as relevant only for the specific role-situations.
c) Maintenance and transformation of subjective reality	> to safeguard a measure of symmetry between objective and subjective reality. Threats to the taken-for-granted reality. E.g. marginal situations that do not fit with this world (dreams again). Challenging definitions of reality.
Two types of maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Routine maintenance • Crisis maintenance
1. Routine maintenance	The reality of everyday life continuously reaffirmed in the individual's interaction with others.
Significant others and less important others	Both entail important parts of the individual's everyday life. Maintained through interaction with both types. The New York Times example – reassures us we live in the real world.
Identity	Ongoing confirmation from especially our significant others. But also the more general others. (Personal media, perhaps especially hot-or-not sites comes to mind, these popularity of these media can clearly in part be explained with a Berger and Luckmann perspective).
Dialectical relation	Between significant others and the less important others. Involve the totality of the individual's social situation.
Conversation	The most important vehicle of reality-maintenance. The conversational apparatus both maintains and modifies reality. For instance with doubts concerning reality: "one then "talks oneself into" these doubts; they are objectified as reality

Language (Personal media)	within one's own consciousness." Thus realizes a world: linguistic objectification (clearly occupies in part these functions. Berger and Luckmann also mentions the use of correspondence as possible vehicles to continue especially important conversations.)
Plausibility structures	Required for the maintenance of subjective reality: specific social base and social processes. Hot-or-not as technique of reality-maintenance? Modern conversation technologies. Berger and Luckmann claim technically mediated conversations are greatly inferior to f2f conversations.
2. Crisis situation	Proceeds essentially as with routine maintenance. But reality-confirmations have to be explicit and intensive. Frequently also ritual techniques.
Subject reality transformed	Ongoing process of modification of subjective reality. Different degrees of modifications.
Alternations: extreme cases of transformations	Appear total. Process of re-socialization. The reality-base is the present: everything will have to be explained from the beliefs in the present.
Not ex nihilo	Must cope with the preceding nomic structure of subjective reality. Has to include both social and conceptual conditions.
Plausibility structure Conversational apparatus Legitimizing apparatus	Must be internalised, displacing all other worlds. are also reorganized. Most important conceptual requirement. For the whole sequence of transformation. Not only the new reality, but the stages by which it is appropriated and maintained.
Reinterpretations	The past and persons of the past need to be reinterpreted. Cannot disappear but must be comprehended in a new way.
Intermediate types	F.ex. social mobility and occupational training. Face the problem of maintaining consistency between the earlier and later elements of subjective reality.
Tinkering the past	But in a less radical manner. Usually a continuing association with persons and groups of the past.
2. INTERNALIZATION AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE	
Macro-sociological context	Always the background for micro-sociological analysis of internalization processes.
Socio-structural aspects Successful socialization	Of successful and unsuccessful socialization. High symmetry between objective and subjective reality (and identity). Graduations on a continuum. Extreme poles are unavailable. Maximal success likely in societies with very simple division of labour and minimal distribution of knowledge.
Counter-realities	Based on unsuccessful socialization. Counter-definitions of reality and identity < as soon as unsuccessfully socialized individuals congregate in socially durable groups. Counter-reality objectivated in the marginal group of unsuccessfully socialized. The leper-example. Unsuccessful socialization into one world, but successful socialization into another world.
1. Heterogeneity in the socializing personnel	> unsuccessful socialization. More complex distribution of knowledge: different significant others mediating different objective realities. Very dubious example of how people may be socialized gays.
2. Mediation of discrepant	> Therapeutic mechanisms. During primary socialization > unsuccessful socialization.

worlds by significant others	Complex distribution of knowledge. A little hard to differentiate from the example above. But difference seems to be that this is actually discrepant worlds (not just somewhat different objective realities – versions of the same world). The child – parents/nurse example. > the possibility of a hidden identity: assymetry between public and private identity.
Possibility of individualism	Individual choice between discrepant realities and identities: directly linked to the possibility of unsuccessful socialization. “the potential to migrate between a number of available worlds and who has deliberately and awarely constructed a self out of the “material” provided by a number of identities.” (171).
3. Discrepancies between primary and secondary socialization	In secondary socialization, alternative realities and identities appear as subjective options. Subjectively chosen identity as a fantasy identity, objectified within the individual’s consciousness as “his/her real self”
Different ways of identifying	In sec. soc. internalization need not be accompanied by affectively charged identification with significant others. Internalizing realities without identification.
Reality and identity pluralism	But must be understood related to socio-structural context < necessary relationship between social division of labour (consequences for social structure) and the social distribution of knowledge (consequences for the social objectivation of reality).

3. THEORIES ABOUT IDENTITY

Identity/society	Dialectic relationship. Identity formed by social processes, that again are in part formed by social structures. Identity maintained, modified, changed by social relations.
Dialectic process	I.e. Identity – social relations go both ways.
Identity types	Based on specific historical social structures. Recognizable in individual cases. Social products <i>tout court</i> , stable elements of objective social reality.
Psychologies	Theories about identity as social phenomenon. Necessary to recognize the reality-definitions that are taken for granted in the social situation of the individual.
Psychology/subjective reality	Another dialectic relationship between psychological theory and those elements of subjective reality that it purports to define and explain. Psychologically defined cases may be internalized as realities through socialization by the individual. Constituents of both objective and subjective reality in relevant contexts. Internalization/identification: psychology pertains to identity. “the imprint of societal identity types upon the individual subjective reality of ordinary people with commonsense”.
Changes in psychological theories	When identity appears as a problem. For instance caused by radical changes in the social structures. > Changes in the psychological reality.

4. ORGANISM AND IDENTITY

Human’s animality	Transformed in socialization, but never abolished. Dialectic between nature and society.
Dialectic	Externally: between individual animal and social world Internally: between the individual’s biological substratum and his socially produced identity. “In the dialectic between nature and the socially constructed

world, the human organism itself is transformed. In this same dialectic man produces reality and thereby produces himself” (183).