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Abstract: In this paper, applying various micro- and macrosociological theories and concepts, I explore how I ended up taking Social Psychology as a major and what my options are for a future career. I use C. Wright Mills’s notion of the sociological imagination as a way of looking at and interpreting the circumstances of my life and my feelings and reactions towards them. I explore how such circumstances and explorations have caused me to be where I am, and how they may influence where I am going. I find that it was mostly personal troubles that led me to this field, but it is public issues that keep me interested and that make me want to continue in this field as a profession. I understand the tension of opposites between what I want to do with my life and my time, and what I must do to “make it” in this society. I am coming to see that society’s view of success and my own may differ and they don’t have to be the same. I see that my learning of different sociological theories and perspectives has enriched my own viewpoints and that I desire to be able to extend these viewpoints to others through teaching and/or counseling, and that these fields would seem to suit me because I am comfortable in the realm of academia. I do not want to get stuck in the “rat race” of corporations and capitalism, but that I must do something to make money to be able to support myself and live a basic comfortable life. Therefore I must make a compromise between the opposites. I realize that it is my personal fears and insecurities as well as some of the larger and public institutions that do not make it easy for women to succeed both in the workplace and in the home. These may hold me back from making high goals for myself and following through. However, I also see that I should not worry too much about getting a job and what I am going to do, and should instead focus now on learning about what interests me in the hopes of finding a meaningful occupation.

My current major is Social Psychology. This means that half of my classes are under the sociology department and the other half under the psychology department. When I tell people about my major, the usual reply is “Oh, that’s interesting, what are you planning on doing with it?” My response to this is always, “I’m going to go to Grad School.” Then I’ll usually give a list of a few fields of graduate studies that I am interest in, and four or five things that I may end up doing with my possible future degree. I can’t limit myself to one choice, and I think I am afraid of choosing a goal, for fear of not achieving it.

I used to think that Sociology and Psychology were both just phony majors, full of information that was just commonsense,
and for people who were bleeding hearts or who didn’t know what they wanted to major in. Sociology and/or Psychology were never on my possible lists of majors during my senior year of high school. It was a difficult road that led me to this major, with the most salient events occurring in the past two years, but on a road that probably began as a young child.

In this paper, using a framework informed by various sociological theories, I am going to investigate what caused me to choose Social Psychology as a major and explore the possibilities for my future career goals. In order to do this I must employ what C. Wright Mills has termed the Sociological Imagination. By this notion, Mills means the ability to relate one’s own life with society as a whole, and the capacity to shift views from the personal to the public (348).

To understand my choice in becoming a Social Psychology student and to determine my future educational goals, I will first look at what Mills has termed “troubles.” Troubles happen “within the character of the individual and within the range of his immediate relations with others” (Mills 350). Troubles fall under the realm of microsociology, which is concerned with face-to-face encounters and the details of communication and human interaction (Wallace & Wolf 5). It is the microsociological connection that I will focus on during the first half of my paper.

To begin to question and comprehend the reasons I have chosen Social Psychology and what I plan to do with my degree, I must first problematize it from a stranger’s point of view, and look at my life as though I have no preconceptions of what it should be, suspending my “learned cultural notions” (Wallace and Wolf 262). These approaches were used by Harold Garfinkel, the founder of Ethnomethodology, as ways of explaining his methods. Ethnomethodology is people’s ways of making sense of their social world (Wallace & Wolf, 269). Ethnomethodology is a type of research associated with Phenomenology. Phenomenology is interested in things that can be directly understood by one’s senses (Wallace & Wolf 263) and “asks us not to take the notions we have learned for granted, but...to question our way of looking at and our way of being in the world” (Wallace & Wolf 262). I need to look at my past experiences and problematize and understand them to question the place I am in today, and to figure out where I want to go in the future. I agree with the UMass Boston student Jennifer Kosmas that “If we can become aware of our own social constructions, then we can also break out of the self-destructive habits by knowing ourselves” (74). So if I gain awareness of what has led me here, I can begin to know myself and figure out the best path for my future.

In her article titled, “The Roots of Procrastination: A Sociological Inquiry into Why I Wait Until Tomorrow,” Kosmas analyzed her relationship with her father in order to get to the bottom of her procrastination problem. Similarly, in her essay titled, “Accepting Myself: Negotiating Self-Esteem and Conformity in Light of Sociological Theories,” Sheerin Hosseini discussed her relationship with her parents in terms of her issues dealing with self-esteem. I feel that both procrastination and self-esteem are issues for me as well. I try to avoid any type of conflict that will make me feel uncomfortable, and if I have an assignment that seems difficult or that I am not sure of, I will postpone it, perhaps in an effort to self-handicap.

This may also stem from my relationship with my parents, and my place in my family. The family is the primary group of socialization. This means that individuals in childhood come to identify emotionally with the significant others in their lives, and that they come to internalize social norms and values (Wallace & Wolf 290). My family was not rich, but we lived comfortably, and my parents did not force us to do chores or even to really clean up after ourselves very much. We were free to enjoy our childhood, which was nice at the time, but I think I may
have overly internalized the role of a child, and that now this is why I have a fear of growing up, and can’t imagine living on my own, and having all the extra responsibilities of paying my bills, cooking dinner, and cleaning up. My father is also what may be called a “helicopter dad” because he tends to hover over our affairs even now, so I feel like I have internalized a sense of helplessness in dealing with things that my dad usually takes care of. I think that part of the reason I may have chosen Social Psychology as a major is because it would take me a few extra years, since not many of the credits from my former major and my previous colleges transferred into this major. Also, I know that I will probably have to attend graduate school. Overall, these give me more years of schooling where I do not have to be a full “grown up.”

Another reason that I have chosen to continue my education and become a social psychology major is because being a college student is important to me. In my family my parents did value education, and there was never any question that we could all go to college. When I started elementary school I moved into secondary socialization. Secondary socialization concerns more specific roles and is a later phase of socialization of an individual who has already been socialized (Wallace and Wolf 290). In these classes, I took on the role of the “brain” and sometimes the “teacher’s pet.” In her essay cited previously, Sheerin Hosseini states that, “As a child, it seemed I wanted more than anything to be noticed and admired by both my parents and my teachers. I wanted to be the one in class who got recognition from the teacher for being intelligent or artistic” (29). I felt very much the same way as Hosseini. Once I realized that I was good at learning, that it came easier to me than most of my classmates, I ran with it, and took this as an important part of my self-concept and self-esteem. This has led me to achieve, but also has given me an extreme fear of failure. I feel like educational success is such an important part of my self-concept that I generally avoid trying activities in which I may not succeed, or that I feel might be too hard, and that I won’t fare well in.

I have taken my role as a student seriously for the most part. In the film Twelve Angry Men, the jurors come in with their own presupposed ideas of what a jury was supposed to do and what the role of a juror was. Some took the roles more seriously than others. They created their own arbitrary rules and followed them. This also connects to the work that Garfinkel did on jury deliberation. The jurors “knew how they were supposed to act” by drawing on knowledge from other sources (Wallace and Wolf 276). In the same way I, even as I entered elementary school for the first time, or entered college as a freshman, knew what was expected of me by drawing on knowledge from other sources, what I had learned from books, TV, movies, friends, and parents.

It’s also important for me to be viewed by others as a college student. I work as a cashier, a job that isn’t very prestigious, and I always feel the need to make it known that my first priority is being a student, and that I only work part time to pay tuition and have some spending money. I also feel that some of my reasons for wanting to earn a college degree are so that I can live “the good life.” The film Affluenza illustrates how Americans are consumerists and that many of us equate happiness with spending, and the goods that we acquire. Although I don’t feel that making money is the greatest factor in my decision to major in Social Psychology, I can’t deny that the prospect of money is an important aspect of my choice to attend college.

The most significant event in my life that caused me to think about work in Social Services or Psychology and that led me to become a Social Psychology major was being involved in an abusive relationship. I became involved with a man who at first seemed like a good boyfriend, then he became controlling, emotionally abusive and finally physically abusive. It was during this
time that I withdrew from my first college. I can analyze this time in my life by drawing on many of the concepts included in Symbolic Interactionism and Rational Choice or Social Exchange Theory.

Symbolic Interactionism is “a social-psychological perspective; it focuses primarily on the individual ‘with a self’ and on the interaction between a person’s internal thoughts and emotions and his or her behavior” (Wallace & Wolf 199). Rational Choice Theory assumes that people are rational and make their decisions and perform actions based on what they think are the most effective means to their goals. The theory presumes that people are constantly weighing alternatives.

There are many concepts in these theories that apply to my situation. At first I allowed a little bit of controlling in the relationship, because of self-esteem issues and my problems with making my own decisions, and because I enjoyed the status that came with having a boyfriend. In Social Exchange Theory, status is defined as common recognition by others of the amount of esteem or friendship that someone receives (Wallace and Wolf 340). Once my troubles got more serious, however, I tried to hide them, and refused to admit to anyone that anything was wrong. I engaged in what Goffman terms impression management; I tried to control how others viewed me. That I could do this may be explained best by Goffman’s theory of dramaturgy. Dramaturgy is concerned with the lives of ordinary people, and how they act out their daily roles on the “stage” of life (Wallace & Wolf, 239). On the front stage, in the presence of an audience, I acted as if everything was perfectly fine, that I had it all together, and refused to let on that anything was wrong. It was only in the back region, hidden away from others, that any of the abuse took place and that I could cry and let myself feel the pain.

During this time, I felt like I was a discreditable person, that I carried this stigma of being an abused woman which could be discovered at any time. It seemed to me, if I didn’t let anyone else know that something was wrong, then nothing was wrong; but if anyone else found out, I couldn’t go on pretending anymore. Finally, when it became more than I could handle with a smile or an explanation, I began to isolate myself from my friends and family. I even lost my sense of self. George Herbert Mead describes the self not as a “passive receptacle” but as active and creative (Wallace & Wolf, 205). At this point in my life, I was not active and creative, I only felt that I was the “me” and not the “I,” that I was acted upon, but not acting or reacting upon my own initiative. I left my first college at this time. Eventually my parents made me go to therapy (once again, I did not make my own decision). I ended up finally getting out of the relationship and moving to South Carolina.

It was in South Carolina that I decided that I wanted to take some classes in Psychology and Sociology to try to understand both myself and others better, and hopefully see what had happened to me. In this sense, I was sort of like Neo, the main character in the movie The Matrix. In one scene, Neo is given a choice whether to take a pill and gain an understanding of what the real world is, without any promises that such knowledge would make him happy, or that he could go back to living his artificially created life. Neo decided to take the pill that would cause him to learn about what was really happening. My choice was similar; I wanted to gain an understanding of myself and other people and the structures of society. I felt that maybe I could get some answers by studying Social Psychology. As Avery Gordon wrote in her book Keeping Good Time, “faced with our powerlessness to assert authoritatively what is going on, we only want to ‘simply understand’” (9). Gordon was speaking about research during wartime, but I feel that her statement applies to most people who can’t ascertain what is happening in their lives or feel powerless to take action to change it, but at least want to understand what is going on.
Now that I have gained some understanding, the question I have is about where I want to go once I get the degree. I have basically determined that graduate school will be necessary. But, I suffer from an anxiety that I won’t be accepted, and I know I probably won’t apply to any elite schools, because of the fear of being rejected. I have never been rejected by a college, and I think that since so much of my identity is tied up in my academic abilities, that rejection would hurt my sense of self. I limit myself to schools I know I will probably get into. I also limit myself in terms of being a woman and knowing that if I have children, I will want to have a job in which I can fit my family life and career.

In her essay titled “Altruism or Guilt: Applying My Sociological Imagination to Choosing a Helping Profession,” Elizabeth McCauley writes about how her future career choices are based on ones that would have a mother-friendly schedule; but she also states that, “I am not certain I want to have children. I am positive that if I choose to I will be in my late thirties when I start, so why am I basing my career choices on non-priorities or priorities that are not my own?” (149).

Similarly, I am worried about experiencing the bifurcation of consciousness. This is experienced in women as they move between modes, generally work mode and home mode, and are constantly aware of and concerned about each, because there are ongoing pressing demands on women, especially those with children (Farganis, 375). Therefore, when I think about wanting to be a professor, I usually think about just being an adjunct so that I would still have time to have a family. Or, I may think I want to have my own counseling practice, but then I’ll think that may take up too much time, or be too hard. Because of the expectation of women to raise a family, I think about it even when I am in no position to be having a family anytime in the near future. I do think that I want to help or at least educate others to avoid, or get out of the situation I was in when I was involved in the abusive relationship. But I struggle with this: is it this because I really want to help others, or is it just because I want to give meaning to this awful thing that I went through, the powerlessness that I felt? Avery Gordon states that,

The struggle to achieve a certain independence from the ways we are imprisoned, with love in our hearts, preparing for a struggle that will change us, that will make us more free, more capable of sharing freedom than we were before: that’s the place we go to, the way we get there. (66)

I feel like I have gone through a struggle, and part of the reason I chose Social Psychology was for understanding, and the other part was so that maybe in the future I would help others by sharing what happened, or just by being someone who could listen to their situations and not judge them. This is where I feel that I want to go, and I think that it is only my own apprehensions, and my interpretation of society’s ideals, that can hold me back.

In his book, The Sociological Imagination, Mills wrote that distinguishing personal troubles—which I defined and explored in the first half of my paper—from public issues “is an essential tool of the sociological imagination” (p.350). Public issues have to do with matters that involve the larger social structures and impact society as a whole. These are part of the realm of macrosociology. Macrosociological perspectives are concerned with analyzing “the large scale characteristics of social structures and roles” (Wallace & Wolf, p 5). Macrosociological theories include Functionalism, Conflict Theory, and Postmodernism.

The functionalist perspective states that society is made up of different parts and that these parts must work together in order for society to function as a whole and maintain
equilibrium (Wallace & Wolf 16). Conflict theory assumes that people have certain basic needs and wants, that power is at the core of social relationships, and that values and ideas are seen as weapons (Wallace & Wolf, 68). Postmodernism has come to mean different things, it has been associated with post-industrialism and post-Marxism, a movement in literary criticism. It deals with the Enlightenment promise of rationality and the relationship of knowledge to theory and power (Farganis 423).

We are influenced by the macrostructures of our society. In our socialization we are introduced to the prevailing ideas of our culture. Culture is defined as “the enduring behaviors, ideas, attitudes, and traditions shared by a large group of people and transmitted from one generation to the next” (Myers, 11). This transmission of culture through generations occurs through socialization and is part of what Emile Durkheim’s called integration, “the incorporation of individuals into the social order” (Wallace & Wolf, 20). Durkheim maintains that integration is important for the maintenance of social equilibrium.

An important part of integration is the understanding of the current ideologies comprising and shaping the culture. Conflict theorists, such as Karl Marx regarded established ideologies as beliefs that serve to legitimize the position of those who currently are in control (Wallace & Wolf, 87). I will discuss some of these ideas that have been internalized by most people and myself, and how they affect our perceptions of the world, and what we end up doing with our lives in it.

The contemporary U.S. society has an ideology that admires rugged-individualism. In our individualistic society identity is self-contained, becoming self-reliant is viewed as an important trait of a successful individual, and independence is valued (Myers, 41). As the division of labor increased in our society so did individualism, or at least the idea of it.

I have struggled with this individualism in my life. I have always been a dependent person; I haven’t really lived on my own. I think that I want to at some point (or maybe just because society wants me to), but I don’t have the money, and I think I am also scared of the prospect of not having my family or friends nearby for support. This will also limit my prospects for the graduate school and careers as I will probably stay in the Boston area or the South Shore. In the movie and book *Tuesdays with Morrie* by Mitch Albom, the late sociology professor from Brandeis Morrie Schwartz says that our culture tells us we should be ashamed of being dependent on others, but that “there is nothing innately shameful about being dependent.” Most people in the U.S. would probably disagree with Morrie. I struggle with this because as I grew up I was allowed to be dependent, and never learned to do things for myself; but now at my age that dependency is deemed inappropriate, and I am told that I need to just grow up. Our society values independence and abhors dependency so much that we have pathologized dependency as a personality disorder in the DSM-IV.

The paradox is that we are not truly independent in our society; we are interdependent. We rely on what Durkheim termed organic solidarity, which occurred as the division of labor and specialization increased. Organic Solidarity is “characterized by the interdependence of roles and a lack of self-sufficiency” (Wallace & Wolf, 20). Durkheim states that this is what holds people together when they are all performing separate tasks. Ferdinand Toennies first termed this type of modern industrial society a gesellschaft, which is “characterized by a predominance of more impersonal or business-type relationships” (Wallace & Wolf, 30). The Functionalist Talcott Parsons labeled these types of relationships in the modern society instrumental. The focus on independence, these formal relationships, as well as the exploitative relationships of Capitalism, are what allow most people to justify their own or others’ positions in life. They feel that
whether one is on top of the chain or on the bottom is a product of their own hard-work. I used to feel this way, and still in part hold on to this ideology for myself; I think that if I just work hard enough and find my niche I will be able to support myself, make money, and live the “good-life.” Of course there are many other factors that influence these outcomes other than “hard-work.”

Although I still hold on to this ideology for myself, I do not expect it of others. A concern that has brought me into the Social Psychology field of study is that of the welfare of others. At my previous college I took business, accounting, management and economic classes. During these classes I never felt good about profits. I felt that leadership and management classes were all about manipulating people to get the most productive value out of them. In the book and movie Tuesdays with Morrie, Morrie was brought by his father to the factory where he worked making fur coats. Having seen and experienced the inside of the factory Morrie vowed that he would, “never do work that used people, that made money off their sweat and degraded them.” I also felt this way; how could I be concerned about business and profits and not worry that the people in the company weren’t happy or were being exploited or were in danger of losing their jobs?

Michael Moore tackles this issue in his film The Big One, where he illustrates some of the real casualties of capitalism. During one stop on his book tour, Moore visits Centralia, Illinois, home of the PayDay candy bar. When he arrives he finds that the workers in the PayDay plant just found out (through a video) that they were losing their jobs. The ironic part was that the workers had worked hard, done their jobs well, and made profits, surplus value, for the company. The factory workers were termed proletarians by Marx, the laborers who don’t own any of the means of production. These particular workers in Centralia are the embodiment of modern exploitation. Karl Marx described exploitation as occurring when “any surplus value is appropriated by someone other than the worker” (Wallace & Wolf 84). Because of this exploitation, the company had the means to relocate their factory to another country with a cheaper labor force.

Of course at the PayDay factory in Centralia, and in many of the other corporations Moore visited during his book tour, the management and the owners and CEO (the bourgeoisie, the people who “control capital and direct labor” [Wallace & Wolf 90]) did not seem to care about the people they had let go. To them it was all about “remaining competitive” and “having an obligation to the stockholders.” Many of the CEOs had a corporate mentality in that in their thinking and conversation they became a spokesperson for the corporation and had the interests of the corporate structure in mind. This corporate mentality included what Max Weber called Zweckrational, a “form of reasoning that breaks down all problems into a means-ends chain and entails rational calculation of costs incurred and benefits to be secured if a particular line of action is pursued” (Wallace & Wolf 93). The management and owners did not seem to worry or care about what happened to their employees, because in the end they would be making profit by laying them off and downsizing to another country. This is a feature of capitalistic mentality and Zweckrational.

Weber came up with the term the latter term to describe bureaucracies. Features of bureaucracies include highly specialized tasks that are arranged in a hierarchical order, depersonalization, routinization, and mechanical predictability. I do not want to end up working in a big bureaucracy or dealing with the alienation and impersonalization of a job like that. Therefore I am caught in what Morrie Schwartz termed, “a tension of opposites” and what Karl Marx termed dialectics, a contradiction, or a “pattern of inner conflict” (Wallace & Wolf, 162). I, like most people, am stuck between what I want to do and what I must do. My dream would be to be a perpetual student, and I
I wish I could just learn for the sake of learning and not deal with the bureaucracy of deadlines and grades, etc. I enjoy learning and my ideal would be to learn about everything and anything that I find interesting. Unfortunately, that is not the “real-world.” I have already been in college for 5 years and can’t afford to continue indefinitely. I need to finish college and earn a degree so that I can get a “real job.”

Also the problem with school for me is that I am so concerned about grades and I really don’t learn for the sake of learning. I wish I could, but I always know that the grade is what is really important. That is the way I can maintain scholarships. Graduate schools and future employers are going to judge me chiefly by my GPA.

Although grades are important to me, I hope to become more like the alternative students that Avery Gordon speaks about:

By naming yourselves alternative students you have chosen a path, a perspective, that says you are part of a long tradition of those who see differently, who imagine and dream other possibilities than the normal ones taken for granted. You have aligned with those...who see the individual as part of the larger social fabric and consider this cooperative interaction freedom; with those who feel a source of pride and accomplishment in what is derided and undervalued; with those who don’t take the easy way out but are willing to live and struggle with difficult contradictions. (72)

One of the reasons I decided to attend UMass Boston was because it is more of an alternative campus. There are students of all ages, from many different ethnicities, and socioeconomic statuses. There are people who go to school full-time, and those who work full-time and take one or two classes a semester. I wanted to be exposed to a wider range of perspectives, which I get from the students around me and from being in a major that really consists of two majors.

I feel that the more I learn, the more I want to learn. I definitely feel that in the future I would like to counsel or teach. I think that it is important for people to be exposed to viewpoints that take them out of the conventional ways of thinking about the world. Rose Weitz writes about resistance in her article, “Women and Their Hair: Seeking Power Through Resistance and Accommodation.” She states that we must define resistance as “actions that not only reject subordination but do so by challenging the ideologies that support that subordination” (137). In order for people to challenge and resist the social forces that act on their lives, they must first understand the ideologies that have put the forces in place and where they come from, to be able to think of different ways of thinking or living. By teaching or counseling I feel that I would have the means to at least expose people to some differing paradigms or ways of looking at life in hopes of allowing them opportunities to resist. Avery Gordon writes of this as dissent:

The maintenance of an alternative perspective requires also an active commitment to dissent and to the insistence that dissent is never treason ... to commit dissent is to commit self-governance, not administrative governance ... social justice, not personal justice ... to commit to learning and unlearning again and again, with pleasure. Dissent is the key link between education and democracy. (73)

I see that this dissent or resistance is important, and that education is a key factor in understanding systems and having the ability to resist them. I myself have always been a firm believer in learning and empiricism and the scientific method, but in reading
about the Postmodern perspective I see that there is some room for subjective relativity concerning reality and that knowledge and science are bound with power. I feel that understanding this has made me less dogmatic in my views, and I feel that interaction with others on a face to face or a teaching level would continue to open my life towards new perspectives.

To conclude, while trying to understand what has brought me into the field of Social Psychology and what I am going to do with my life when I finish school, I see that it was mostly personal troubles that led me to this field, but it is public issues that keep me interested and that make me want to continue in this field as a profession. I understand the tension of opposites between what I want to do with my life and my time, and what I must do to “make it” in this society. I am coming to see that society’s view of success and my own may differ and they don’t have to be the same. I have seen that my learning of different sociological theories and perspectives has enriched my own viewpoints and that I desire to be able to extend these viewpoints to others through teaching and/or counseling, and that these fields would seem to suit me because I am comfortable in the realm of academia.

I do not want to get stuck in the “rat race” of corporations and capitalism, but that I must do something to make money to be able to support myself and live a basic comfortable life. Therefore I must make a compromise between the opposites. I realize that it is my personal fears and insecurities as well as some of the larger and public institutions that do not make it easy for women to succeed both in the workplace and in the home. These may hold me back from making high goals for myself and following through. However, I also see that I should not worry too much about getting a job and what I am going to do, and should instead focus now on learning about what interests me in the hopes of finding a meaningful occupation.
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