

Stigma Erving Goffman

Stigma Erving Goffman

Downloaded from www.everybodystreet.com by Marquez & Yadira

UNDERSTANDING STIGMA: THE ENDURING LEGACY OF ERVING GOFFMAN

In the landscape of sociological thought, few concepts have proven as durable or as insightful as the notion of **stigma**. While the word itself has ancient Greek origins—referring to a physical mark designed to expose something unusual and bad about the moral status of the signifier—it was the Canadian-born sociologist **Erving Goffman** who redefined it for the modern era. His 1963 book, *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*, remains a cornerstone text for understanding how social identity is constructed, damaged, and managed. The concept of **stigma Erving Goffman** introduced is not merely an academic curiosity; it is a living framework that helps us decode everything from workplace discrimination to online cancel culture. This article delves deep into Goffman's theory, exploring its core components, its practical applications, and its remarkable staying power in a rapidly changing world.

To grapple with the idea of **stigma Erving Goffman** articulated, one must first appreciate his unique perspective. Goffman was a master of micro-sociology, the study of everyday face-to-face interactions. He was less interested in massive social structures than in the small, nuanced rituals of human behavior. His work reveals how society functions not through grand decrees, but through the subtle cues, performances, and judgments we exchange in our daily lives. Stigma, in this context, is a fundamental disruption of social interaction. It is a gap between what we expect someone to be—their "virtual social identity"—and what they actually are—their "actual social identity."

THE GENESIS OF GOFFMAN'S THEORY OF STIGMA

To fully appreciate the depth of **stigma Erving Goffman** explored, it is helpful to look at the intellectual climate in which he wrote. The early 1960s were a time of significant social change, but also of rigid conformity. The civil rights movement was gaining momentum, mental health institutions were being scrutinized, and societal norms regarding appearance, behavior, and status were fiercely enforced. Goffman, with his keen eye for the unspoken rules of social life, recognized that everyone, at some point, fails to live up to the expectations placed upon them.

Goffman was not the first to study social deviance, but he was among the first to treat it as a normal part of the human condition rather than a pathology of a few individuals. He argued that stigma is not an attribute of a person, but a relationship between an attribute and a stereotype. This is a crucial distinction. In Goffman's view, no attribute is inherently stigmatizing. It only becomes a stigma when it is deemed deeply discrediting by a particular social group. This reframing places the locus of the problem not on the individual, but on the social world that does the judging.

What is a Stigma? Defining the Core Concept

In Goffman's framework, a stigma is a "spoiled identity." It is a mark—whether visible or invisible—that causes the bearer to be seen as less than fully human. Goffman defined it as "an attribute that is deeply discrediting." However, he quickly added that what is discrediting in one context might be entirely neutral or even positive in another. For example, a facial scar might be a source of shame in a corporate boardroom but a badge of honor among combat veterans.

The power of the **stigma Erving Goffman** described lies in its social dynamics. When we encounter a person with a stigma, we often engage in a process of "stigma theory." This is a pseudo-explanation that justifies our negative feelings and allows us to treat the stigmatized person differently, often with discrimination. We attribute a whole range of negative characteristics to them based on a single attribute. This is the foundation of prejudice and stereotyping.

THE THREE TYPES OF STIGMA ACCORDING TO GOFFMAN

Goffman neatly categorized the sources of stigma into three distinct groups. While these categories can overlap, they provide a useful framework for understanding the different ways identity can be spoiled.

- Abominations of the Body:** This category includes physical deformities, disabilities, disfigurements, and chronic illnesses. These are visible marks that immediately signal difference. In Goffman's time, this might have included conditions like polio, severe burns, or missing limbs. Today, we might expand this to include obesity, visible skin conditions, or the physical signs of certain medical treatments.
- Blemishes of Individual Character:** This category refers to perceived flaws in a person's moral character, as inferred from their behavior. This includes mental illness, addiction, a criminal record, unemployment, homosexuality (which was heavily stigmatized when Goffman wrote), or even a history of suicide attempts. These stigmas are often considered the person's "fault" and are seen as evidence of a weak will or a dangerous disposition.
- Tribal Stigmas of Race, Nation, and Religion:** These are stigmas that are inherited and passed down through generations. They are associated with a person's lineage, ethnicity, nationality, or faith. Racism, xenophobia, and religious persecution are all manifestations of tribal stigma. This type of stigma can be the most pervasive because it affects entire groups of people and is often deeply embedded in social structures.

KEY CONCEPTS: THE DISCREDITED AND THE DISCREDITABLE

One of the most influential aspects of the **stigma Erving Goffman** theory is the distinction between the "discredited" and the "discreditable." This dichotomy hinges on the visibility of the stigma.

The Discredited Individual

These are individuals whose stigma is immediately known or visible to others. A person in a wheelchair, someone with a severe facial burn, or a person speaking with a heavy accent are examples. The central problem for the discredited individual is not whether their stigma will be discovered, but how to manage the tension it creates in social interaction. They must constantly navigate the discomfort, pity, or hostility of others. Goffman wrote extensively about the "interaction rituals" used by discredited individuals to put others at ease, such as using humor, self-deprecation, or direct acknowledgment of their condition.

The Discreditable Individual

These are individuals whose stigma is not immediately apparent and could be hidden from others. Examples include someone with a history of mental illness, a person living with HIV, or an individual with a non-visible disability. The central problem for the discreditable individual is the management of information. They must constantly ask themselves: "To tell or not to tell? To reveal or to conceal?" This creates a profound psychological burden. The act of "passing" as normal requires constant vigilance, leading to isolation and anxiety. Goffman's analysis of information control remains incredibly relevant in discussions about coming out, disclosure in the workplace, and privacy in the digital age.

THE MORAL CAREER OF THE STIGMATIZED PERSON

Goffman also explored what he called the "moral career" of the stigmatized. This is the process by which a person learns that they are stigmatized and internalizes or rejects that identity. This career typically follows a pattern. A person might be born into a group that is already stigmatized (e.g., a racial minority) and learn their "place" in society through socialization. Alternatively, a person might acquire a stigma later in life (e.g., through an accident or a diagnosis of a chronic illness) and undergo a painful process of "identity change."

This later stage is particularly brutal. The person must come to terms with the fact that they are now seen by the world as different and lesser. They must learn the "biographical narrative" of their stigma—the story of how they became this way. They must also be socialized into the "club" of others who share their stigma, learning from them how to manage daily life and interaction. This concept of the moral career is a powerful tool for understanding the emotional and psychological journey of anyone living with a stigmatized condition.

MANAGING A SPOILED IDENTITY: PASSING AND COVERING

Much of Goffman's work focused on the practical strategies people use to manage their spoiled identities. Two of the most important are "passing" and "covering."

Passing

Passing is an attempt to be accepted as a "normal" person by successfully hiding one's stigma. This is a high-stakes performance that requires careful control of information, appearance, and behavior. A closeted gay person passing as straight, a person with a learning disability hiding their struggles, or an immigrant denying their accent are all examples of passing. The effort required is immense and can lead to burnout, depression, and a profound sense of inauthenticity. Goffman was fascinated by the "art" of passing and the risks of being "found out."

Covering

Covering is a less extreme strategy than passing. When covering, the stigma is known to others, but the individual works to keep it from "looming large" and dominating the interaction. A person in a wheelchair might downplay their disability by being overly cheerful and independent. A person with a mental health condition might avoid talking about it in polite company. Covering is about reducing the discomfort of others by minimizing the visibility or impact of the stigma. While less exhausting than passing, covering still requires significant emotional labor and reinforces the idea that the stigma is a source of shame that should be hidden.

THE "OWN" AND THE "WISE": THE SOCIAL WORLD OF THE STIGMATIZED

Goffman was also acutely interested in the social circles of stigmatized individuals. He identified two key groups: the "own" and the "wise."

- **The "Own":** These are other people who share the same stigma. They form a support network, a source of solidarity, and a place where the stigmatized person can let their guard down. Within the group of the "own," the stigma is normalized. Jokes can be made, stories can be shared, and the constant pressure to "perform" normalcy is lifted. This is the foundation of support groups and advocacy communities.
- **The "Wise":** These are "normal" people who are sympathetic to the stigmatized and are accepted as "honorary members" of the group. The wise are typically people who have had significant contact with the stigma through their work or personal lives. Examples include family members of someone with a disability, mental health professionals, or close allies of a marginalized community. The wise are invaluable because they can act as bridges between the stigmatized and the mainstream world, offering acceptance and advocacy without the direct experience of the stigma.

CONTEMPORARY RELEVANCE OF STIGMA ERVING GOFFMAN

It would be a mistake to see **stigma Erving Goffman** as a relic of the 1960s. His framework is more relevant today than ever, perhaps because the tools of social judgment have become so powerful and pervasive.

Stigma in the Digital Age

The internet has created entirely new landscapes for stigma to operate. Goffman's concept of the "discreditable" is intensely relevant to online life. A person's digital footprint can contain information that, if discovered, could spoil their identity. Old tweets, embarrassing photos, membership in controversial online groups—all of these are potential stigmas that require constant information control. The fear of "cancel culture" can be understood as a Goffmanian nightmare: a public and permanent spoiling of one's identity on a massive scale. The distinction between public and private self, which Goffman explored so beautifully, has become dangerously blurred.

Health, Illness, and the Body

Goffman's work on abominations of the body and character has been foundational to the sociology of health and illness. The stigma surrounding mental health, while slowly receding, is still a major barrier to treatment. Conditions like addiction, HIV/AIDS, and obesity continue to be heavily stigmatized. The concept of the "moral career" is used to describe the journey of someone diagnosed with a chronic illness, from the initial shock of diagnosis to learning to navigate a world that now sees them differently. Modern patient advocacy groups