

COMPREHENDING COMPETING SPHERES OF SOCIAL CONTROL

Timothy M. Chester, Texas A&M University

ABSTRACT

My purpose here is to examine the arrangement of both formal and informal norms and how they are utilized to channel children's behavior along certain trajectories. It is argued that three distinct contexts for social action exist within the consumer society. These contexts are described as "spheres of action" which possess moral agents who have vested interests in channeling individual behavior in certain directions. This paper examines this theory in light of the Christmas shopping season, by focusing on the conflictual spheres of social action that exist within the setting of a mall. First, there remain the capitalist entrepreneurs who have a need to sell products both to, and for children. On the other hand, parents often have to control their child's newly created impulsive need for a toy or other product that is directly marketed at them. Unobtrusive observations of children's behaviors were made over a four week period during the Christmas shopping season in order to provide data for an ethnographic analysis of competing methods of social control utilized by the Mall, the toy store, and the parent.

INTRODUCTION

My purpose here is to examine the arrangement of both formal and informal norms and how they are utilized to channel children's behavior along certain trajectories. To do so I adopt a theoretical perspective which views children's social actions on three separate levels, as there exists multiple contexts from which informal norms arise and guide individual behavior in various settings. Specifically, there exists a broad sphere - this thing we refer to as "society" - which has formal and informal rules regulating behavior. Next, there exists a smaller setting within the larger - that of the group - which can share societies formal rules, but may have a different set of informal norms. Finally, there exists the context of the family, where parents have the responsibility of acting as moral agents and possess a vested interest in regulating their children's behavior. Comprehending these competing spheres of control remains the focus of this writing.

To illustrate this theoretical perspective I turn to the consumer society, specifically the setting of the "Mall" during the Christmas shopping season. The "Mall" has been referred to as a bastion of interaction, where a wealth of information can be obtained by the interested observer (Boyle 1995). Ethnographic investigation is utilized to illustrate the existence of these competing "spheres of action" which possess respective moral agents who have vested interests in channeling children's behavior in certain directions. While it is apparent that some of the proprietors within the Mall have a need to sell products both to, and for children, we often neglect the fact that parents often have to control their child's newly created impulsive need for products that are

directly marketed at them. The setting chosen for investigation provides sociological insight into competing moral agents and their methods of social control.

Some ethnographic portrayals of the Mall have focused on its interactive aspects (Boyle 1995), or how it creates a context for sociability for various class groups (Graham et al 1991; Schnact, Unnithan 1991). Other, more critical examinations have focused on its relation to consumer society (White, Hellerick 1994), parental discipline of children across boundaries of social class (Brown 1979), and how the Santa Claus myth is "staged" for children during the Christmas shopping season (Thompson, Hickey 1989). This project has sought to provide further critical insight into the suburban Mall by examining competing control strategies used by the Mall, its stores, and the parents of children.

In the course of this writing I first turn toward the development of a critical theoretical perspective which can be utilized as an interpretative tool for analysis. Secondly, I focus on the setting of the mall, in order to get an ethnographic sense of the various contexts for action which exist in this facility. Then, the various components within the setting are examined, and their methods of controlling children's behavior are discussed.

THEORETICAL ORIENTATION

The nature of the problem to be studied requires the adoption of a social construction perspective regarding the development of norms and sanctions. This is necessary as there exists multiple contexts from which informal norms arise as individuals move from one social setting to another. Specifically, there exists a broad sphere - this thing referred

to as "society" - which has formal and informal rules regulating behavior. Next, there exists a smaller setting within the larger - that of the group - which can share societies formal rules, but may have a different set of informal norms. Finally, there exists the context of the family, where parents have the responsibility of acting as moral agents and possess a vested interest in regulating their children's behavior. This triple overlay of spheres gives us competing contexts from which different sets of norms can and do arise.

Both formal and informal norms are defined here in relationship to a sphere of action - the sphere may be inclusive of the whole society, or it may consist of a subgroup within the larger sphere. The schema assumes that those behaviors which are acceptable within one sphere (time/space/group) may or may not be acceptable in another. Additionally, the inverse also applies, that which is not acceptable in one sphere, may be the norm in another. Interestingly, this triple overlay of spheres of action allow certain types of children's behavior to be labeled deviant in one context, while the same behavior is acceptable, and even preferred, in another social setting.

The appropriate starting point for a discussion on the development of a pluralistic conflict model is the consensus approach which comes from the early functionalists (Durkheim [1893] 1933; Ross 1901; Sumner 1906), and dominated sociological theorizing until the late 1950s. Consensus theory is a product of utilitarian thought and focuses on how the development of both formal and informal norms serve to further the general welfare of the individual members within the sphere of action. Norms arise as the result of an agreement by consensus of all the members of the sphere concerning which behaviors are appropriate and acceptable, and which behaviors are not. An inverse relationship exists between informal norms and formal rules. Informal rules and their appropriate sanctions serve to fill gaps which are left by the codification of norms into formal laws. Inversely, the development of codified law results from the insufficient ability of informal rules to fully regulate all behavior on the part of individuals.

The consensus model gives us a basic framework, but it is ignorant of the concept of power and how it shapes the development of norms in particular directions. To correct for this omission one must adopt a more critical stance towards the development of norms.

One such position was articulated by Pfohl (1994)¹. Incorporating ideas from classical and post-structuralist Marxism, and blended together with insights from affirmative postmodernism (Chester, Segura forthcoming), Pfohl expands on the consensus model with the result being a critical, social constructivist stance. This provides a more powerful analytical tool that can be used to more fully understand the process which underlies the development of norms.

The critical perspective assumes that power as well as material and symbolic objects vested with value exist within each sphere. In order for power to exist, there must exist objects which are valued by the society or group. Some objects, under certain contextual conditions, are valued more highly than others. Power also presumes that some individuals are better able to accumulate and control the distribution of valued goods within a certain sphere of action. This remains the basis of the entity's power. An entity can be said to hold power when it has the ability to control the distribution of valued goods within a sphere of influence. As a result, within the arena where norms are developed and enforced, some entities possesses the ability to influence the process whereby norms are developed. Frequently, and usually as the "norm" of the interaction process, the entity with vested power shapes the rules to serve its own interests (Chambliss 1969; Pfohl 1994; Turk 1977; Vold 1958).

Invariably, one should ask some rhetorical questions. *What are rules?* They are the informal and formal norms which guide individual behavior. Individuals become familiar with the rules through the socialization process through symbolic communication. The rules are not static instruments, but are subject to change. They may change as individuals move from one sphere of action to another, from the rules of the larger society, to a sub-sphere where other rules apply, or they may change from one historical circumstance to another. *Where do rules come from?* They are developed within an inter-subjective sphere, where they are established through consensus, fiat, or a combination of both processes. *How does power influence the development of rules?* Power gives one individual, or group of individuals, the ability to influence the outcome of the deliberative process - the ability to influence the development of rules through their inherent ability to control the distribution of valued

goods within the relative sphere of social action.

Thus, from a power-reflexive point of view the development of rules, which results in certain behaviors being labeled as deviant, is the result of a process where context, language, value, and power are tools which are used in the process of symbolic communication. The result of this process remains norms, which consist of both formal and informal rules. This process occurs within each sphere resulting in empirical behaviors that may be deviant within one sphere while they may in fact be the norm within another. This perspective provides what Pfohl (1994) regards as a reflexive, interpretative tool. This tool will be the primary instrument of analysis in this case study. When a rule is encountered several questions will be asked:

*Who's interest does this rule serve?
Does this entity hold a position of power
relative to the sphere of social activity?
If so, what is it of value that they hold?*

And finally,

*How does this rule serve the entities own
interests?*

Asking these sorts of questions will give us the opportunity to more fully understand the social processes underlying the labeling of acceptable/unacceptable behavior within the social setting.

In comprehending the social setting we should look to the work of Erving Goffman in order to find some additional interpretative tools which will aid in the analysis. In *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (1959) Goffman gave us the conceptual framework referred to as dramaturgical analysis. This perspective is helpful in describing various settings where social interaction occurs. According to this perspective all interaction occurs within a particular context (stage), through various parts (roles), and through the use of props, costumes, and scripts. Each of these component parts act as symbols which contribute to the interaction process. The perspective assumes that any social environment can be structured in such a way as to facilitate certain types of behavior. From this approach, we can begin to examine various spheres of action within the consumer society, and how they conflict with one another.

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

Largely, the analysis that will be provided here will be interpretative in nature. The data collected is the result of fieldwork done at a local shopping mall. The mall serves as the social milieu, or a larger sphere, in which behavior is exhibited on the part of children. The toy store serves as a smaller sphere within the larger unit. Each sphere is represented by a moral agent, an individual or entity which is charged with the responsibility of formulating and enforcing rules. We should not forget the smallest of the spheres - the family unit - where the parents serve as moral agents. No doubt that they have the responsibility for, and a vested interest in, regulating their children's behavior.

Observations of children's behaviors were made over a four week period. The observer was unknown to any of the participants and was stationed in an unobtrusive position inside the shopping facility. Detailed observations of adult-child interactions were made at several locations within the Mall. In addition to field observations, the investigator interviewed the director of security for the mall, as well as the manager of the toy store in order to get a sense of the formal and informal behaviors which were deemed acceptable within each sphere. Additional time was spent reviewing the formal policy statements which were provided by the security director.

Overall, data has been collected on three levels: 1) norms and rules within the larger sphere (the mall), 2) norms and rules within the smaller sphere (the toy store), and 3) actual observations of behavior within the social setting. The data also includes various interaction styles which were used by parents in regulating their children's behavior.

ETHNOGRAPHIC DATA AND ANALYSIS

We shall now consider the setting of the mall in the light of a power-reflexive interpretative analysis. The larger setting, or front region consists of that area which the individual actor first confronts as he/she enters the social context. We should consider how the environment is structured, as well as reflect on the messages that are sent to the individual actors as they enter the social stage.

Upon first entering the mall, one immediately sees a sign which details the formal rules which govern behavior within the mall, and are posted at every entrance into the facility. When discussing these rules with the

Security Director of the facility, he remarked that the reason for the rules was to serve the protection of the individuals who are using the shopping facilities. Thus, in conformance with consensus theory, the rules of the Mall are designed to protect the greater welfare of the individuals within the facility. On the surface this would appear to be true, however, upon deeper reflection the formal rules also serve the need to create a conducive environment which encourages the consumption of goods sold by the various entities within the facility.

Out of twenty-seven rules which are listed on the placard, six are directed primarily towards the regulation of children's behavior. These include the following:

1. No loitering.
2. No attendance of children (under age 18) during school hours and unaccompanied by parents or guardians.
3. No running, horseplay, throwing any type of debris, disorderly or disruptive conduct of any nature.
4. No use of skateboards, roller skates, roller blades on mall property; use of bicycles in the mall concourse.
5. All persons entering the Shopping Center are required to wear shoes and be fully clothed.
6. No congregating in the Shopping Center or on Shopping Center property is permitted.

In our discussion, the security director stated the position that the rules served as formal statements of policy, but only a few of them are strictly enforced. Enforcement of the formal rules usually occurs when someone complains, or if the control agents (security personnel) witness behavior that is highly disruptive or disorderly. For example, formal policy states that children are not allowed to visit the mall without direct parental supervision. However, this is rarely the case with older children (ages 12 and up). This seemed to fit my own observations, as on numerous occasions I observed children in this age category roaming the facility without direct supervision by adults. However, I also observed a few instances where the agents of control - the security officers - stopped children who were walking by themselves, and asked them where their parents were. When asked about this the officer remarked that this rule is not enforced unless the children are breaking other rules, for example, the rules against disruptive

conduct. One should ask who it is that they are disrupting? Perceptually, the other shoppers within the facility, thus the need for the control agent to intervene.

Many of the listed rules are more rigorously enforced at different points in time (specifically evening periods) in order to prevent gang related activities. Presumably, this is done to prevent gang-related violence which perceptually represents an inherent risk to the individuals within the mall. The bans against loitering, foul language, and congregating are readily enforced during the evenings. This fits my own observations, as I observed that more control agents are employed in the evenings. Moreover, they remain much more visible during this period as well.

It was noted in our discussion that in similar facilities gang-related clothing, colors, or symbols are not allowed to be worn or displayed within the facility. When asked about this, the director quickly cited the issue of public safety. When I inquired about any instances of serious gang-related violence within the facility, none was cited with the exception of what was referred to as "shoving matches" between members of congregating groups. The frequency of this form of physical violence remains extremely rare. In response to my further probing of this issue, it was stated that no one wants to shop in an environment that is dominated by groups of "irresponsible and impulsive" teenagers. In this statement, the social dynamics at play were revealed - actually, many, if not all of these rules, are designed to create the perception of a safe, predictable, and comforting environment - a context that is more inductive to the marketing and distribution of material goods. Informally, it was noted that most behaviors were acceptable as long as the children were supervised by their parents in a responsible way. The meaning of "responsible way" was left ambiguous. Thus informally, "anything goes" as long as it is done in a responsible manner, under the supervision of parents, and that it does not distract or disturb other shoppers.

As one enters the facility, at the main entrance, one can readily observe props which serve various functions in the regulation of children's behavior. As soon as one enters the facility she can observe what was labeled as a "candy station." This consisted of a round table which sat in the center of the walkway, about twenty feet from the main entrance. On top of the table, organized in circular fashion,

were twenty candy machines. Each machine held a different variety of candy, which could be purchased for a quarter. This serves as a control device which is directly related to another prop stationed nearby. Down the corridor, after leaving the candy station, one happens upon the stroller rental counter. It is here that parents can rent strollers so that their younger children can ride during their trip to the facility. It was noted on each of the days of observation that the rental desk was "sold out" of strollers. As the observer walked through the mall, one could see the children riding in the facility strollers. I was curious to find that a good number of children who were being pushed in the carts seemed too large to be forced to ride in a stroller. This important prop, which is distributed near the main entrance, goes hand in hand with the candy station. On numerous occasions, I observed an adult buying candy for their child, and then renting a stroller for them. The use of these two props is directed towards controlling the behavior of children, through limiting their mobility, as well as pacifying their impulses through the distribution of rewards.

As the field observations were done during the beginning of the Christmas buying season², I observed that on each end of the mall there were exhibits designed for children. On one end of the mall there was the typical "Santa Claus" scene, where children could visit with Santa, and have his/her picture taken with him. During the periods spent in the field, I observed that the waiting line for Santa was extremely long, and was to the most part made up of parents who had their children in strollers. On the other end of the facility was a sand house exhibit, which featured a large model of Santa Claus' workshop made entirely out of sand. The scene was surrounded by parents with small children, who obviously had brought their children to this area so that they could see the display. Also stationed strategically throughout the corridors of the facility were benches for sitting. The benches also served as important props, as parents and their children used these benches so that they could make periodic rest stops. These props were stationed every fifty feet or so, and more often than not were occupied by adults and children alike.

The second sphere of social action within the larger setting of the Mall consists of the many stores which make up the shopping facility. These sub-spheres are governed by

the same formal rules which govern the larger facility. However, in my discussions with the manager of the toy store, it was quickly deducible that the informal rules within this sphere of activity differ from other stores, as well as the larger context of the mall. It was noted by the manager that the store remained the one place in the mall for kids. Thus, informally, kids are allowed to "be kids" - free to roam, inquire, touch, and play on their own with less parental supervision. It was noted that as long as the parent of the child was in the store, the child was free to roam the facility on his/her own. The children were free to touch and play with items, and many were available to be examined and played with (or tried out) before purchase. This stands in stark contrast to the informal rules of other stores, where children are discouraged from roaming on their own, and from touching and playing with store items.

As one walks into the toy store one first observes a Christmas display which consisted of an elaborate model train display that was in operation. This prop served as an enticement which was the first stop of many of the children who came into the mall. It should be further noted that the entire front half of the store was designed so that kids could play with many of the products that are sold in the store. On one side there exists many shelves of stuffed animals, which the children are free to pick up and play with. Within the center aisle, there are several floor displays of play items which the children can pick up and use, such as game consoles, and other items for smaller children. In the center of the front region of the store were shelf units stocked with inexpensive smaller toys. This seemed to be the region which was occupied by the younger children. The back region of the store was stocked with larger, more expensive items, and was populated by older children, many of whom were walking through the mall without direct parental supervision.

In addition to the two larger spheres of action there also exists a third context for social action - the family unit. The parent also has a subjective expectation of behavior that is based on spoken and unspoken rules. Based on unobtrusive observations³ one can deduce some basic trends which governed the behavior of younger children. Thus, the parent, as an agent of control, also attempted to structure interaction in a particular way in which to motivate a child to engage in what is perceived by the respective moral agents as more

proactive behavior.

DISCUSSION

According to the perspective which has been adopted for this analysis, each of the formal and informal rules serves some entities vested power interest. Additionally, the various components of the setting serve those interests as well. Thus far, three spheres with competing sets of rules and expected behaviors have been conceptualized: 1) the front region, or the main structures of the shopping facility, 2) the back regions, or the small component stores that together make up the larger facility, and 3) the family unit, which has its own sets of rules and expectations that are followed in larger contexts. While it may appear on the surface that they may often conflict, participant observations found that this was not the case between the Mall and its component stores. Instead, it was the interests of the larger two spheres that often clashed with the third - the family. While the structures of the mall are meant to induce buying behavior on the part of individuals, the family unit attempts to structure behavior in a way that minimizes situations where the parent must buy goods for the child purely as a means of pacifying their impulses. Thus, while the toy store is very good at attempting to induce impulsive whims and desires on the part of children, parents are very good at preventing the children from fulfilling impulsive desires.⁴

The proper starting point for analysis would must be a critical interpretation of the formal rules which govern the facility. Critically examining these norms allows one to comprehend the profit and sales motives which underlie the formal structure of shopping facilities. *Who's interest do these rules serve?* As stated earlier, the first response by the mall's security director was that the rules served to protect the interests of the shopping public. Perceptions of violent gang behavior were utilized to provide a rationality for various rules. However, upon further examination, it was revealed that incidents of gang-related violence are extremely rare, perhaps even unheard of in the context of the local shopping mall. Going back to the formal rules we see bans against loitering, unsupervised minors, horseplay, running, certain forms of clothing, and congregating. Additionally, the rules prescribe bans against the distribution of handbills, sales of merchandise in the parking lot, radios, and smoking. Largely, the rules are designed so that the

perception of safety, comfort, and undisturbed shopping can be commodified and sold to the mass public. Such images say "Come shop here, it's great!" Those merchants who make up the facility must protect this image, for without it, the shopping public might decide to not visit the facility. The formal rules help to create the perceptions which are needed in order for the maintenance of a large volume of shopping traffic.

This appears to be the case in the smaller regions as well. Most stores have informal bans against children playing with merchandise and prefer that parents keep strict control over their children. Often children are not allowed to pick up items, or wander through the stores on their own. *Why so?* Again, it does not serve the overall contextual needs for mass distribution of goods and services. Children wandering through the stores may disrupt other consumers, they may necessitate the intervention of store staff (who prefer to spend their time selling goods), or even may break items, or make them unsellable to other individuals. However, in the context of the toy store, the informal norms necessitate the free flow of children through the smaller facility as its products are marketed directly toward this population, a population whose members often impulsively demand that parents make purchases for them.

Next, we shall consider the use of props, and determine if they too are designed to assist in the facilities mass distribution of goods. Consider the case of the strollers and candy machine. Right at the mall entrance we see control devices distributed which help parents assist in controlling their impulsive children. The strollers act as devices which restrict child mobility, and as we observed, a large number of children in the strollers could have walked through the facility on their own. The candy serves as a ready supply of rewards which the parent can distribute to his/her child in order to motivate the child to engage in contextual appropriate behaviors. Thus, the mall provides control devices to the parent which are utilized so that the child does not disturb other shoppers through engaging in negative behavior.

Consider the props of Santa Claus and the sand castle. On the surface level, it would appear that these do not necessarily create more buying on the part of adults. However, on closer reflection it becomes obvious that these exhibits were strategically placed on opposite

ends of the mall. In order to view them, one must travel from one end of the store to the other. In making such a journey, the adult invariably passes many more stores, and as a result will probably stop in one or more of them. Thus, the placement of such props helps to increase traffic flow which is essential to the economic goals of the shopping facility.

The case of the benches provides another example. In addition to providing a resting point for parents, it also provides other contexts where parents can more readily interact with their children and provide them needed attention. Through most of the shopping experience the child is ignored, as the parent attends to his/her own wants and needs. The benches provide another method of control for the parent, so that the child's impulses can be regulated with more ease. I observed that most of the individuals utilizing these resting points were engaged in direct interaction and conversation with their children, thus giving the child attention that he/she needs in order to function in the other-directed consumer society. Positive behaviors can be rewarded, negative behaviors can be discussed. So as with the strollers and candy, the benches serve as another prop which assists the parent in controlling the behavior of his/her child.

Additionally, during the field observations it was observed that outside the toy store benches were noticeably absent. In front of this smaller sphere of activity was approximately forty feet of corridor. In the rest of the facility, two benches usually divided such areas. Upon examining the floor, it was observable that at one time benches had occupied this space, as tiles had been removed where the benches had been secured to the ground.⁵ It is deducible that if benches had been in place, a large number of parents would have used them to rest outside while their children visited the toy store. The absence of such props dictates that the parents now enter the store with their children - which makes it easier for the store to sell products to them.

We have already discussed the shifting of informal norms as one leaves the larger mall and enters the toy store. The front of the toy store is designed entirely to entice children into the store, often with reluctant parents in tow. The children are allowed to roam free, as it makes it easier for them to develop impulsive whims which results in frequent cries of "can I have this?" First, the train display serves as an enticement into the store. From there,

the front is filled with touch me items, or items that the children can play with. The stuffed animals on the wall, the center shelves with smaller, more inexpensive items are strategically placed. As children freely interact with such items, it becomes much easier for the store to sell them to their parents.

The family unit also has its own interests and power structure. The parents retain power as they maintain control over the distribution of rewards and punishments, as well as the source of the basic needs of the child. Within the larger two contexts the parent has an additional interest - to control the behavior of the children, and to largely avoid having to make the ritual purchase at the toy store in order to pacify the child's impulses. In analyzing the observations, it was necessary to categorize the different methods of control which were utilized by parents. The sample of observations were organized into six distinct modes of interaction between parents and their children.

First, there is the process that I refer to as the "two by two in" which consists of two adults and one or more children. While walking through the facility, the two parents form the boundaries on both sides of the children. I have referred to this form of control as the "two by two". "In" refers to a family unit which walked through the facility in two by two form, but when coming to the toy store, the adults allowed the children to enter toy store. Secondly, there is what can be conceptualized as the "two by two avoid." This refers to two by two interaction while walking through the mall, but when coming to the toy store the children were not allowed to enter, and the family continued its journey through the facility. Thirdly, the "hand in" method refers to the situation where the adult holds the child's hand in place while walking through the mall's corridors. Once coming to the toy store, the parents released the child's hand, the child ventured into the store, and the parent followed. Next, "hand out" refers to a hand-holding method of control where the family did not enter the toy store. Fifth, the "avoid path" style of interaction refers to a method where the parents took a different path through the corridor in order to avoid walking directly in front of the toy store entrance. And last, strollers were also used, and I have used the term "stroller avoid" to note instances where the child's mobility was restrained by the use of a stroller, with the result being that the family simply walked past the

store.

Thus, the family as a separate sphere of action relied on various methods of controlling their children's behavior. The compilation of observations shows that in 64 percent of the sample the parent was able to use a form of control in order to prevent having to enter the toy store. Thus, they reinforce the norm that the family not enter the store, which invariably serves the parents vested interests in not making impulsive purchases. In such cases, the new informal norms of the toy store were not adopted by the family as they traveled through the mall. Only in 36 percent of the cases were the old rules of children's behavior shed, in favor of the more interactive norms guiding children's behavior within the toy store.

CONCLUSIONS

Throughout this discussion, it has been argued that both formal and informal norms invariably serve the interests of the entity vested with power relative to any particular social context where the rules regulate individual behavior. In the case at hand both the formal and informal norms within the larger mall serve to regulate behavior so that the environment remains conducive to the mass marketing and selling of consumer goods. We have also seen how the development of informal norms within the smaller context of the toy store were different, but only so because the change in norms served the same overriding interest - the selling of goods. The smallest of the spheres - the family unit - also has vested interests - largely, the saving of capital, or at least avoiding the situation where it is expended on impulsive desires on the part of the families youngest members. Adult-child interaction strategies served this interest to a large degree. In conclusion, this analysis has operated from a reflexive constructivist point of view, and the results obtained support the use of this critical perspective. More ethnography's are needed, which would aid in providing an adequate portrait of everyday experiences in consumer society.

ENDNOTES

1. It should be noted that I take Pfohl's perspective from his 1994 textbook as opposed to his scholarly monographs (1978 & 1992) as the former

gives a much broader approach which serves the purposes of this paper. For a more detailed examination of Pfohl's approach, and how it develops from within interactionist and affirmative postmodern boundaries see Chester and Segura (forthcoming).

2. The data here was collected during the 1995 Christmas shopping season.
3. No attempt was made in this study to directly interview a sample of parents; however, countless observations of parent-child interactions were made.
4. In line with Brown's (1979) findings, the use of common intervention strategies by parents did not seem to fall across class or racial lines.
5. In each of my interviews with facility and store personnell, no one claimed to know why or when the benches in this location were removed.

REFERENCES

- Brown BW 1979 Parent's discipline of children in public places *Family Coordinator* 28 1 67-71
- Boyle CE 1995 Seeing gender in everyday life: a field trip to the mall *Teaching Sociology* 23 2 150-154
- Chambliss WJ 1969 ed *Crime and the Legal Process* NY: McGraw-Hill
- Chester TM, CB Segura forthcoming. The rise of the postmodern left *Current Perspectives in Social Theory*
- Durkheim DE [1893] 1933 *The Division of Labor in Society* trans. G Simpson NY: Free Press
- Goffman E 1959 *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* NY: Doubleday
- Graham DF et al 1991 Going to the mall: a leisure activity of urban elderly people *Canadian J Aging* 10 4 345-358
- Pfohl S 1978 *Predicting Dangerousness: The Social Construction of Psychiatric Reality* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books
- _____ 1992 *Death at the Parasite Cafe: Social Science (Fictions) and the Postmodern* NY: St. Martin's Press
- _____ 1994 *Images of Deviance and Social Control* NY: McGraw-Hill
- Ross EA 1901 *Social Control* NY: Macmillan
- Schnact SP, PN Unnithan 1991 Mall walking and urban sociability *Sociological Spectrum* 11 4 351-367
- Sumner WG 1906 *Folkways* Boston: Ginn
- Thompson WE, JV Hickey 1989 Myth, identity and social interaction: encountering Santa Claus at the mall *Qualitative Sociology* 12 4 371-389
- Turk A 1977 Class, conflict, and criminalization *Sociological Focus* 10 209-220
- Vold GB 1958 *Theoretical Criminology* NY: Oxford U Press
- White DR, G Hellerick 1994 Nietzsche at the mall: deconstructing the consumer *Canadian J Political Social Theory* 17 1-2 76-99

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author thanks Howard B. Kaplan, John R. Cross, and Howard Robboy for their comments on earlier drafts of this paper.