

Mead and Goffman Comparison

Posted on July 27, 2022

View this essay online:

<https://academic-master.com/mead-and-goffman-comparison/>

Introduction

George Herbert Mead and [Erving Goffman](#) developed influential accounts of the social self, but they addressed different questions about how identity is formed and sustained. Mead explains how self-consciousness develops through communication, role-taking, play, organized games, and the internalization of wider social expectations. His approach is developmental and philosophical: the self becomes possible because people can take the perspective of others and respond to themselves as objects. Goffman begins largely with socially competent actors and examines how they manage encounters, present identities, protect face, cooperate in performances, and distinguish between public and private regions of interaction. Both approaches reject the idea of a completely private self that exists independently of society, yet neither reduces individuals to passive products of social pressure. Mead preserves spontaneity through the “I,” while Goffman emphasizes the skill required to manage situations. Read together, their theories explain both how a social self emerges and how that self is performed in everyday life (Mead, 1934/2015; Goffman, 1959).

Mead and the Development of the Social Self

Mead’s account begins with the claim that a fully developed self is not present at birth. Children acquire selfhood by learning significant symbols, especially language, and by becoming able to imagine how their conduct appears from another person’s standpoint. In the play stage, a child takes the role of a significant other, such as a parent, teacher, doctor, or fictional character. In the game stage, the child coordinates several roles and rules at once, as a player must understand teammates, opponents, positions, and the shared structure of play. This more complex perspective-taking supports the generalized other, Mead’s term for the organized attitudes of a wider community that an individual takes into account. His distinction between the “I” and the “me” captures an ongoing process rather than two separate personalities. The “me” represents internalized social expectations, while the “I” is the person’s response to them. Because that response cannot be predicted completely in advance, Mead leaves room for novelty, resistance, and social change within a self that remains fundamentally social (Mead, 1934/2015).

Goffman and the Performance of Identity

Goffman's dramaturgical perspective shifts attention from the development of selfhood to the organization of face-to-face encounters. Social interaction resembles a performance because people enter situations in which others form impressions and act on those impressions. Individuals use appearance, language, setting, timing, manner, and cooperation with others to sustain a workable definition of what is happening. The front stage is the region where a performance is presented to an audience, while the backstage allows preparation, relaxation of some front-stage expectations, discussion of the audience, and repair of mistakes. These regions are analytical rather than absolute; backstage conduct also has rules and observers. Impression management does not mean that every performance is deceptive. A physician, teacher, server, manager, or grieving family member may regulate conduct sincerely because the situation requires professionalism or tact. Goffman's central insight is that social order depends on coordinated presentation. Identities become credible through repeated interaction, and audiences often cooperate by overlooking small errors or giving performers opportunities to recover from embarrassment (Goffman, 1959).

Where Mead and Goffman Converge and Diverge

The strongest similarity between Mead and Goffman is that both treat society as constitutive of the self rather than as an external force acting on an already complete individual. Mead shows how people acquire the ability to see themselves from social perspectives; Goffman shows how those socially meaningful identities are enacted before particular audiences. Both also allow for multiple selves without assuming dishonesty. A person may be a parent, employee, student, patient, friend, and citizen, and each role activates different expectations. Situational variation therefore does not automatically prove that one role is false and another authentic. The key difference is analytical level. Mead asks how mind and self become possible and how individual action relates to social order. Goffman usually begins after those capacities have developed and studies meetings, services, ceremonies, institutions, and interaction rituals. Mead's social order rests partly on internalized perspectives and the generalized other; Goffman's order is more fragile, sustained through performances, tact, face-work, and repair. Together they show that social stability requires both deep socialization and continuous moment-to-moment maintenance (Stryker, 2008).

Face, Teams, Power, and Institutions

Goffman's concepts of face and performance teams deepen the comparison because they show how identity is collectively protected. Face is the positive social value a person claims through the line taken in an encounter. Contradiction, exposure, or a visible mistake can threaten that claim, prompting apology, humor, avoidance, correction, or assistance from others. Performance teams such as families, medical staff, coworkers, or service employees coordinate language and behavior to

maintain a shared definition of events. Power matters because some actors have greater authority to define the situation, classify others, or decide which mistakes deserve protection. This point helps answer a common criticism that symbolic interactionism pays too little attention to institutions and inequality. Goffman's later work on stigma and total institutions shows how classifications and organizational control can reshape identity, while Mead's generalized other can be understood as contested rather than perfectly unified. Contemporary analysis can therefore connect their micro-level insights with race, gender, class, disability, bureaucracy, and professional authority without abandoning the central claim that meanings are produced through interaction (Goffman, 1961; Goffman, 1963).

Identity in Digital Interaction

Digital communication demonstrates why the two theories remain useful. Social-media users anticipate audiences, select photographs, edit text, manage privacy settings, and maintain different profiles in ways that resemble Goffman's impression management. At the same time, likes, comments, group norms, and imagined public reactions become social feedback that users can internalize, closely resembling Mead's account of perspective-taking and the generalized other. The boundary between front and backstage becomes unstable because supposedly private messages can be recorded, forwarded, or exposed to unintended audiences. Metrics also make evaluation unusually visible: follower counts and engagement statistics can become simplified indicators of social approval even when users know that those measures do not capture the whole self. Digital identity is therefore neither entirely artificial nor entirely independent of offline life. It is another environment in which people develop expectations about how others see them and strategically present themselves. Mead helps explain how social evaluation enters self-understanding, while Goffman clarifies how people organize the performances through which that self becomes publicly recognizable.

Conclusion

Mead and Goffman offer complementary rather than competing theories of identity. Mead explains the emergence of self-consciousness through significant symbols, role-taking, play, organized games, the generalized other, and the continuing conversation between the socially organized "me" and the spontaneous "I." Goffman analyzes what happens when socially formed actors enter encounters and must present identities, coordinate with others, protect face, and respond to disruption. Their difference is therefore mainly one of focus: Mead provides a theory of the genesis and structure of the social self, while Goffman provides a micro-sociology of its situational performance. Both reject the idea that identity can be understood as a sealed inner essence detached from relationships. At the same time, neither requires that people be mere conformists, because action involves interpretation, improvisation, and the possibility of changing expectations. Used together, the two perspectives explain how society becomes part of the person and how persons continually reproduce, negotiate, and sometimes transform society through everyday interaction (Mead, 1934/2015; Goffman, 1959;

Stryker, 2008).

References

Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Anchor Books.

Goffman, E. (1961). *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates*. Anchor Books.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. Prentice-Hall.

Mead, G. H. (2015). *Mind, Self, and Society: The Definitive Edition*. University of Chicago Press.
(Original work published 1934)

Stryker, S. (2008). From Mead to a structural symbolic interactionism and beyond. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 34, 15-31.