

Zeitschrift: Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Soziologie = Revue suisse de sociologie
= Swiss journal of sociology

Herausgeber: Schweizerische Gesellschaft für Soziologie

Band: 18 (1992)

Heft: 2

Artikel: A new paradigm for the sociology of knowledge : "The social construction of reality" after 25 years

Autor: Eberle, Thomas Samuel

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-814525>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 14.12.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

A NEW PARADIGM FOR THE SOCIOLOGY OF KNOWLEDGE: “THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF REALITY” AFTER 25 YEARS*

Thomas Samuel Eberle

Soziologisches Seminar, Hochschule St. Gallen

It was one of Alfred Schutz' major unrealized projects, prevented by his early death, to formulate a *new theoretical foundation for the sociology of knowledge*. His blend of phenomenology and Weberian sociology promised to locate the sociology of knowledge on new ground, redefining its perspective as well as its basic concepts. Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann, who had studied at the New School for Social Research in New York where Schutz had taught, decided to pursue this project when they met as junior members of the Graduate Faculty at their “Alma Mater”. The result was quite dramatic: a modern sociological “classic” was born.

The Social Construction of Reality by Berger and Luckmann has become one of the most cited sociological books of the past 25 years. Its title is, undoubtedly, one of their outstanding achievements. Its contents, however, while brilliantly written have possibly never been really understood by many of its readers. Some have said, rather maliciously, that the book sold so well because many engineers (mistakenly) bought it. Unfortunately, I may add, of the many sociologists who bought or cited the book only a few have studied it.

The current *twenty-fifth anniversary of Social Construction* invites us to reassess this book, to evaluate the impact it has exerted on the sociological landscape, and to examine its legacy.

1. The Book and its Message

The logic of the *Social Construction* was simple: Society must be grasped in its duality as an “objective” and a “subjective” reality. The objective social reality, although produced by social action, appears to the individual as separate and independent from him or her. The subjective side consists in the consciousness an actor has, shaped in pervasive processes of socialization, and sustained and modified in daily interactions. In this duality the seeming

* This is a vastly elaborated version of Eberle 1992. I am grateful to Deirde Boden and to Christopher Prendergast for their helpful comments and their generosity to let me tap extensively their native speakers' language competence.

dichotomy of Durkheim and Weber was reconciled, and the basic question for sociological theory could be put as follows: “How is it possible that subjective meanings *become* objective facticities” (Berger & Luckmann, 1967, 30)? To avoid intricate philosophical reflections, they defined the key terms from the point of view of the natural attitude: “It will be enough, for our purposes, to define ‘reality’ as a quality appertaining to phenomena that we recognize as having a being independent of our volition (we cannot ‘wish them away’), and to define ‘knowledge’ as the certainty that phenomena are real and that they possess specific characteristics” (Berger & Luckmann, 1967, 13). The *revolutionary idea* was to declare *common sense knowledge* as a central focus for the sociology of knowledge. Traditionally, the sociology of knowledge has been preoccupied with the history of ideas only; now, it must concern itself “with everything that passes for ‘knowledge’ in society” (ibid., 26).

The authors’ main thesis that reality is socially constructed, and that sociology has to study the ways in which this is done, was striking. The book resurrected Alfred Schutz’ phenomenological analysis of the life-world, used it to clarify basic sociological concepts like role and institution, and offered a new synthesis not only of Weber and Durkheim, but also of Mead and philosophical anthropology (Gehlen and Plessner). Berger and Luckmann’s explication of the media through which social order is objectified – typification, signs, symbols, habitualization, and so on – rendered deep insights into the richness of human interaction. Their analysis of the relationship between social institutions and the symbolic worlds of meaning (Sinnwelten) which legitimize them proved how conventional jargon about the “logic of institutions” obscured the actual processes through which institutions become social realities. They presented a sociological theory which conceived of social actors as competent humans, evaded sociological reifications, and abjured the widespread arrogance of social scientists (who at the time loved to talk of “false consciousness” and Freudian “unconscious constraints”, properly identified, of course, only by themselves). But above all they made clear how naive an objectivist stance towards social reality is. Put simply: The *how* of social phenomena has to be explicated before we can attend to the *what* and the *why*.

2. Social Construction and Ideology

The book was received well by its critics. Indeed, at a time when the prevalence of Parsonian structural-functionalism was eroding and the “coming crisis of Western sociology” (Gouldner, 1970) was being discussed, *Social Construction* gave new orientation to many sociologists. It offered a new reading of several

sociological classics – different from Parsons' interpretation in his *Structure of Social Action* (Parsons, 1937) – and linked their perspectives in a fresh way. As Charles Lemert (1992, 10) puts it in retrospect: "To this day, I cannot think of a single book that presents with such exquisite parsimony so many different ideas so well."

Although Berger as well as Luckmann agree that they would change very little in the book if they were to rewrite it today (Berger 1992, 1), its impact on American sociology remained – in the authors' view – somewhat marginal. One reason was that both authors were situated "in an emphatically peripheral, non-elite institution" (ibid.). The other was "the orgy of ideology and utopianism that erupted all over the academic scene in the late 1960's, almost immediately after the publication of our book. Neither Luckmann nor I had any sympathy with this *Zeitgeist* ..." (ibid.). But it was this context, as I shall point out, which shaped a specific – and mislead – reception of their book.

In this respect, the situation in Europe was quite similar. *Social Construction* was translated in many languages. In Germany, for example, it was published at S. Fischer in 1970, opening the new series "Conditio Humana", and was introduced by the great Helmuth Plessner. Interestingly enough, it was not reviewed by the renowned *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*. Otherwise it was well received. Book reviewers commended the new, un-ideological approach, praised the comparatively low price of a high-quality book and expressed amazement that an American original was published in German within only three (actually four) years.¹ Although the sociology of knowledge used to be a pet theme of German readers (as Plessner notes in the introduction), *Social Construction* did not have an easy time of it. When structural functionalism and quantitative sociology – both imported from the United States after World War II – confronted growing criticism in the sixties, it was the Frankfurt school as well as neo-Marxism which reaped the benefit. Then, after Habermas entered into a well-publicized debate with Niklas Luhmann (who defended a functionalist systems theory blending Parsonian and phenomenological concepts), the two became the most cited and quoted German sociologists of the period.

In this intellectual context, in the United States as well as in Europe, *Social Construction* was often interpreted with a special twist. Many left-liberal veterans of the '60s turned to this book to make sense of life and sociology, detecting the *arbitrariness* of social constructions (cf. Lemert, 1992, 10).

1 Helmut Dahmer in *Soziale Welt* (1970/71), Wolf Lepenies in *FAZ* (1969) und F. U. Pappi in *Sociologica Ruralis* (1971) and many others. I thank Thomas Luckmann for giving me his whole set of collected reviews of the book, and for a very illuminating discussion.

"Constructionism" became a radical perspective which helped to reveal reality, to strip it of ideological distortions, and to pave the way for new interpretations. Academic feminism is a particularly prominent example for this view. As inspiring as such an interpretation can be, it is far indeed from Berger and Luckmann's intentions. Thus Luckmann assures: "whenever someone mentions 'constructivism' or even 'social constructionism', I run for cover these days" (Luckmann, 1992, 4). And Berger sees much of the "constructivist" literature as coming from the aforementioned "ideological cauldron with which I have no affinity whatever" (Berger, 1992, 2).

Instead, Berger and Luckmann advocated an *empirical sociology of knowledge* which investigates the intricate ways in which reality is socially constructed. They adhered to the Weberian maxim that a scientist's task is to describe and explain social actions and their consequences as they are, but not to proclaim any political stance how things should be. In practice, this maxim of *Werturteilsfreiheit* has to be seen in its own complexities: Any empirical description or proposition makes use of typifications which are embedded in systems of relevancies, i. e. necessarily has its value implications. Thus, to see existing social constructions on different premises may well sharpen one's eyes for how they are constructed, as both Schutz and Simmel have shown thoroughly with their analyses of being a stranger.² The main problem is not the search for arbitrariness in social constructions, but the way such research is done. I would agree here with Mary F. Rogers who brands "theoretical tokenism" which unduly limits the impact of Berger and Luckmann's book: "*Social Constructionism* often serves as little more than a theoretical shibboleth accompanied by a few flat propositions about how people 'construct' their identities, worldviews, and taken-for-granted ways of managing their affairs" (1992, 6).

3. Phenomenology and Sociology

On the other hand, even many of those who called themselves "*phenomenological sociologists*" did not grasp the logic of Berger and Luckmann's paradigm correctly. Many overlooked the central fact that the authors introduced their dualistic conception of the society as an objective and a subjective reality by a part they explicitly called "*philosophical prolegomena*" and as such "*pre-sociological*": the *phenomenological analysis* of the foundations of knowledge in everyday life. They draw a strict line between a phenomenological analysis

2 Schutz (1964) and Simmel (1968[1908])

of the life-world and a sociological analysis of society: Both are “empirical”, although not in the same sense; while the phenomenological method is “egological”, the social scientific method is “cosmological” (cf. Luckmann, 1973). In this sense, much of what has been labelled as “phenomenological sociology” had little to do with phenomenology and not much to do with sociology either!

It is one of the shortcomings of *Social Construction*, in my view, that Berger and Luckmann excluded epistemological and methodological considerations. I admit that tactically this may have been a good move: It stressed their intention to proclaim an *empirical* sociology of knowledge (as a “*Wirklichkeitswissenschaft*”) which clearly differed from the older tradition, and it opened the door to the many social scientists who dislike any philosophical binding. However, they also risked broad misunderstandings of fundamental concepts and missed out on a fuller analytic empowerment through Schutz’ life-world analyses. For many it remained obscure why sociology should care about consciousness and subjective meanings, given their concern with social actions and social facts. Why should they not restrict their attention to external, observable behavior? Yet, it is Schutz’ critical epistemological contribution to analyze in rich detail the act of interpretation (*Verstehen*) in everyday life as well as in the social sciences. The formal meaning structures of the (phenomenologically analyzed) life-world provides, on an *epistemological* level, a frame in which the *hermeneutic task* of any sociological analysis, qualitative or quantitative, inevitably has to be pursued. How (socially derived) subjective knowledge involved in concrete human actions can be explicated by the sociologist is a *methodological* issue. Its implications, however, are always epistemological.

Thus, it is highly illuminating to examine *Social Construction* in the context of the *Structures of the Life-World* (Schutz & Luckmann 1973, 1989) and of the respective authors’ methodological writings (Luckmann 1973, for one; Berger & Kellner 1981). In this light, it becomes clear that the rather terse term “construction” parallels “constitution”: *Construction* is a social process and has to be analyzed by sociology; the *constitution* of meaning is a subjective process which takes place in consciousness and has to be analyzed by phenomenology. Moreover, for readers bothered by the rather loose definitions of some central concepts in *Social Construction* (like “knowledge”, “reality”, “objectification” and so on), fine-grained specifications of each term can be found in the *Structures of the Life-World*. Even for those skeptical of the potential of phenomenological analyses to evade the reflexive circle, few other books explicate human experience, knowledge and action, the different transcendencies and the complex interrelatedness of subjective and intersubjective knowledge

in richer detail. Unfortunately, more than twenty years passed between the first publication of *Social Construction* and the publication of the second volume of *Structures of the Life-World*. This may have been one reason that the intimate relationship between the two has been recognized by rather few. In the intervening years, as indicated above, the reception of these basic ideas had taken quite diverse and often divergent routes.

4. Social Constructionism and Subjective Constructivism

Interestingly enough, Berger and Luckmann considered the title *The Social Construction of Reality* as self-evident: they have never delivered a clear definition of what they meant by it. Furthermore, readers of translated versions of the book may well find that what is called “construction” or “constructed” in their language is expressed differently in the English original. But, all things considered, “social construction” obviously has different meanings. For one, the term “construction” has a static as well as a dynamic aspect. In its *static* aspect it denotes a reality-as-it-is (appears), in its *dynamic* aspect it means the *process* of reality-construction. Then again, it makes a difference if we see a natural landscape with its mountains, rivers, meadows, cows, farmhouses and so on – a *natural reality* shaped by our cultural knowledge – or if we gaze at a *society* which is produced, through and through, by human actions. To understand what is going on in society (e. g. in a social setting), the sociologist has to grasp the meanings the actors themselves employ and are embedded in.

It is one of the main theses of *Social Construction* that cultural constructs are socially stabilized by institutional structures. Constructions are thus not the subjective business of singular individuals. They are socially derived and intersubjectively shared and enacted. The *social constructionism* of Berger and Luckmann therefore stands in strong opposition to the *subjective constructivism* that people like Paul Watzlawick and others³ defend. The subjective construction of reality is always based on internalized cultural knowledge and – leaving aside deep pathological aberrations – coordinated with other human actors in interactions or collaboration. As Goffman poignantly puts it: “In some cases only a slight embarrassment flits across the scene in mild concern for those who tried to define the situation wrongly” (Goffman, 1974, 1).

Subjective constructivism leaves out just what *Social Construction* is all about: reality construction in interaction and conversation, by means of internalized

3 Cf. Watzlawick 1976, 1984.

social objectivations and typifications, stabilized by routines, institutionalizations and legitimations, and so on. Viewed against this background, subjective constructivism is ahistorical, asocial and blind to institutions. It is noteworthy that phenomenologists and adherents of the methodological individualism (in Weber's sense) have time and again encountered harsh criticism of being "too subjectivist", especially in American Sociology; but in fact, it is Berger and Luckmann – both phenomenologists as well as methodological individualists – who have always incisively rejected such flat subjectivism!

5. The Legacy

It was Berger and Luckmann's aim to "move the sociology of knowledge from the periphery to the very centre of sociological theory" (Berger & Luckmann, 1967, 29). They have partly succeeded: They managed to alter the consciousness of many sociologists and helped to institutionalize the "sociology of knowledge" as an acknowledged specialty in the sociological establishment. More encouraging may have been the fact that members of diverse disciplines, such as social psychologists, anthropologists, geographers, historians, ethologists and theologians also showed (and still show) a strong interest in *Social Construction*. If we consider, for instance, that a discipline like cognitive anthropology moved from the linguistic analysis of terms to the investigation of idioms and is now slowly arriving at the notion of *cultural knowledge* and its complex relation to *action*,⁴ we can appreciate just how far ahead Berger and Luckmann were twenty-five years ago.

In addition, *Social Construction* has undoubtedly played a crucial role in making the phenomenology of Alfred Schutz popular to sociologists. Nowadays, phenomenological concepts are found throughout different fields of sociology. The German grand theorists, Habermas and Luhmann, have incorporated phenomenological concepts as central elements. Presently, even rational choice theorists are attempting to integrate Schutz' work on "choosing among projects of action" to refine their approach.⁵ And in the United States, the so-called "neo-institutionalists" have developed an analysis that claims to draw directly on Social Construction.⁶ However, there is also a lively discussion under way

4 Cf., e. g., Holland & Quinn (1987).

5 Cf. Hartmut Esser (1991, 1992).

6 Cf. Powell & DiMaggio (1991).

about how adequate these theorists are in handling both the phenomenological framework and the social constructionist perspective and its concepts.⁷

Berger and Luckmann themselves stayed close to Schutz. Both agree that their collaboration ended only because of geographical reasons (Berger, 1992, 2; Luckmann, 1992, 4). They also chose, although remaining compatible in principle, to follow different roads of theoretical development. Berger has repeatedly advocated to return to the “big questions” which are, in his understanding, of a “macrosociological” sort (Berger, 1992, 2). His major intellectual focus after *Social Construction* became the problems of modernization and Third World Development. Since 1985 he has been Director of the Institute for the Study of Economic Culture at Boston University, working with an interdisciplinary group of social scientists. He still holds that the way *Social Construction* related “events within institutional structures to movements within the consciousness of individuals” is the best guide to deal with social issues: “the very concept of ‘economic culture’, denoting the interface between economic institutions and various elements of culture (ideas, religion, morality, lifestyles), lends itself beautifully to elaborations in terms of the sociology of knowledge” (Berger, 1992, 2).

Luckmann, who has been at the University of Constance since 1970, was first engaged in editing Schutz’ *Structures of the Life-World*. He then turned to what Berger would term a “microsociological” analysis, namely a program for the investigation of concrete communicative processes:

These conceptual links, called by some a ‘theory’ of communicative genres, start from the assumption that for recurring communicative problems in social interactions, more or less obligatory patterns of the organization of the communicative process are constructed socially. The system of genres in use, as well as less obligatorily structured communication in social milieus and institutions, may be conceived as the communicative budget of a society. I am convinced that a description of continuities and changes in communicative budgets is a prerequisite for the description and explanation of social stability and change. It provides the formal empirical basis for a study of the manifold historical permutations of the social construction of reality. The first studies guided by that theoretical program looked at communicative processes which reconstruct various kinds of pasts: alarm calls to the fire

⁷ Cf. the methodological discussion of meaning adequacy in Eberle (1984). Concerning Habermas’ concept of “life-world”, see Matthiesen (1984); regarding Esser’s interpretation of Schutz, see the critique by Prendergast (1992) and Srubar (1992).

department, gossip, conversational transmissions of information and wisdom, religious conversion stories, recapitulations of television programs, etc. The next four-year study will focus on 'moralizing' genres. The data will consist of public debates during the Gulf War, 'pastoral' counselling on radio programs, anti-smoking campaigns, local ecology appeals, pro- and anti-abortion arguments in various public and semi-public contexts, and the like. (Luckmann, 1992, 4 f.)

Luckmann has continued to influence quite a strong group of German sociologists. In analyzing what Berger and Luckmann (1967, 78) called the "conversational apparatus" in which a common sense of reality is constructed as an ongoing accomplishment in face-to-face situations, they borrow widely from ethnomethodology, ethnography, conversation analysis, symbolic interactionism, cognitive anthropology, and other specialties. By investigating the processes of reality construction locally and in situ, they complement the general level of analysis in *Social Construction* and materialize what had been Berger and Luckmann's goal from the outset: to found an *empirical sociology of knowledge*.

REFERENCES

- BERGER Peter L., "Reflections on the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of The Social Construction of Reality", *Perspectives*, 15/2, 1 f.
- BERGER Peter L. & KELLNER Hansfried (1981): *Sociology Reinterpreted: an Essay on Method and Vocation*, Anchor Press/Doubleday, Garden City, N. Y.
- BERGER Peter L. & LUCKMANN Thomas (1967), *The Social Construction of Reality; a Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*, Penguin, Harmondsworth (Original: Doubleday, Garden City, N. Y. 1966).
- DAHMER Helmut (1970/71), "Berger/Luckmann (Buchbesprechung)", *Soziale Welt*, XXX/1.
- EBERLE Thomas S. (1984), *Sinnkonstitution in Alltag und Wissenschaft. Der Beitrag der Phänomenologie an die Methodologie der Sozialwissenschaften*, Paul Haupt, Bern/Stuttgart.
- EBERLE Thomas S. (1992), "*Social Construction in Context*", *Perspectives*, 15/2, 7 f.
- ESSER Hartmut (1991), *Alltagshandeln und Verstehen. Zum Verhältnis von erklärender und verstehender Soziologie am Beispiel von Alfred Schütz und "Rational Choice"*, J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen.
- ESSER Hartmut (1992), "The Rationality of Everyday Behavior: A 'Rational Choice's Reconstruction of the Theory of Action of Alfred Schutz", *Rationality and Society* (October 1992, in press).
- GOFFMAN Erving (1974), *Frame Analysis. An Essay on the Organization of Experience*, Harper Colophon, New York.
- GOULDNER Alvin (1970), *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology*, Basic Books, New York/London.
- HOLLAND Dorothy & QUINN Naomi, *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

- LEMERT Charles (1992), "What's real after all these years?", *Perspectives*, 15/2, 10 f.
- LEPENIES Wolf (1969), "Praktische Theorie. Über die Rolle des Wissens", *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 10. 6. 1969.
- LUCKMANN Thomas (1973), "Philosophy, Science, and Everyday Life", in NATANSON Maurice, Ed., *Phenomenology and the Social Sciences*, Northwestern University Press, Evanston/Ill., 143–185.
- LUCKMANN Thomas (1992), *Social Construction and After*, *Perspectives*, 15/2, 4 f.
- MATTHIESEN Ulf (1984), *Das Dickicht der Lebenswelt und die Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns*, Wilhelm Fink (Übergänge), München.
- PAPPI F. U. (1971), "Berger/Luckmann (Buchbesprechung)", *Sociologia Ruralis*, 1, 121 f.
- PARSONS Talcott (1937), *The Structure of Social Action*, MacGraw-Hill, New York.
- POWELL Walter W. & DIMAGGIO Paul J., eds. (1991): *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, Chicago University Press, Chicago.
- PRENDERGAST Christopher (1992), "Rationality, Optimality and Choice: Esser's Reconstruction of Alfred Schutz's Theory of Action", *Rationality and Society* (October 1992, in press).
- ROGERS Mary F. (1992), "Weather Vanes, Tokens and Texts", *Perspectives*, 15/2, 6.
- SCHUTZ Alfred (1964), "The Stranger: An Essay in Social Psychology", in: SCHÜTZ Alfred, *Collected Papers*, II, S. 91–105.
- SCHUTZ Alfred & LUCKMANN Thomas (1973, 1989), *The Structures of the Life-World*, Vol. I+II, Northwestern University Press, Evanston/Ill.
- SIMMEL Georg (1968 [1908]), *Soziologie. Untersuchungen über die Formen der Vergesellschaftung.*, Duncker & Humblot, Berlin.
- SIMPSON George (1967), "Berger/Luckmann (Book-Review)", *American Sociological Review*, 32, 137 f.
- SOEFFNER Hans-Georg (1992), "Reconstruction instead of Constructivism: Twenty-Five Years of The Social Construction of Reality", *Perspectives*, 15/2, 8 f.
- SRUBAR Ilja (1992), "Limits of Rational Choice", *Rationality and Society* (October 1992, in press).
- WATZLAWICK Paul (1976), *How Real Is Real? Confusion, Disinformation, Communication*, Vintage Books, New York.
- WATZLAWICK Paul, Ed. (1984), *The Invented Reality: How Do We Know What We Believe We Know? Contributions to Constructivism*, Norton, New York.

Author's address:

Dr. Thomas S. Eberle, Soziologisches Seminar, Hochschule St. Gallen
Tigerbergstrasse 2, CH-9000 St. Gallen