

Theory of Labeling: Contemporary Concepts of the Sociological Understanding of Deviance

Aleksandar Jovanoski Ph. D.¹ Agron Rustemi Ph. D.²

Abstract - The paper presents an overview of the emergence, establishment and current status with the latest development of labeling theory within sociological paradigms - especially in the area of sociological explanation of the causes of social deviations. In addition to the bioanthropological, psychological, medical, and criminological explanations for the causes of deviant behavior, the theory of labeling is one of several sociological theories besides the theory of anomie, the theory of differential association, the theory of self-esteem, and the theory of self-control. Starting with the early work of the founders of the theory of labeling Howard Baker in the early 1960s, and Erwin Goffman on the impact of stigma on people with disabilities and the construction of their social identity, the text examines the latest achievements to this theory, which considers the causes of deviant behavior solely as a reflection of the social reaction. The theory of labeling belongs to the wider circle of theories for the social construction of deviant behavior. The paper also lists the critiques of the theory of labeling. The re-actualization of the sociological interest in the theory of labeling in recent years is conditioned by the impact that the Internet has on everyday life and thus on our own experience of ourselves and the perception of our experience in the eyes of others. Today in the era of viral and networked society, the perception of others about us greatly influences the decision to start a deviant life.

Index Terms: Howard Baker, label, labeling, stigma, Erwin Goffman, social deviation.

1. INTRODUCTION

The problem of defining human behavior is very old and can be said to date back to the very beginnings of the organization of human society. The desire of people, from ancient times to live in meaningful and organized communities, pushed them into the process of building appropriate systems of values, norms, customs, and in response to them and sanctions. These elements of culture later grew into institutes and institutions that constitute the basic structure of later political institutions and states. With the further process of standardization within the institutional response to the growing needs for division of labor and specialized knowledge, skills and art, the need to define acceptable and unacceptable ways to achieve individual goals has grown. At that moment or stage of development of human society, the need arises to define normal and acceptable behavior versus abnormal and unacceptable. From time immemorial, the process of determining the socially acceptable behavior of individuals and groups has been followed by two major questions: first, what constitutes the content of social morality that ascribes permissible patterns of

behavior, and second, what is the instance that prescribes the criteria for acceptable and unacceptable behavior?

Regarding the second question, there is a wide range of answers to date, and depending on the periodization of the development of society, the sources of social morality are: the council of elders, the tribal elder, the tribal sorcerer, the powerful houses of slave owners, the church, the feudal lords, the state, and today it is a global society in which the rapid development of communications and information technology has contributed to the Internet playing a significant role in defining the good and the bad; of the acceptable and the unacceptable. Today, as never before in human history, we are witnessing the rapid and instantaneous emergence and development of new values, norms and cultural patterns of behavior, which are also rapidly becoming redundant and outdated. As for the answer to the first question, i.e., the content of social morality today, in the era of consumerism and the internet revolution, we can say that it is quite fluid, and moral relativism seems to be living its golden age. Attempts to scientifically explain the origins and motives of deviant behavior have led sociology to produce a number of theories. Sociological theories in addition to those of biology,

¹ Aleksandar Jovanoski is an associate professor at the Faculty of Law - Kicevo with over 15 years of academic career. University of St. Clement of Ohrid – Bitola, Law Faculty – Kicevo, Republic of N. Macedonia aleksandarjovanoski3@gmail.com

² Agron Rustemi is an associate professor at the Faculty of Contemporary Social Sciences with over 15 years of academic career. University of South-Eastern Europe Tetovo, Republic of N. Macedonia a.rustemi@seeu.edu.mk

anthropology and psychology today constitute a branched theoretical approach that is easily recognizable in sociopathological and criminological etiology. Starting from different positions in determining the source of deviant and criminal behavior, these scientific approaches point out various reasons for deviations, according to some are the biological, inherited and most often unchanging characteristics of man, according to others the psychological characteristics of the person and the internal life are to blame for deviant behavior. response to various stimuli, while others accuse society and the environment that surrounds the person as crucial for deviant and criminal behavior. These, third family or theories within the sociological paradigm are branched into several currents: the theory of anomie, the theory of differential association, the theory of self-esteem, the theory of social pressure, and the theory of labeling. The latter theory, or the theory of labeling seems special and different not only in terms of differences within the sociological paradigm but also in terms of bio-anthropological and psychological theories, for the sole reason that it insists on the mirror character of the formation of social identity and hence the reaction. locates the middle of individual behavior as the main initial trigger in the development of a deviant cultural pattern of behavior. This theory is so developed today that it notes theoretical views that explain how groups and institutions with their stigma contribute to initiating and strengthening the self-identity of the deviant and directly contribute to the development of a deviant career.

2. DEFINING STIGMA

The notion of stigma, or etiquette is quite old in social use and is found in almost all known cultures and stages of development of human society. Etymologically, the word stigma has Greek (ancient) roots and usually meant a sign or stamp that was imprinted on slaves, criminals, traitors, ostracized (persecuted) and meant them in various qualities. The label, among other things, signified ownership attitude towards slaves but also incriminating status of criminals or persecuted. In the Middle Ages, under the influence of the power of the Christian church, labels of witchcraft, heresy or delusion were imprinted on a certain type of women, eccentric men, but also on great number of scientists and politicians. That the stigma had a huge impact not only on the perception of others about the social reputation, work and general well-being of the labeled person, but also on the pure survival of the person and his family, having in mind particularly the practice of the Holy Inquisition of the Catholic Church which often without any evidence mostly on personal accusations and slanders, sent countless men and women to the stake. From this series of social stigmatizations, we should not forget the yellow stripes of the

Jews in the Second World War, who, given the consequences, have no counterpart in the human history of stigmatization. The process of stigmatization implies the determination of negative values and attributes by the community or society towards an individual (or group) so that the group, community or wider society that appears as an emitter of stigma has a superior position and disparages the omnipotent individual or the weaker group. Hence, the process of stigmatization is based on economic, political but often legal inequalities that exist in society, and stereotypes and prejudices are often the basis of stigmatization. People who had various diseases, addictions, manifested a certain deviant behavior, had physical disabilities, mental illnesses but also revolutionary ideas for solving the biggest issues and challenges at the moment also appeared as a target of stigmatization. It must also be noted that political rivalry emerges as a motive for socially stigmatizing and disavowing a political competitor - and such claims often end with the revelation of a tendentious and false accusation that comes too late, the adversary has won the position or prestigious service. To such individuals, the warning has been preserved to this day that care should be taken with them, and if possible, they should be avoided. Individuals' mental illnesses are often seen as incurable diseases, while addictions and forms of deviance are seen as genetically predisposed conditions that cannot be overcome or improved. After all, the stigmatization and avoidance of people who carry stigma as a common practice of today's speaks and the practice of institutions that care for stigmatized people (most often hospitals and sanatoriums for people with mental illness) are built on the outskirts of cities and other settlements - far from the eyes of others. Ironically, today, despite advances in medicine and the finding of drugs and therapies for mental illness and addiction, the person is still perceived and stigmatized as a lunatic, criminal, or addict after successful treatment and rehab. In fact, the real problem arises when this tendentious and stereotyped and prejudiced labeling penetrates deep into the victim's consciousness and leads to a state of self-confidence that he really deserves and reflects the stigma attached to him. The person begins to intensely notice and evaluate how he is perceived by the environment, accepts the label and finally reconciled with that condition decides to live with that stigma. Often the process of stigmatization is accompanied by real avoidance, ridicule and discrimination that lead to alienation and self-isolation. This situation today is also subject to legal analysis, because it contains elements of violation of the fundamental rights and freedoms of the citizen.

3. HOWARD BAKER'S CONTRIBUTION TO CATEGORIZING THE THEORY OF LABELING IN THE ORDER OF SOCIOLOGICAL PARADIGMS

The theory of labeling is an important sociological theory that began to develop intensively in the 60s of last century. It provides answers to questions about human behavior, for example, why people behave in a certain way when society rejects an individual, i.e., gives him a label. Becker first defines the theory of labeling according to which he sees deviation as a consequence of the process of interaction between social control and possible deviation and therefore it can be seen that the theory of labeling and deviation are closely related. Deviant are those individuals whom society has marked as such because they have violated its norms. [1]. Becker believes that the first consequence of labeling a person is the consolidation of his deviant status, which automatically becomes dominant. Thus, the theory of labeling, with all that it encompasses and refers to, is neither a theory nor focused solely on the act of marking as some believe. On the contrary, it's a way of looking at the general area of human activity, it is a perspective from which, previously obscure things will be clearer" [2]. Theory of labeling is considered an important approach in deviant research, suggesting that people become deviant because political authorities and others name their behavior by assigning certain labels. The problem of labeling was explored by another sociologist, Erwin Goffman, at about the same time as Baker. However, his interest in stigma focuses on people with physical and mental disabilities and shows how the stigma given to them by the environment affects the formation of their problematic social identity [3]. So, if a person is mentally ill, his status as a parent, friend, worker is automatically ignored ... All people behave more or less abnormal and therefore there is a division into deviant and "normal". Such phenomena are called primary deviations. Therefore, the behavior is contrary to social norms, but generally goes unnoticed by the action of social control. Both approaches by Howard Becker and Erwin Goffman's dramaturgical analysis belongs to the micro-sociological paradigm and explore society in the context of everyday small group interactions and face-to-face relationships. According to Becker, the theory of labeling belongs to the developmental concepts, mainly focused on the social psychology of deviation and deals with assumptions for deviation at the level of individual and small group.

...This assumes that those who have broken a rule constitute a homogeneous category, because they have committed the same deviant act.

Such an assumption seems to me to ignore the central fact about deviance: it is created by society. I do not mean this in the way it is

ordinarily understood, in which the causes of deviance are located in the social situation of the deviant or in "social factors" ", which prompt his action. I mean, rather, that Social groups create deviance by making the rules whose infraction constitutes deviance, and by applying those rules to particular people and labeling them as outsiders. From this point of view, deviance is not a quality of the act the person commits, but rather a consequence of the application by others of rules and sanctions to an "offender." The deviant is one to whom that label has successfully been applied; deviant behavior is behavior that people so label. [3].

Labeling individuals as deviant creates favorable conditions for secondary deviation (which is the basis of the study of marking theory). It is a deviation that individuals themselves accept in response to environmental reactions. Labels like madness and loss of reason are a kind of social control of mental illness. A person does not receive a label because he is ill, but at the moment of entering a mental hospital, and after receiving a label he often stays forever [4]. The point is that they are more often labeled as powerful in society, and individuals who are labeled as deviant are often from poor and powerless groups. Thus, social control creates the mentally ill and socially responds to them through the institutions in which it places them [1].

4. ERWIN GOFFMAN: LABELING AS THE BASIS OF A DEFORMED SOCIAL IDENTITY

Goffman is best known in sociology as the most important representative of the dramaturgical approach, and his sociological perspective is based on the belief that social life is a series of dramatic performances, similar to those performed on theatrical stages. His contribution today in sociological theories is recognizable in the contemporary directions of symbolic interactionism, structuralism and ethnomethodology [5], i.e., the sociological paradigm that society studies at the micro level of relationships. The idea that the person is formed interactively in contact with others, in which the space between the individual and others appears as his audience, is the basis of his most famous work, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* 1959 [6]. As integral parts of his sphere of research interest, Goffman emphasizes the appropriate analogy of theater and introduces the terms: *foreground*, *stage*, *personal plan*, *backstage*, and *impression management*. The last notion of impression management, as well as mystifications are actually techniques with which social actors play roles in their lives. Convinced that

social relations are best explored at the micro level of interaction, Goffman goes to great lengths to equate social actors with theatrical actors and extracts the essence of human life from the intention of better representation to others in a good light.

However, Goffman's other work, *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity* 1963 [7], is much more significant on the problem of social deviance. In this book, Goffman explores the problem of labeling, the meaning of evaluation, and definition by others in the interaction process. Perhaps the most significant contribution to Goffman's book stigmatizing theory is the classification of stigma. Namely, Goffman believes that there are three types of stigmas, i.e., three sources for stigmatization. "The first is physical disfigurement - various deformities of the body. Then there is the weakness of character which manifests itself as weak will, dominant or unnatural passions, dubious or rigid beliefs, dishonesty and finally, there is tribal, national and religious stigma, which is a kind of stigma that is transmitted from generation to generation and equally covers all family members [8]. In the last chapter of this small but influential book on theory of labeling, Goffman specifically addresses the relationship between stigma and deviance, and it is interesting to note that he clearly expresses his opposition to the term deviance, considering that the term deviant or deviance cannot be an umbrella that included every person with behavior contrary to expectations. This is because there are too many forms of deviation such as alcoholism, prostitution, drugs and the like. and that most often people who are stigmatized as deviant manifest different types of addiction and deviant behavior. Very often these individuals have nothing in common in the motives and manifestations of deviant behavior and the social background is quite different. But it is much more significant that in the ranks of persons who manifest deviant behavior, among others, Goffman includes the occultists and insists on categorizing them as deviant. Further classifying deviant individuals, he distinguishes social deviants from deviant groups. The first type is considered to be in fact individuals who most often belong to the lower social class in whom the mark of their status is clearly recognizable through the way of expression, appearance, behavior and who are considered second-class citizens, while the second type or deviant groups are ethnic and racial minorities - individuals who have a common history and culture (often of national origin) whose membership is passed down from generation to generation, imply loyalty to the group and have a relatively unenviable position in society [8]. From the above it can be noticed that the perception by others plays an important role in creating self-awareness as a deviant person. If we add to this Goffman's conviction that all those individuals who in one way or another are hindered by social mobility and advancement to

higher social strata through career or professional advancement, then to the group of social deviants such as drug addicts, prostitutes, alcoholics, criminals should be added to the Roma, musicians, bohemians, jazzers, urban poverty [8]. (ibid., 156-7). From today's point of view, this view would certainly be considered ethnocentric and chauvinistic, but the reality of America in the 1960s, on which it bases its theoretical positions, leads Goffman to implicitly offer prejudices and stereotypes as a necessary tool for stigmatization and but also the granting of social deviant status.

Writing in his book and presenting personal testimonies of people with physical disabilities, Goffman also points out how the rejection and lack of feeling of others about such people contributes to the emergence of autostigmatization. But on the other hand, when it comes to deviance, he makes a sharp difference in terms of the well-being of some of the stigmatized deviant personalities and the stigmatized normal (non-deviant) personalities who are in a very unenviable position. As an example, he cites people who are married to a bad person or people with low incomes and large families. The contrast of social perception and willingness to stigmatize in this case shows that physical deficiencies (which are the main focus of his book) sometimes remain out of reach but the quality of life of such individuals is no better than that of stigmatized individuals.

5. CRITICS OF THE LABELING THEORY

labeling theory is an important theory that can be used to explain criminal behavior. Labeling theory is a theory that laid emphasis on the social process through the special attention devoted to the interaction between individuals and society. This theory assumes that it is likely that every person can commit criminal acts. Akers & Sellers [9] argued that labeling theory as an explanation of criminal and deviant behavior is derived from the symbolic interactionism theory in sociology. Symbolic interaction is a theory that asserts that facts are based on and directed by symbols. The foundation of this theory is meanings. Symbolic interaction according to Aksan, Kisac, Aydin and Demirbucen [10] examines the meanings emerging from the reciprocal interaction of individuals in social environment with other individuals and focuses on the question of "which symbols and meanings.

The problem of morality seems to be part of all sociological research, but the interaction theory of deviation is particularly provocative in this type of research. Moral criticism comes from the political center and beyond; from the political left and from the left current. Interactionist theories are accused of aiding and abetting the enemy, when the enemy is considered to be those

who disrupt the stability of the existing order or government institutions. They are accused of openly endorsing conventional norms, of refusing to support attitudes against government institutions, and (of the present) of supporting attitudes against government institutions only seemingly temporarily more inclined to maintain the status quo.

Many critics (not necessarily conservative, though some are) believe that interactionist theories of deviance publicly or covertly attack traditional morality, while consciously rejecting conventional definitions of what is and what is not deviant and questioning the assumptions underlying the actions of conventional organizations. deal with the issue of deviance. Lemert, for example, says:

On the surface, the sociology of deviance offers a relatively independent or scientific approach to the study of certain types of social issues. Nevertheless, her manner, attitude, and choice of subject matter reveal a strong critical stance toward the ideology, values, and methods emanating from state societal oversight agencies. In extreme statements, the theory of deviance is described as little more than the result of arbitrary, accidental and biased conclusions, which should be understood as a sociopsychological process in which groups of people seek to create conditions for permanent recognition of established values and behaviors. There is also an impression that the purpose of describing and analyzing the company's oversight agencies is to show their failure in what they are trying to deal with and to expose their incidental encroachments on "inalienable rights" and "freedoms". Viewed in this way, the sociology of deviance is more a critique of society than a science. Weak help and support is the kind of decision-making and supervision that is really needed to maintain the unique feature of our society, the possibility of freedom of choice. [11].

Howard Becker himself responded to numerous criticisms a few years after the publication of the initial version of the labeling theory. He did so in the 1963 article *Outsiders: Studies In The Sociology Of Deviance*. [12]. One of the first things he did was reconsider the critique of "labeling theory" that criticism does not distinguish explanation from the essence or nature of what needs to be explained. If the critics think that the deviation is only a matter of definition set by those who react to it, but at the same time postulates the deviation to which they react, then the

deviation certainly exists even before the reaction occurs. Some critics do not address the real logical problems that Becker has examined before, but rather argue that there is certainly a certain characteristic of activity that indicates deviation, regardless of whose reaction it is. Usually the deviation is located in cases of breach of contract rules ([13] [14]).

Critics in this process were disturbed by the fact that the term "deviation" occurs more often in pairs with situations that are defined as deviant, regardless of whether the alleged activities occurred or not. In making this choice, analysts probably wanted to avoid agreeing to a restrictive division of the potentially deviant situation. This is to avoid the consequences of recognizing the essential situational character of the rule, which exists only when the contract for one situation after another is renewed and does not constitute a permanent specific embodiment of the core values [15].

In response to the criticism, Becker stressed that the real attack on the social order is the insistence that all parties involved be properly investigated. The former definition of the field of deviation as the subject of research was focused on persons accused of violating the rules of this order, except for observing those who created those rules and implemented them. Being excluded from arousal means that their claims, theories and statements are not subject to critical scrutiny. [16].

The fact that interactionists do not accept conventional theories leads to a critical attitude towards the affirmation of conventional authority and morality and towards hostility to interactionist research by their advocates and advocates. For these reasons, interactionist theories seem (and are) leftist. Intentionally or not, they erode conventional thinking patterns and government institutions. However, the Left criticizes these theories by supporting neither left nor right-wing views. Just as there are people who approve of the work of existing institutions and do not like the way interactionist theories question their assumptions and legitimacy, there are those who see existing institutions as worthless with regret that interactionist theories do not mention that worthlessness. . Both resent the ambiguity of the moral stance, attributing the problem of the unfortunate ideology to "value neutrality", which, pretending to be neutral, actually supports "radical" or "barely liberal" ideologies, as is the case. ([17]; [18]).

Interactionist theories of deviation are severely criticized when critics find that this complex picture of the relationship between scientific research and ethical judgment is too subtle and insufficiently direct. Just as critics at the center resent the interactionist theory of incomprehensibly refusing to acknowledge that rape, robbery, and murder are truly deviant, critics on the Left argue that it does not acknowledge that class oppression, racial discrimination, and imperialism are truly deviant or that they are deviant. . and injustice are real social

problems, yet they are already being denounced [17]. Both sides want to insert their biased ethical opinions into scientific papers in the form of unsupervised factual claims that rely on the direct use of ethical judgments around which there is a high degree of agreement. Thus, if I say that rape is really deviant or that imperialism is a real social problem, I think that these phenomena have certain empirical features that, we will all agree, make them worthy of condemnation. We can, according to our research, determine exactly that, but very often we are required to accept them by definition.

Determining that something is deviant or a social problem makes empirical representation unnecessary and protects us from discovering that our prejudices are incorrect (when the world is not what we imagine it to be). Do we protect our own ethical assessments from empirical scrutiny?

keeping them shining in disappointments, we err in emotional arguing. Scientists would often like to show that complex combinations of sociological theories, scientific evidence, and ethical judgments are nothing more than a matter of definition. Scientists with strong value beliefs (whether political or moral) seem to want just that. Why do people want to hide their morals under the guise of science? Probably because, realizing or intuitively feeling the current vain advantage that they do not have to admit that they are making "just a moral assessment", they prefer to pretend that a scientific discovery has been made. All participants in any major social and moral controversy will try to gain this advantage and present their own morality as an axiom so that it can become one of the assumptions of their theory, research and political dogma without discussion. The left, whose views I sympathize with, therefore proposes that it directly and openly attacks injustice and oppression, instead of pretending that the judgment that such and similar forms of behavior are social evil may come from basic sociological principles or that it is justified only by empirical discoveries.

Criticism of the left current. Some critics [19] argue that interactionist theories of deviation are only ostensibly against government institutions and actually support them, attacking lower-ranking officials in repressive institutions, leaving those in high positions responsible for oppression. untouched and, most of all, blaming their disobedient subjects.

With the knowledge we have now, we can theoretically deal with such issues.

There is no corroborating evidence to support the criticism, nor is there any evidence to refute it. This critique is directed at some general moral subject of discussion of interactionist theories, as well as the factual problems associated with the consequences of research and theorizing, and can therefore be challenged.

Interactionist theories of deviation, as well as interactionist theories in general, deal with the way participants define themselves and their environment. Particular emphasis is

placed on the diversity of decision-making powers - how one group gains power and how it uses it to determine the extent to which other groups will be valued, understood and treated. Elites, ruling classes, superiors, adults, men, whites - mostly members of superior social groups - maintain their power by equally controlling the way people define the world, its components and capabilities, and by using more primitive forms of control. They can use even more primitive means to establish hegemony. But label-based control of markings and markings is easier to enforce and costs less, superior ones prefer it. The attack on the hierarchy begins with an attack on denunciations, labels and ingrained notions of who is who and what is what.

History is increasingly telling us that there are hidden ways of control, based on determinations and labels directed at people. We try to maintain control by blaming people for various deviant behaviors. In the United States, political dissidents are accused of using illegal drugs. Almost every modern country uses psychiatric diagnoses, institutions and staff to shut down politically troubled types from Ezra Pound to Z. A. Medvedev [20] (Szasz, 1965). If we investigate how moral entrepreneurs encourage the creation of rules and how they apply them in certain cases, we will find out how governments of all kinds maintain their positions. In other words, we will discover new forms of repression and ways in which repression becomes "normal", "everyday" and legitimate.

Most interaction-type deviation research focuses on the direct participants in deviant dramas: the daily encounters between those involved in various forms of crime and vice and those who apply the rules. We are more inclined to investigate police officers, hospital staff, prison guards, psychiatrists, etc., meaning the people who directly give the stigma than their superiors, where the idea of stigmatizing someone comes from. (Exceptions: [21]; [22]; [23] Application of Deviation Theory to Protesting US Politics).

But the main concern of lower-level authorities is neither exclusivity nor inevitability; the consequence of this concern is to actually question the subordinates who are subject to control by higher authorities. They can order these activities openly or metaphorically, so that, if necessary, they can be rejected, or simply allowed to appear due to incompetence and oversight. If these activities are to be condemned, then several organs, in any case, share the blame. Even if he is not a trial general for the My Lai killings, these events have shaken people's faith in the moral soundness of the military action in Vietnam and those in high positions. Similarly, if we think that school psychologists work for school administration and not for their patients [24], we lose all the trust we have in traditional psychiatric institutions. The speed with which official spokespersons at the highest levels are able to refute corruption analysis (even at the lowest level),

incompetence or injustice should show us, at least as clearly as they do, the extent to which these analyzes attack institutions and their agents and superiors. and subordinates. Such research has a special moral impetus allowing us to examine the work of institutions in the light of their public goals and their own favorite descriptions of what they do. Therefore, our work has a critical impact when it produces something that can be interpreted as an assessment of social processes or any part of them.

6. THE CONTEMPORARY CONDITION WITH THE LABELING THEORY

The field of scientific interest in the role of stigma in today's society is expanding to other areas such as medicine and especially psychiatry. An analysis of the sociological contribution to the embodiment of the theory of labeling was previously made through a brief review of the positions of the most important sociologists Howard Baker and Irwin Goffman. It was found that a good part of their research focus was on people with physical disabilities. Recent studies in psychiatry, however, show how mental retardation contributes to stigmatization and auto stigmatization leading to withdrawal and the beginning of a deviant life. People suffering from mental health spectrum disorders state several reasons why they do not seek help. Experience of discrimination, contempt, misunderstanding, gossip, giving the epithet aggressive and dangerous, humiliation. These are the most common problems faced by a mentally ill person, if he seeks help. The fact is that more people are suffering from the effects of stigma, even more than the effects of mental illness. Similarly, social stigma takes many forms, from avoidance to ridicule. Support and understanding, for the mentally ill, often disappear when it becomes apparent that the person will not recover. Thus, the chronically mentally ill are exposed to the greatest stigma. Stigmatization of mentally ill people is defined as negative labeling, marginalization and avoidance of people precisely because they have a mental illness [25]. To become mentally ill also means to experience social negation of values. The stigma of mental illness also means fear of the mentally ill. A person is usually not at all aware of this fear, it becomes apparent only when the person meets a mentally ill person, when he is in thought or reality, the person imagines everything that can happen to him. A mentally ill person is anything that is not a normal member of society. A firm definition of the normal is impossible without a precise definition of the abnormal. On the other hand, it is society that determines what is normal and what is pathological. The line between normal and pathological is very thin. It is a pathologically important element of social

balance and therefore its social value is irreplaceable, within which society does not want to touch them [4] .

Sladjana Ivezic [25] in her article "The Stigma of Mental Illness" describes how society most often characterizes mentally ill people, ie with which prejudices it most often stigmatizes them. According to her, the mentally ill are:

- 1.) Dangerous (especially if treated in psychiatric institutions and diagnosed with schizophrenia)
- 2.) Unable to live independently and make decisions
- 3.) Weak people (they are to blame for their illness because they are not strong enough "character"; depression and anxiety disorders)
- 4.) Incurable (demented, retarded, schizophrenic and treated in social care institutions).

From a personal experience, it can be stated without a doubt that it is not only possible but also likely that a person can become what he or she is labeled. It can also be stated that this theory applies more to children and those with low self-esteem than anyone with a positive self-image hence it has been widely utilized to explain juvenile delinquency. According to the labeling theory, a person is more apt to commit acts that go against what is socially acceptable if that person is labeled in such a way [26]. It is important to note that social labeling theory argues that deviants and criminals begin accepting or believing they are people who do bad things and therefore through transformation begin to believe that they are bad people. In summary, contemporary labeling theorists assume that during real or imagined interactions, individuals project themselves into the role of significant other and make assessments or self – appraisals [27]. Further examination of the labeling perspective indicates that this assumption is guided by the view that humans have the ability to choose among competing labels for their self-conceptions [27]; [28]. The current labeling theory of crime deals with the results of labels, or strain on people (stigmas) and how it affects the development of criminal behavior. Theory of Labeling holds that society by placing labels on delinquents, criminals, stigmatizes them, therefore leading to a negative label to develop into a negative self-image [29].

7. CONCLUSION

The purpose of the interactionist approach in sociology is to clarify the phenomena under this heading in researching and explaining deviation, but also to explain to what extent moral attitudes about them complicate our understanding. The interactionist approach begins with the task of raising the awareness of sociologists by clarifying that their work should include research on deviance by raising awareness of the importance of multiple facts and a wider range of people and

events. All participants in these moral dramas, accusers and defendants, should be studied, without the usual exceptions that may escape our professional research, regardless of the height of our social reputation or position. Carefully monitored, realistically presented activities that try to understand the possibility of action of all involved.

At the second level, according to Erwin Goffman's dramatic analysis, the interactionist approach shows sociologists that drama is the basis for exploring deviation, from all possible perspectives, imposing deviations - situations, actions and people - those powerful enough or high enough. of legitimacy to be able to do so. A full understanding requires a thorough study of these definitions and the ways in which they are developed and they become legitimate and taken for granted. Goffman more closely explored the problem of labeling and the importance of evaluation, labeling, and definition by others in the interaction process. The most significant contribution to the theory of stigmatization of this book by Goffman is the classification of stigma. Goffman believes that there are three types of stigmas, i.e., three sources of stigmatization. The first is physical disfigurement, the second is weakness of character and tribal stigma, national and religious, which is a kind of stigma that is transmitted from generation to generation and equally affects all members of the family.

In the current circumstances, both of these levels of analysis create a radical interactionist approach. Research by moral entrepreneurs (as well as all those who want to control) and interactionist analyzes disrupt the social hierarchy of credibility. They call into question the monopoly of truth and the "whole story" of those in positions of power and authority. They say that we should find out for ourselves the truth about the indicated deviant phenomena, instead of relying on the official and the verified reports that should be sufficient for every good citizen. They create a relativistic attitude towards the

accusations and forms of deviation made by dignitaries and officials, considering them as a raw material for the analysis of the social sciences, rather than as indisputable statements of moral truth.

The stigmatization of the mentally ill is also increasing. This type of stigma is defined as negative labeling, marginalization and avoidance of people precisely because they have a mental illness. To become mentally ill also means to experience social negation of values. The stigma of mental illness also means fear of the mentally ill.

Interactionist theories about the phenomenon of deviation eventually become radical because the government views them as such. When power, political or otherwise, has power because it is partly astonishing and deceptive, science, which awakens and speaks the truth, necessarily attacks the basis of that power. Authorities are being attacked whose institutions and the judiciary are being subjected to interaction research because of their "bias", their failed attempt to embrace traditional wisdom and values, and their destructive effect on public order.

These consequences of interactionist research complicate our moral position as scholars by explaining events in moral arenas such as courts, hospital, school, and prison. They make it impossible for us to ignore the moral implications of our work we are.

This discussion of contemporary trends in the theory of deviation is only the beginning of a consideration of the significance of morality in contemporary sociology. Further progress is being made in addressing this complex potential problem with similar research within other areas of sociology such as the study of educational institutions, health care, the military, industry and business - that is, in all other areas where sociological research clarifies activities. of people and institutions and thus influence our moral judgment of their performance.

REFERENCES

- [1] Flegar, R. *STIGMATIZACIJA PSIHIČKIH BOLESNIKA*, Zagreb: SVEUČILIŠTE U ZAGREBU - HRVATSKI STUDIJI.2018.
- [2] Becker, H. *Outsiders : Studies In The Sociology Of Deviance* New York, The Free Press p. 177-212, 1991
- [3] Goffman, E.. *Stigma: Notes on the management of a spoiled identity*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall. 1963
- [4] Frančišković, T., Moro, L.J. i suradnici, *Psihijatrija*, Zagreb: Medicinska naklada 2011.
- [5] Ritzer, G. *Suvremena sociološkijska teorija*, Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Globus. 1997.
- [6] Goffman, E. *Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. N.Y. Anchor, Garden city, 1959.
- [7] Goffman, E. *Stigma: notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. N. J. Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs 1963.
- [8] Gofman, I. *Stigma: Zabeleške o ophodjenju sa narušenim identitetom* Novi Sad: Mediteran Publishing. 2009.
- [9] Akers, R. L., and Sellers, C. S. *Criminology theories* (5th ed.). NY: Oxford University Press. 2009.
- [10] Aksan, N., Kisac, B., Aydin, M., & Demirbukan, S. Symbolic interaction theory. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1, 902-904. 2009.
- [11] Lemert, E. *Human deviance, social problems and social control*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. 1967.
- [12] Becker, H. S. *Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance*. New York: Free Press. 1963.
- [13] Gibbs, J. P. 'Conceptions of Deviant Behavior: The Old and the New'. *Pacific Sociological Review*, Volume: 9 issue: 1, page(s): 9-14.1966.
- [14] Alvarez, R. Informal reactions to deviance in simulated work organizations: A laboratory experiment. *American Sociological Review*, 33(6), 895-912. 1968.

- [15] Strauss, A. Schatzman, L. Ehrlich, D. Bucher, R. and Sabshin, M. "The hospital and its negotiated order." Pp. 147-169 in E. Friedson (ed.), *The Hospital in Modern Society*. New York: The Free Press. 1963.
- [16] Becker, H. WHOSE SIDE ARE WE ON? Presidential address, delivered at the annual meeting of the Society for the Study of Social Problems, Miami Beach, August, 1966. *Social Problems*, Vol. 14 N.3 p.239 – 247. 1967
- [17] Mankoff, M. Power in advanced capitalist society: A review essay on recent elitist and marxist criticism of pluralist theory. *Soc. Probl.* 17: 418–430. 1970.
- [18] Liazos, A. The Poverty of the Sociology of Deviance: Nuts, Sluts, and Preverts *Social Problems*, Volume 20, Issue 1, Summer 1972, Pages 103–120,
- [19] Gouldner, A. The sociologist as partisan: sociology and the welfare state. IN: *American sociologist*. 3(2) pp. 103-116. 1968.
- [20] Szasz, T. S. *Psychiatric Justice*. MD. New York: Macmillan Co., 1965.
- [21] Messenger, J.C. *Inis Beag – Isle of Ireland*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. 1969.
- [22] Dalton, M. *Men who manage*. New York: Wiley.1959.
- [23] Skolnick, J. *The politics of protest*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1969.
- [24] Szasz, T. 1969
- [25] Ivezić, S, 'Stigma psihičke bolesti' *Medix* (64) 2006.
- [26] Bernard, T. J., Vold, G. B., Snipes, J. B., & Gerould, A. L. *Vold's theoretical criminology*. New York: Oxford University Press. 2010.
- [27] Adams, M. S., Robertson, C. T., Gray-Ray, P., & Ray, M. C. *Labeling and delinquency*. *Adolescence*, 38(149), 171–186. 2003.
- [28] Mead, G.H. *Mind, Self, and Society from the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1934.
- [29] Cullen, F. T., & Agnew, R. *Criminological theory: Past to present : essential readings*. New York: Oxford University Press. 2011.

IJSER