

## Microfoundations VS Goffman and Foucault

First I want to say what each one is about. The first is microfoundations in the aspect of relating to “the existential function of the social.” This is when we as humans want to be perceived in a certain way. This idea supports the thought of consistently trying to understand why you do the things you do. An example of this would be consistent thinking of what people might say about you if you do something considered different. This also supports cognitive burden which is that when you are in a group of people you feel as if you do not have to think as much. An example of this would be when you are in a class and the teacher is someone to talk to, you do not feel like you have to answer since you are in a group with other people.

People always want to be grouped and they are scared to contradict the social norm. No matter what we do we always want to be a part of something. This is probably why we as humans always put people in a “box” instead of noticing what makes them different. We also hate change whether we would like to admit it or not. We always want to either set a routine or schedule to plan ahead. When something we do not plan to happen occurs there is an imbalance and that creates fear. These social skills are not only important to keep us in check but allow us to adapt to certain situations.

Then I would like to talk about Goffman and Foucault. First I will start with Goffman. This is the idea that one's “self” is always seeking approval by others. This supports the thought that people do not want to feel out of place. This also mentions how people change their personalities depending on who they are with. It is how people change and act differently based on which friends they are with. An example of this would be filtering your personality with someone you just met compared to the friends you have known since you were five. Another

your sporty friends you would not always talk about books.

Now that I talked about these two topics comparing them is quite easy since they are almost the same thing besides very few differences. But first I will talk about the similarities. Both are based on the fact that we as humans always look to others for approval. We are always looking to see if we are thinking the same as others. We are sometimes afraid to speak our minds for fear of being considered different. Most of these are in the brain. By this I mean we are the ones who are overthinking and putting things out of context.

Although they are similar there are some differences. Microfoundations are something that is considered cognitive which means in the brain. It is how we as humans would lack communication if it was not for these ideas. What I mean by this is that microfoundations are also group-based in that fact that although we do not want to be different we also do not want to be compared or put in a box. This is the idea that we want to share things with other people and want to relate to others. Fear plays a major role in microfoundations.

As for Goffman and Foucault, this is more of a mental situation than a physical aspect. When someone mentions the “stage” it is not an actual stage. When a stage is mentioned it is more of the thought that people are always looking at you. This supports more of a change aspect compared to microfoundations. Goffman supports the idea that people want to change. The change is changing depending on who you are with. This idea is more open to change in the sense of adaptation compared to microfoundations which no matter what do not want to change themselves. As for Foucault, this is more of how people view the idea that every action has a reaction which in this context is more of a mental issue. An example of this is surveillance. What I mean by this is not as much of a physical object as an example being the police or someone or

whether that be stopping at a stop sign, your GPA, or even the thought of not stealing while you are at the store. This is important to mention because no matter how we are as a society we are always thinking about who is watching.

In conclusion, humans are always thinking about what others are thinking about what others see in them. Whether that be if they look weird or if they walk funny. It is interesting to see that and read about how humans will always be natural compared to others and that is natural. Some more than others and some might say that they do not compare themselves but the some you read about these certain situations it is something you cannot avoid. This is an effect of adaptation to the environment and I believe there might never be a world where humans do not compare themselves at all.