archeology, and what Italian historians called *microhistoria*. They produced a rich vein of studies such as Le Roy Ladurie's fascinating cultural inventory of local Pyrenees village life in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries – *Montaillou: The Promised Land of Error* (1979), and Roger Chartier's history of reading. However, cultural history was hardly new to the Annales. Marc Bloch published his study of the "royal touch" in the early 1930s, and Febvre's 1942 study of religious thought artfully turned the question of whether Rabelais was an atheist into a study of *mentalités* – about what collective meaning unbelief would hold in sixteenth-century Europe.

The Annales School gained prominence in historical sociology in the 1970s when Immanuel Wallerstein invoked Braudel's *The Mediterranean* in formulating his world-system theory. More widely, along with other exemplars, the Annales School inspired the emerging post-1960s generation of historical sociologists to embrace diverse new practices and topics. The Annales School is best known for the studies of its participants. However, the challenge it poses for historical sociology and for sociology more generally concerns how to conduct social *science* under (historicist) conditions in a world where enduring traditions and practices, and durable social institutions and structures of life, frame both everyday and "historic" events.

SEE ALSO: Braudel, Fernand; Historical and Comparative Methods; Marx, Karl; Weber, Max

REFERENCES AND SUGGESTED READINGS

Burke, P. (1990) *The French Historical Revolution: The Annales School, 1929–89*. Cambridge, Polity Press.

Burke, P. (2003) The Annales, Braudel and Historical Sociology. In: Delanty, G. & Isin, E. (Eds.), *Handbook for Historical Sociology*. Sage, London, pp. 58–64.

Carrard, P. (1992) *Poetics of the New History: French Historical Discourse from Braudel to Chartier*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.

Hall, J. R. (1989) *Cultures of Inquiry*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Iggers, G. (1997) *Historiography in the Twentieth Century*. Wesleyan University Press, Hanover, NH.

Stoianovich, T. (1976) *French Historical Method: The Annales Paradigm*. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY.

anomie

Mathieu Deflem

Anomie refers to the lack or ineffectiveness of normative regulation in society. The concept was first introduced in sociology by Émile Durkheim (1893) in his study on the social dimensions of the division of labor. Contrary to Marx, Durkheim argued that the division of labor is not problematic as long as it is sufficiently regulated. However, under exceptional circumstances, Durkheim maintained, the division of labor will take on an anomic form, either because there is a lack of regulation or because the level of regulation does not match the degree of development of the division of labor. Durkheim saw such anomic forms present during periods of industrial crises, in the conflict between labor and capital, and in the lack of unity and excessive degree of specialization in the sciences.

In his famous study on suicide, Durkheim (1897) extended the anomie perspective when, next to altruistic and egoistic suicide, he identified the anomic type of suicide. Durkheim argued that anomic suicide takes place when normative regulations are absent, such as in the world of trade and industry (chronic anomie), or when abrupt transitions in society lead to a loss in the effectiveness of norms to regulate behavior (acute anomie). The latter type explains the high suicide rate during fiscal crises and among divorced men.

Durkheim's anomie concept was not widely influential in sociology until it was adopted and expanded in Robert K. Merton's (1938, 1968) theory of deviant behavior and opportunity structures. Differentiating between society's culturally accepted goals and its institutionalized means to reach those goals, Merton argues that a state of anomie occurs

as a result of the unusually strong emphasis in US society on the cultural goals (individual success) without a corresponding emphasis on the legitimate norms (education, work). Anomie refers to the resulting demoralization or deinstitutionalization of a society's legitimate means, leading people in some social categories, depending on their socioeconomic conditions, to be more likely to adopt illegitimate and often illegal means to reach culturally approved goals.

Based on Merton's work, anomie became among the most discussed and applied concepts in American sociology during the 1950s and 1960s. Working broadly within the structural functionalist framework, various theoretical extensions and reformulations were introduced and applied in empirical research. Theoretically, anomie was perceived among non-Marxists as a useful alternative to alienation. In matters of empirical research, an important development was the introduction of the concept of anomia. First introduced by Leo Srole (1956), anomia refers to the social psychological mental states of individuals who are confronted with social conditions of anomie. Throughout the 1960s, the concept of anomia was widely adopted in empirical research, in part because it was easily measurable on the basis of the anomia scale Srole had introduced. At the same time, applications of Merton's anomie theory were also popular, especially in the area of crime and deviance. Caught between the polarization of micro and macro perspectives, the relation between anomia and anomie at a theoretical level has never been adequately addressed.

During the 1970s and early 1980s there was a general decrease in the popularity of structural functionalism, and the concept of anomie was much less applied and discussed. Since the late 1980s, however, there has been a revival of the sociological use of the anomie concept in at least two areas of inquiry. First, Merton's perspective of anomie and social structure is now widely recognized as one of the most influential contributions in criminological sociology (Adler & Laufer 1995; Passas & Agnew 1997). Along with Merton's various theoretical reformulations since 1938 and its extensions by others, the theoretical approach has now been broadened as comprising an anomie theory as well as a strain theory (Featherstone & Deflem 2003). Whereas Merton initially presented the two theoretical components as inextricably linked, that perspective is generally no longer accepted. Anomie refers to a state of social organization, whereas strain is a mechanism that induces deviant behavior. Strain can only occur under conditions of anomie, but the social condition of anomie can be accompanied by a variety of mechanisms that lead to deviance. In contemporary criminological sociology, strain theory is much more influential than anomie theory.

Second, less widespread but no less significant is the recent adoption of the anomie concept in research on societies undergoing rapid social and economic change. This perspective particularly grew out of sociological efforts to account for the drastic changes that have been taking place in many Eastern European countries since the collapse of communism. This notion of anomie largely relies on the work of Durkheim, who introduced the concept a century before to denote similar events of transition and upheaval. It remains to be seen if and how this renewed concept of anomie will integrate with the related literature on globalization and inequality that is traditionally rather hostile toward Durkheimian and functional structuralist theories. Perhaps a new integrated perspective can emerge that will transcend the prior dichotomies between anomie and rival concepts such as alienation.

SEE ALSO: Alienation; Durkheim, Émile; Merton, Robert K.; Norms; Strain Theories; Structural Functional Theory

REFERENCES AND SUGGESTED READINGS

Adler, F. & Laufer, W. S. (Eds.) (1995) *The Legacy of Anomie Theory: Advances in Criminological Theory, Volume 10*. Transaction, New Brunswick, NJ.

Durkheim, É. (1933 [1893]) *The Division of Labor in Society*. Trans. G. Simpson. Free Press, Glencoe, IL.

Durkheim, É. (1952 [1897]) *Suicide: A Study in Sociology*. Trans. J. A. Spaulding & G. Simpson. Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

Featherstone, R. & Deflem, M. (2003) Anomie and Strain: Context and Consequences of Merton's Two Theories. *Sociological Inquiry* 73: 471–89.
Merton, R. K. (1938) Social Structure and Anomie. *American Sociological Review* 3: 672–82.
Merton, R. K. (1968) *Social Theory and Social Structure*, enlarged edn. Free Press, New York.
Passas, N. & Agnew, R. (Eds.) (1997) *The Future of Anomie Theory*. Northeastern University Press, Boston.
Srole, L. (1956) Social Integration and Certain Corollaries: An Exploratory Study. *American Sociological Review* 21: 709–16.

ANOVA (analysis of variance)

Paul T. Munroe and Neil J. Salkind

Analysis of variance (or ANOVA) is a statistical technique that tests the difference between more than two sample means. It is one of the simpler of the techniques that fall within the larger category "general linear model."

In the basic case, a sample is divided into groups based on their values on one independent variable, usually a discrete variable with a relatively small number of categories. Within each group, the means for a second variable, the dependent variable, are calculated. The difference in the means for the different groups is calculated and is then compared to the variation of the individual cases within each group around that group's mean. The larger the difference in the means (relative to the variation around each mean), the more likely it is that the means are significantly different – that is, the less likely that one would make a Type I (alpha) error by saying that the groups have different means in the population from which the sample is drawn.

To calculate ANOVA, an F test is performed. The F statistic comprises the ratio of the variance between groups and the variance within groups as follows:

$$F = \frac{Variance\ Between\ Groups}{Variance\ Within\ Groups}$$

When the source of variance between groups (reflecting the strength of the treatment) is larger than the source of the variance within groups (reflecting individual variability), then the F value increases and approaches statistical significance. If both sources of variance are equal, the resulting F value is equal to 1, which one would expect by chance.

The manual computation of F is too detailed for this presentation, but below is the output from a simple one way analysis of variance computed using the Data Toolpak from Excel.

SUMMARY

Groups	*Average*
Column 1	4.67
Column 2	3.24
Column 3	6.43

ANOVA

Source of variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*F crit*
Between groups	107.27	2	53.63	43.71	3.15
Within groups	73.62	60	1.23		
Total	180.89	62			

The above output shows: the average for each of the three groups or levels of the one independent variable source of variance (between and within groups); Sums of Squares (SS) and Mean Squares (MS), both variance estimates and the degrees of freedom (df); F value, which is a ratio, as stated earlier; and critical F value or that needed for significance.

In this example, the F value is greater than the critical value (that would be expected by chance alone) and the difference between the three groups is statistically significant. Since the F test is a robust test (an overall test of the significance between three means), follow-up tests (often called post-hoc comparison) need to be conducted to learn where this difference lies. These tests compare all combinations of means.

As with all general linear model techniques, there are some assumptions that must be met before one can make reliable inferences about the population based on the sample. The most