EDITOR'S NOTE: The concept of risk is an important one in economics, psychology, and sociology. It has been of particular importance in dramaturgical analysis of performances, especially of work performances, where errors and mistakes can often be costly. Unruh shows some of the major kinds of risks encountered by the funeral director, their sources, and the ways in which such risks are avoided or minimized. This organizational analysis expands the microinteractional focus of the dramaturgical perspective.

DOING FUNERAL DIRECTING

Managing Sources of Risk in Funeralization

DAVID R. UNRUH

IN HIS ESSAY on "Mistakes at Work," Everett C. Hughes (1971: 318) notes that workers often think of errors, mistakes, and miscalculations in terms of probability. That is, tasks and performances are weighted according to the chances of error as well as the consequences of such mistakes (see also Gold, 1964). This article focuses on the funeral director as an example of a worker who actively and quite consciously manages the sources of risk in the workplace so as to decrease the probabilities of error. Through participant observation at thirty-six funeral services and unstructured interviews with all employees at three midwestern funeral homes, I have come to see the funeral director as representative of workers who are judged primarily by the experiences they create and not by any material product. In this sense, the funeral director shares many occupational concerns with psychiatrists, tour guides, ministers, and even prostitutes. These shared concerns are perhaps more real than imagined. For example, unlike the building construction worker who can "cover up"

AUTHOR'S NOTE: The comments and suggestions offered by Jeffrey Riemer, Lyn H. Lofland, Gary Hamilton, John Lofland, and two anonymous reviewers from *Urban Life* have helped clarify my thinking on these matters.

URBAN LIFE, Vol. 8 No. 2, July 1979 247-263

nearly all of his mistakes and repair his product before clients see it (see Riemer, 1976), much of what the funeral director does is open to public scrutiny, either on the spot or soon after preparation. Thus, there is an immediacy present in the funeral director's work which does not often exist in many other occupations—at least in terms of degree.

Further, the sheer physical work involved in constructing a funeral service, coupled with prolonged contact with clergy and families is as Habenstein (1962: 242) notes,

> demanding of energy and spirit in a way which is seldom appreciated by the layman. . . . In dealing with the bereaved, the funeral director operates in an atmosphere of tension, distress, and easily displaced hostility.

Thus, the funeral director is an important site for the study of risk management since decreasing the probabilities of error is a paramount concern as he or she constructs an experience for a great many people at a difficult period in their lives.

Finally, this article is first and foremost a structural analysis of some factors in an occupational milieu which are managed to control the level of risk. However, in another sense, it must also be read as a strategy analysis since the funeral director must actively construct and manage the structure of the workplace so as to minimize the occurrence and severity of risk situations.

SITUATIONS AND SOURCES OF RISK

Since the presence of risk is always a matter of degree, it is important that the funeral director decrease the probability of error and thus minimize risk and risk situations. I am here defining risk situations as those circumstances and occurrences which threaten to disrupt, or detract from, the funeral experience as envisioned by the funeral director. The funeral experience is as many dramaturgical analyses imply, one which should be flawless and totally believable (cf., Habenstein, 1955; Goffman, 1959; Turner and Edgley, 1976).

Risk situations in funeralization oftentimes center around, and arise out of, the following four sources of risk: (1) incongruent organizational appearances, (2) possible intrusions or interruptions, (3) unpredictable responses, and (4) worker error or miscalculation. I do not intend to imply that these "sources" of risk exhaust all of the empirical or theoretical possibilities by which the funeralization process might be disrupted, but rather that the four categories encapsulate many of the "typical" and everyday events which are viewed by the funeral director as potentially disruptive.

INCONGRUENT ORGANIZATIONAL APPEARANCES

Whenever a funeral director's services are requested, the process of corpse disposal is thrust into an organizational context. Since all organizations have images, expectations, and reputations to uphold, there is an element of risk involved in each worker's actions—lest they contradict the organization's image. In short, a funeral home organization cannot appear to be concerned, efficient, thoughtful, and competent if the funeral director and employees do not seem to embody those traits.

In order to maximize congruent images, the risk of incongruency and dissonance must be minimized. Funeral directors seem to focus their individual efforts around the management of (1) organizational ideology, (2) personal appearance, and (3) professional interaction.

Organizational ideology. An organization's ideology is not displayed in a consistent manner to all clients. Just as hospital personnel occasionally construct and invoke different rules for different patients (cf., Roth, 1972; Freidson, 1970: 315-325), the funeral director manages the presentation of funeral home ideology in a highly situational manner.

For example, at Catholic Funeral Home (a small, neighborhood mortuary), the death of a local "Gypsy King" exposed the limits of how far the funeral director might

"stretch" his organization's ideology to conform to client demands. Friends and family of "the King" demanded that he be buried in a new Stetson, cowboy boots, and be paraded through his "old stomping grounds" in a horse-drawn caisson. They also assumed the right to dig holes in the mortuary parking lot for a barbecue and to occupy the chapel for a forty-eight hour vigil. Since the funeral director was being paid handsomely for the solid bronze casket and other amenities, it would be easy to view the funeral director's acceptance of these requests as due to simple economic motivation.

However, the point I wish to stress is that funeral directors continually makes decisions which have far-reaching effects on their reputation, future business, and performance at funeral services. By accepting the demands of the gypsies as being within the "organizational ideology," the funeral director caused a great many problems with other families being served concurrently. These problems revolved around difficulties of access, use of equipment, and a loss of tranquility about the funeral home. Thus, other families being served probably did not quite receive the warm, courteous, and efficient service they might have expected. Put simply, funeral directors clearly see some performances as more important than others.

The funeral director must make decisions, albeit routine ones, about how much probability of error each client might be willing to tolerate. Funeral services for dignitaries, skid row bums, and gypsy kings are constructed on this basis. Clearly, the funeral directors observed tolerated a greater chance of error during funerals for skid row bums than they did for civic leaders. When certain demands are made, as when a motorcycle gang required pick-up trucks for hearses and limousines, funeral directors may simply refuse and force the client to look elsewhere for cooperation. I have seen and heard reports of requests by ethnic or religious groups which were denied simply because they lay outside the "organizational ideology."

Personal appearance. Risk is always present when an organization presents an appearance or image and expects employees to model that image. Competence of action and believability in performance are, of course, conveyed by personal appearance. Nowhere is this aspect more apparent than in illegal or quasi-legitimate occupations where appearances are managed so as to create the look of professional competence and normality (cf., Ball, 1967; Whitehurst, 1974).

For funeral directors, Habenstein (1962: 234) notes the importance of language and appearance as they professionalize. A "professional" funeral director simply should not, in common sense terms, look like the stereotypical truck driver, lawyer, or graduate student. A great deal of risk exists when employees do not conform to the organization's perception of what the community "expects" in a funeral director.

This was made painfully clear to me when, in my role as participant observer, I was asked to either change my appearance or leave Protestant Funeral Complex (a large, bureaucratic, mass mortuary). Many audience members seemed to assume me to be an employee. Consequently, directions and assistance were often asked of me, and I would assist as best I could. After several months of this, the executive funeral director sent a newly hired funeral director to tell me:

> Well, you see, Mr. Smith is an old Army man and kind of conservative. He only allows us to have well-trimmed moustaches. Well . . . maybe next time you come, you could wear a sportcoat and kind of trim your beard. I really think that he's worried about the older families who have been with him for a long time.

In effect, I was being requested not to act nor dress like a funeral director (dark suit, passive demeanor). But on the other hand, I was also advised to look more like an "acceptable" observer—if I chose to continue my observation. I chose to terminate my relationship with the funeral home

since I had completed all that I had planned there, but in retrospect, I should have taken this as a clue for what I should have done to gain immediate acceptance. However, interpretation here is best focused on my "incongruent organizational appearance," what its effect was on the funeral director, and what the perceived consequences of it were for clients. Related examples exist wherein the teenage son of one funeral director was being "taught" how to dress and act, and part-time employees were chastised for unpolished shoes, etc.

Professional interaction. Procedures and expectations exist for workers regarding their interactions with customers or clients (cf., Roth, 1972; Hughes, 1971). The funeral directors' interaction with clients must, within certain limits, match clients' expectations. Habenstein (1962: 242) notes that "overpersonalization of relations with the client may be as offensive as complete lack of sympathy." In professional interaction, the funeral director must be efficient without appearing too business-like, and knowledgeable while remaining sympathetic to their needs. Risk predominates in that a tendency toward any extreme may result in gaps in vital information, incorrect scheduling, misunderstood directions, emotional involvement, and eventually a sloppy and disorganized performance.

To structure professional interaction, and thus manage risk, the funeral director uses a number of devices. Manilla folders conceal the death certificate which is used as an interview schedule, and itemized cost schedules "force" clients to deal with the funeral service piece by piece. As one funeral director describes,

> I say to the client, "This is what is ordinarily in a funeral service." They may then say, "Fine, but I don't want to look at that at all." My role is to then say, "But it is necessary to look at that because they help answer the questions a funeral director must ask. . . ." I furnish automobiles which raises the question (in the minds of clients), "How are we going to go about this?"

The management of risk arising out of things which are related to organizational appearances controls only a small number of things that might go awry. In the following section we will explore the ways in which risk is managed by controlling possible intrusions or interruptions.

POSSIBLE INTRUSIONS OR INTERRUPTIONS

The funeral director is, to say the least, cautious about who is allowed to view activities like corpse removal, embalming, cosmetizing, and burial. Presumably, as Habenstein and Goffman (1959: 114) imply, the funeral performance would not be "real," believable, or meaningful if the bereaved were allowed to witness everything the funeral director does.

However, the risk of error or unbelievability, which arises out of possible intrusions, is more prevalent and pervasive than that of simply not allowing family members to view certain processes. The funeral director must not have casket salesmen, groundskeepers, corpse arrivals, obnoxious relatives, and—in one reported instance—the deceased's mistress intruding or interrupting the bereaved family's experience. The risk of possible intrusion or interruption exists throughout the entire process—from picking up the corpse, through embalming, the funeral service, and burial. I will here explore two important ways in which this risk is managed.

Temporal order. The funeral director, much like medical personnel (cf., Roth, 1963; Davis, 1963; Glaser and Strauss, 1968), has a conception of how a process should develop temporally, and anything which interferes may threaten to destroy all earlier efforts. Unlike medical personnel, the funeral director's task is that of creating an experience for clients and not that of treating a "disease," which is often perceived as having a "natural" process. It should be noted, however, that many of the funeral directors interviewed believe that "recovery" from grief is facilitated by the pleasant experience which they themselves create.

The proper scheduling of events minimizes the risk of other funeral parties running into funerals in progress and of families arriving at the church or chapel long before the funeral service is set to begin. However, since one of the funeral homes did not have enough space to create a special "family waiting room," the funeral director had to schedule and coordinate the arrival of the family just as the service was set to begin. By taking long alternate routes, the funeral director could waste time if need be, or he or she could always take a shorter route or drive quickly to arrive on time (see Unruh, 1976).

Variations exist among funeral homes and the funeral directors relative to how much risk is involved when they conduct funerals which do not conform to the "normal" sequence of events. The "normal" sequence is, of course, culturally determined. For example, at Black Funeral Home (a small, local, Black-oriented mortuary), a week between a death and the funeral service is not unusual. As the funeral director notes,

> We have a situation in our culture in which we aren't "instant disposal types." People . . . take off weeks from work just to be here, so the funeral service must wait for them.

Where the funeral director is not ordinarily prepared for delays in the process, the presence of a corpse for six, eight, or ten days often leads to embarrassing questions from other funeral-goers, visitors, and researchers. For example, at Protestant Funeral Complex, the corpse of a six-month child was "displayed" in the reposing room for almost two weeks as the teenage mother scrambled to raise the burial fee. Queries proved quite embarrassing as the funeral director explained that the mother wanted to pay the fee herself (that is, without welfare funds or parental assistance). Thus, the appearance of kindness, sympathy, and understanding was temporarily overshadowed by economic necessity.

Microecology. In "An Abortion Clinic Ethnography," Donald Ball (1967) demonstrates how one set of workers transformed an illegal or quasi-legitimate organization into a viable and believable organization. The management of this impression was largely accomplished by managing the microecology—or spatial context. For the funeral director, day to day management of funeral home microecology is largely used to reduce the probability of intrusion or interruption. I do not, of course, intend to imply that location, physical arrangement, and funeral home appearance do not also help define the situation—only that the minimization of intrusions or interruptions is a major concern and conscious activity.

For example, most funeral homes place their facilities for embalming in the back, out of the flow of everyday traffic. Doors to the preparation room are always locked and the embalming inside is concealed by curtains or dividers. Thus, work in progress will not be interrupted, nor will families stumble into the corpse before it is ready for viewing. The threat of intrusion is apparently so great that Catholic Funeral Home devised an elaborate scheme by which embalming could be safely concealed since the preparation room lay just off the chapel and family room. Intercom systems were rigged and doors were locked. In this way, some business could be conducted in absentia without anyone leaving the preparation room. Should someone knock at the door, the embalmer quickly washed his hands, discarded his gown, doused all lights, and posited himself directly in the doorway—shrouded in darkness. The door would then be opened and the embalmer could decide if it was "safe" to resume work, or whether the intruder should be directed elsewhere.

Other examples of microecological management abound. Family areas are created in chapels, territories at cemeteries and churches are defined, and funeral home offices are preferred because interruptions can be screened through secretaries. All of these efforts contribute, at

least partially, to decrease the probability of intrusions or interruptions in the funeral director's work at hand. I have not covered the funeral director's attempts to manage the microecology or temporal order of hospitals (see Sudnow, 1967), churches, public streets, or cemeteries. The point, however, remains that intrusion or interruption of the performance is a major source of risk in the production of a flawless and efficient funeral service.

UNPREDICTABLE RESPONSES

A third major source of risk in funeralization lies in the probabilities of unpredictable responses by participants, the implication being that performer actions, as well as audience reactions, must exist within certain boundaries. For example, if family members must be carried into the funeral service screaming and kicking, audience members may come to see the funeral performance as tragic, sadistic, or even comical. Thus, believability is maintained if the funeral director is able to coordinate and manage responses to the funeral service within "reasonable" cultural limits.

"Reasonable" limits are indeed cultural since I observed great variations in what the funeral directors see as acceptable behavior. For example, at Black Funeral Home, many family members seemed almost hysterical, uncontrollable in their weeping, and physically aggressive as they occasionally attacked the funeral director as the casket was closed, or attempted to throw themselves into the grave. Important as it is to note that the funeral director generally interpreted these actions as simply arising out of guilt, or that people "were just acting," the point remains that uncontrollable responses may endanger the ongoing believability of a funeral service.

I will now concentrate on segregation and guidance as ways in which the funeral director attempts to manage unpredictable responses.

Guidance. Guidance is, as the similarity of terminology implies, perhaps the very essence of funeral directing. Styles of employment differ of course, but guidance and direction were what most of the funeral directors saw as their major functions. This is the tone of one funeral director's explanation of his role:

> There are two kinds of directors. There is the band director who is up front and very visible to the audience, and there is the theater director who is hidden in the orchestra pit—out of view. I prefer to be that kind of funeral director.

Guidance, as a risk management strategy, is most widely used during the actual funeral service. This should be evident since unpredictable responses like hysteria, convulsions, or even laughing would not be a great problem if there were no audience present. When these responses occur, the funeral director may simply usher that person near an outside door (so they might remove themselves from the situation), or next to a supportive other where the response might be controlled. Likely candidates for emotional outbursts are often singled out by other family members for the funeral director to monitor during the funeral. When an outburst occurs, the individual may be removed and pacified immediately, but more likely the funeral director simply stands back and waits for others to offer support. If support does not come, the funeral director often asks others to assist or, as a last resort, steps in personally.

These few examples certainly do not cover the range of empirical instances wherein guidance is used as a way in which unpredictable responses are managed. The task of bringing predictability to a precarious and emotion-laden situation is facilitated by guidance—whether the funeral director is "up front and very visible" or "hidden in the orchestra pit."

Segregation. The segregation of performer from audience, preferred customer from stranger, and "types" of participants from another is important in Hughes's (1971: 339)

and Goffman's (1959) notion of the social drama of work and everyday life. For the funeral director, segregation is an important and vital activity in the control and management of responses. As a strategy by which the risk of audience responses are made predictable, controllable, and appropriate, segregation is vital for the funeral director's product—a good funeral experience for the family.

For example, by creating special "family rooms" in the chapel, families are provided with not only a prominent position for the funeral service, but also a place where emotional breakdowns and the like are expected. These areas are usually situated near an exit so "overly" emotional family members may withdraw voluntarily—or at the funeral director's suggestion.

Segregation has an active interactional component as well. For example, when a funeral service ends and audiance members withdraw, funeral-goers will often mill about the foyer area waiting for a glimpse of the bereaved family as they proceed to the place of burial. To minimize the risk of funeral-goers saying the "wrong" things to families, blocking their passage, or otherwise upsetting them, the funeral director occasionally misinforms the general audience as to when and where the family will leave the chapel and begin the procession to the cemetery. Thus, while funeral-goers believe that the family is still composing themselves in the chapel, the family may be hustled out a side door and into waiting limousines. This is important to note since many of the funeral directors seemed to believe that many people mill about not so that they may see the family, but so the family might see them. As a result of this belief, the funeral directors have no qualms about imparting misinformation—and thus intentionally segregating the general audience from the bereaved family.

Thus, segregation may bring predictability to responses simply by avoiding those situations where the outcome seems to be less predictable than others. Or, segregation may be used to make "vital" scenes safer, in both a legal and dramaturgical sense—as when the funeral director at

Black Funeral Home positioned himself, other employees, wreaths, and chairs around the gravesite so as to discourage family members from falling or jumping into the grave.

WORKER ERROR AND MISCALCULATION

A final "catch-all" category of sources of risk centers around worker error and miscalculation. While mistakes by workers may certainly center around other major sources of risk (e.g., incongruent organizational appearances, possible intrusions, or unpredictable responses), there is enough concern expressed by the funeral director toward worker errors and miscalculations per se to warrant a brief discussion of several ways in which the risk of such errors is managed.

For the funeral director, and perhaps many other workers, two interrelated activities seem to combine to manage a great deal of the risk and uncertainty which engulf their work—namely, the division of labor and the formulation and invoking of rules.

Division of Labor. Hughes (1971: 318) suggests that a division of labor functions largely to diffuse responsibility and minimize risk (see also Peterson, 1978). For the funeral director, labor division, as a strategy of risk management, is most obvious when part-time employees must be called in for assistance. Since these employees (usually students, wives, firemen, or other people who have "stretches" of spare time when they can be "on call") generally lack everyday funeral-directing experience, they are often delegated the minor tasks of parking cars, delivering flowers, or driving automobiles.

The probabilities of error, as well as the consequences of mistakes, are relatively insignificant if less than competent employees are assigned less than vital tasks. When flowers are delivered to the wrong address or when caskets are awkwardly shoved into the hearse, the problems which might arise are relatively minor and can usually be ignored

or covered up. These worker-centered errors or mistakes are only minor flaws in the overall performance, and something with which an understaffed funeral director can live.

However, the possibilities of errors which might result from the assignment of tasks to an incompetent funeral director or part-time employee are endless. I have observed several incidents where the funeral director exercised *extreme* caution and concern as he "allowed" his embalmer to conduct funeral services. These incidents occurred only when two funeral services had to be scheduled simultaneously. Inevitably, the embalmer was assigned the smaller, simpler, funeral service, which was always scheduled to occur at the funeral home chapel—where the embalmer had the greatest control and most experience.

The importance of labor division, as a strategy of risk management, is best illustrated by a mistake which involved the funeral director and part-time employees from Catholic Funeral Home, a funeral service in a distant Catholic church, and a misunderstanding between employees. By entrusting the part-time employee with the scheduling and organization of limousines, the funeral director was delegating a risk which (if he had enough available workers) he would have assumed himself. As the funeral service progressed, the funeral director realized that the part-time employee had taken a needed limousine home, believing that it (and he) was no longer needed. The funeral director was so shaken that he forgot to display the corpse in the church, he publicly lost his temper, and had to plead with the priest to drive his own automobile some twenty miles to the place of burial. The impatience of family members indicated a loss of dramatic continuity as the corpse was viewed at the unsheltered grave during a blustery and hot summer afternoon.

Funeral services, however, run smoothly more often than not. Proper and competent division of labor contributes to smooth performances in an important way. That is, embalmers are generally entrusted with corpse preparation, funeral directors manage and guide the entire process, and

part-time employees take up "the slack" and accomplish peripheral tasks.

Rules. Hughes (1971: 341) notes that in the social drama of work, "rules have of necessity to do with mistakes, for it is in the nature of work that people make mistakes." For the funeral director, and probably many other occupations, rules and conceptions of "proper" activity often lie dormant —only to be revived and invoked when a worker unwittingly violates "the rules." For example, just prior to my first attempt at "funeral directing" at Catholic Funeral Home, I was hurriedly "taught" the rules of funeral director demeanor and interaction. I was instructed that funeral directors *never* put their hands in their pockets. Rather, one's hands should always be clasped gently in front of one's waist. Thus, it would appear that a major worker-centered error would be that of not *being* a funeral director (see my earlier discussion of personal appearances).

More important, however, the funeral director uses rules to structure action in the funeral home setting—thereby providing employees with sets of priorities if conflicts arise. For example, a paramount rule seems to be simply that any funeral "in progress" *always* takes precedence over any other activity which might arise. If the funeral home receives a notification of death during a funeral service, the funeral service must take precedence. After all, as one funeral director expressed, "that corpse is not going anywhere."

Another "rule" which illustrates the caution usually exercised by the funeral director during all phases of the job is quite simple. When picking up a corpse, whether it is in the company hearse or in one's private station wagon, always stop for gasoline *before* the corpse is received and never after. It would appear quite suspicious and unprofessional for the embalmer to run out of gas on the way back to the funeral home with a corpse in the back seat. Accordingly, errands (like going to the bank or post office) are routinely accomplished as a normal part of the trip to the

hospital for the corpse. Similarly, these errands *must* be accomplished first.

These few "rules" can only illustrate some of the guidelines which funeral directors use to standardize and control their personal actions as well as those of employees. It would be impossible to enumerate even a small number of rules which further guide funeral directors' work, define their mistakes, and identify ways in which mistakes are managed or remedied. For example, I have chosen not to mention much about the funeral directors' "code of ethics," which may serve not only as a guideline for everyday behavior but also as a guideline for how mistakes, errors, or miscalculations are to be handled (see Hughes, 1971: 341).

CONCLUSION

The substance of this article has, of course, centered around the occupational activities of the funeral director. I have described and analyzed some of the major sources of risk to funeral directors as they attempt to contruct a flawless funeral experience. However, I would be remiss not to note that the management of risk is not the entirety of funeral directing. Many other activities and concerns similarly permeate the occupational world of the funeral director, such as dealing with client ambivalence, hostility, or other logistical and cost/benefit considerations.

It is my intent, however, that this article be seen as a minor contribution to the study of *risk* and risk management as generic topics of study. The funeral director is, in this context, an example of a worker who must confront and deal with certain kinds of risk routinely. There are indeed many other workers, as well as participants in everyday life, who must deal with risks of many kinds. By studying workers like the funeral director, perhaps the sources of risk, as well as the strategies by which risk is minimized in many diverse situations, might be elucidated, refined, and theoretically formulated. In this way, the risks of social life might be made understandable and sociologically relevant.

REFERENCES

BALL, D. (1967) "An abortion clinic ethnography." Social Problems 14: 293-301.
DAVIS, F. (1963) Passage Through Crisis: Polio Victims and Their Families. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
FREIDSON, E. (1970) Profession of Medicine: A Study of the Sociology of Applied Knowledge. New York: Harper and Row.
GLASER, B. and A. STRAUSS (1968) Time for Dying. Chicago: Aldine.
GOFFMAN, E. (1959) The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. Garden City, NY: Anchor.
GOLD, R. (1964) "In the basement—the apartment-building janitor," in P. Berger (ed.) The Human Shape of Work. New York: Macmillan.
HABENSTEIN, R. W. (1954) The American Funeral Director and The Sociology of Work. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago.
——— (1962) "Sociology of occupations: the case of the American funeral director," in A. Rose (ed.) Human Behavior and Social Processes. Boston. Houghton Mifflin.
HUGHES, E. C. (1971) The Sociological Eye: Selected Papers on Work, Self, and the Study of Society. Chicago: Aldine.
PETERSON, K. J. (1978) "Taking license with Medical work: notes on the resolution of risk and uncertainty in a gynecological self-help clinic." Symbolic Interaction 1: 138-147.
RIEMER, J. W. (1976) "Mistakes at work: the social organization of error in building construction work." Social Problems 23: 255-267.
ROTH, J. (1963) Timetables: Structuring the Passage of Time in Hospital Treatment and Other Careers. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
——— (1972) "Staff and client control strategies in urban hospital emergency services." Urban Life 1: 39-60.
SUDNOW, D. (1967) Passing On: The Social Organization of Dying. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
TURNER, R. and C. EDGELY (1976) "Death as theater: a dramaturgical analysis of the American funeral." Sociology and Social Research 60: 377-392.
UNRUH, D. R. (1976) "The funeralization process: toward a model of social time." Mid-Amer. Rev. of Sociology 1: 9-25.
WHITEHURST, C. (1974) "The quack as healer: a study in doctor-patient interaction," in J. Jacobs (ed.) Deviance: Field Studies and Self-Disclosures. Palo Alto, CA: National Press Books.

DAVID R. UNRUH is a Ph.D. candidate in sociology at the University of California, Davis. He is currently writing a dissertation analyzing experiences of older people from "a social world perspective." His interests include aging, urban sociology, and the sociology of work. He has recent publications dealing with an ethnography of an urban setting, participation in social worlds, and conceptions of change in children.