

Tactics and Strategies within the Framework of Everyday Life Sociology^{1,2}

Gündelik Yaşam Stratejisi Çerçevesinde "Taktik ve Stratejiler"

Tule GÜLTEKİN³

Gönderilme Tarihi: 20.12.2024

Kabul Tarihi: 27.12.2024

ABSTRACT

The sociology of everyday life offers a framework for analyzing the relationship between individuals' micro-level practices and societal structures by interpreting the meanings they create. The sociology of everyday life reflects the influence of the classical period through its emphasis on the relationship between the individual and society. Durkheim's focus on social order and norms, Weber's emphasis on meaningful action, and Simmel's work on micro-interactions provide a foundational framework for understanding individuals' daily practices. The contributions of the French intellectual tradition to this field stand out in their examination of ordinary practices as tools for meaning-making and resistance. Michel de Certeau's concepts of strategy and tactics provide a critical foundation for explaining the creative actions individuals develop in response to power structures. While strategies represent mechanisms controlled by powerful actors, tactics refer to the everyday forms of resistance that individuals create under limited conditions. This approach reveals that individuals are not passive recipients within societal structures; instead, they actively produce their own worlds of meaning. In this context, tactics and strategies, within the framework of the sociology of everyday life, offer a robust analytical perspective for explaining individuals' unique forms of resistance and meaning-making in relation to societal structures. Accordingly, this study serves as an effective guide to understanding how social transformation is shaped in the ordinary details of everyday life.

Key Words: Everyday Life, De Certeau, French Sociology, Tactics, Strategy.

ÖZ

Gündelik yaşam sosyolojisi, bireylerin mikro düzeydeki pratiklerini anlamlandırarak toplumsal yapılarla ilişkilerini çözümlenmeye yönelik bir çerçeve sunmaktadır. Fransız düşünce geleneğinin bu alana katkıları, bireylerin sıradan pratiklerini, anlam yaratma ve direniş araçları olarak incelemekle öne çıkmaktadır. Michel de Certeau'nun strateji ve taktik kavramları, bireylerin iktidar yapılarına karşı geliştirdiği yaratıcı eylemleri açıklamak için kritik bir dayanak oluşturur. Stratejiler, güçlü aktörler tarafından kontrol edilen mekanizmaları temsil ederken, taktikler bireylerin sınırlı koşullar altında geliştirdiği gündelik direniş biçimlerini ifade eder. Bu yaklaşım, bireylerin toplumsal yapılar içinde pasif alıcılar olmadığını, aksine kendi anlam dünyalarını ürettiklerini ortaya koymaktadır. Bu bağlamda, gündelik yaşam sosyolojisi çerçevesinde taktik ve stratejiler, bireylerin toplumsal yapılara karşı özgün direniş ve anlam yaratma biçimlerini açıklayan güçlü bir analiz perspektifi sunar. Bu doğrultuda çalışma, toplumsal dönüşümün gündelik yaşamın sıradan ayrıntılarında nasıl şekillendiğini kavramak için etkili bir yol gösterici olma misyonunu üstlenmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Gündelik yaşam, De Certeau, Fransız Sosyolojisi, Taktik, Strateji

¹ To cite this article: Gültekin, T. (2024). Tactics and Strategies within the Framework of Everyday Life Sociology. Oditoryum Eleştirel Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 3(5), Ss. 83-96. ISSN: 2980-0439.

² This article is based on the author's PhD Thesis.

³ Res. Ass. PhD. İstanbul University-Cerrahpaşa, Faculty of Health Sciences, Department of Gerontology, tulegultekin@iuc.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-9531-7187 .

Introduction

The study of everyday life is very important for the sustainability of a society. Everyday life is meaningful in its own context. It should be evaluated within the framework of the conditions and factors in which it exists. It is formed by being affected by changes in society according to time and space. The functioning of the social system depends on the continuous repetition of everyday life. Its habitual and routinized characteristic makes it seem unimportant and unproblematic, like the unquestioned background of the meaning of life. Everyday life is almost a given basic reality. It creates the individual, transforms them, makes them conscious individuals in their own awareness. In this way, the concept of everyday life seems to be far from being a descriptive concept of the marginalized and ignored field. For many sociologists today (Sheringham, 2006; Sztompka, 2008; Kalekin-Fishman, 2013; McLuhan, et al. 2014), the field of everyday life has become a fundamental area that sociology should turn its lens on. In this context, Douglas (1970: 3), in his introduction to *Understanding Everyday Life*, in which he deals with the issue of everyday life, states that for many reasons, sociology, like almost every branch of social sciences, i.e. all disciplines, necessarily begins and ends with understanding everyday life in order to analyze human actions in their theoretical and methodological contexts. Gardiner (2016: 14-15) writes as follows:

“Everyday life is a critical environment where we interact with nature, develop our communication skills, experience friendship and love, apply norms in daily life, experience a variety of emotions and ultimately become part of the life cycle. Everyday life is an environment where we develop our skills individually and collectively and where we experience the fullness of being truly human”.

Everyday life is intimately connected to human action and involves various differences and conflicts of meaning; it is the point of connection and the convergence of common ground. Everyday life is the totality of relationships that form the basis of human existence (Burkitt, 2014: 212). Everyday life is filled with aspects of social life and human behavior that seem routine, ordinary and trivial (Crow & Pope, 2008: 597). However, in reality, these seemingly ordinary and insignificant qualities are also the features that make everyday life an object of analysis. Looking at the theoretical transformations regarding the objectification of the field of everyday life through the developments in sociology in the historical process and then touching upon some defining principles shaped as products of the same process will make this claim more understandable.

The Sociology of Everyday Life in the Historical Process

Historically, the sociology of everyday life has emerged as a discipline to understand the daily practices of individuals and communities. Going beyond the basic structural elements of society, the routine behaviors, habits and micro-level interactions that individuals exhibit in daily life have attracted the attention of sociologists. In the 19th century, the rapid change in the social structure

with the industrial revolution and urbanization made it necessary to focus on the daily lives of individuals. In this context, many classical sociologists, from Karl Marx to Emile Durkheim to Max Weber, have analyzed the economic, religious and social motives in the daily lives of individuals. In this context, the contributions of classical sociologists formed the foundations of the sociology of everyday life. However, in the second half of the 20th century, this field started to receive more attention with studies aimed at understanding cultural transformation.

Emile Durkheim emphasized the importance of everyday life for social integrity. According to him, rituals, habits and social norms strengthen individuals' sense of belonging to society. Durkheim's work, especially with the concept of “collective consciousness”, reveals that everyday life is the cornerstone of social solidarity. Durkheim analyzed how the increasing division of labor in modern societies affects the daily experiences of individuals and drew attention to the negative effects of these processes such as anomie (Durkheim, 2004: 48; Edinsel, 2014: 383; Kabakçı, 2019: 207-209).

Karl Marx analyzed the impact of the economic structure on the daily lives of individuals and revealed the role of everyday practices in the capitalist system through the concept of alienation of labor. Marx discussed how capitalism commodifies the labor of individuals and the traces of alienation in everyday life. According to him, individuals are not only subjected to economic pressures in the production process, but also alienated from their human potential in the process. This dimension of everyday life shapes social relations by transforming both the physical and mental labor of individuals (Marx, 2003: 229; Durdu, 2014: 103-108).

Max Weber, on the other hand, analyzed individuals' search for meaning in their daily lives and the relationship between their social actions and rationalization processes. Weber's “ideal type” approach allows us to understand the processes by which individuals create meaning in their daily lives. In *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, Weber reveals how religious values are reflected in economic behavior in everyday life. The concepts of charismatic leadership and bureaucratic rationality also provide important tools for understanding how individuals' everyday lives interact with the social structure (Weber, 2008: 296; Weber, 2017: 127-129).

In the first quarter of the twentieth century, a model of pragmatic social behaviorism, later known as symbolic interactionism, was developed under the leadership of George Herbert Mead at the University of Chicago. Symbolic interactionists argue that interaction with the environment primarily positions the individual as a pragmatic actor. During the same period in Germany, Edmund Husserl and Alfred Schutz introduced the phenomenological perspective. While the interaction between these two schools of thought remained largely isolated during this era, the isolation gradually diminished by the 1950s and 1960s. Schutz's move to America, Blumer's emphasis on Mead's symbolic interactionism, and later the involvement of Erving Goffman contributed to the establishment of a theoretical foundation that would grow increasingly influential (Adler et al., 1987: 217-218).

In a way, Mead and the representatives of subsequent schools, as a result of their discontent with the systems perspective, argued that the description of structure cannot be sufficient for sociological analysis. Opposing the systems approach not only requires looking at the ways in which individuals use structures or systems and how they develop attitudes towards certain social processes, but also requires an interpretivist understanding of voluntary and creative actions at the individual level (Gardiner, 2016: 18). Thus, sociology could no longer remain insensitive to the subjective gaze of the human subject, which has become a fundamental object of social reality in relation to the contextual manifestations of the everyday.

Among the initiatives that led to this development, Blumer, for example, developed Mead's concepts of role-taking, rational voluntary actors and reflexivity by emphasizing actors who construct their worlds through individual grounds and subjective meanings from an interactionist perspective. Blumer encouraged his students to explore different “worlds of meaning” and shared meanings established in social interaction. His work has therefore had a significant impact on the sociology of everyday life (Adler et al. 1987: 217-218).

For Schutz, everyday life is the most fundamental reality for individuals interacting in an established and intersubjective field (Kilminster, 2008: 285). Like Schutz, Berger and Luckmann, two thinkers with significant influence on symbolic interactionism, focus on the mechanisms that support interaction in everyday life. Berger and Luckmann examine how meanings serve to institutionalize typical actions that are governed by general principles and also involve transcendental consequences (Kalekin-Fishman, 2013: 717).

Among all these developments, Goffman has a privileged place in making everyday life an object of analysis. In dramaturgy, which he introduced as a new field, Goffman focused on the analysis of the individual interacting in the new field of social reality, arguing that the social order can be traced in the interaction between individuals. Goffman talks about both roles (self) and norms (micro-social norms) in his work. Goffman describes actors (agents, actants, individuals who are responsible for their actions) as agents who play their roles deliberately and in accordance with their individual interests while directing their own actions based on the impressions of others. Goffman also deeply analyzes how the actions of everyday life, which shape the inner self of the individual and at the same time provide self-regulation of society, are formed through interaction (Adler et al. 1987: 219).

According to Goffman, the coming together of individuals and face-to-face interaction constitute one of the most fundamental elements of social life. Face-to-face interaction is a process in which two individuals share the same physical environment and influence each other's behavior, and this process is critical for understanding the dynamics of social relationships (Goffman, 2014: 16). In the context of the sociology of everyday life, the behaviors individuals exhibit during their daily encounters, as well as the motivations behind these behaviors, play a vital role in understanding how social order is constructed.

Goffman argues that individuals in social groups often present idealized images of themselves. This process enables individuals to present themselves in a particular way, aligning their actions with social expectations. This not only emphasizes their status or roles but also serves to reproduce the norms and rules that govern the flow of daily life. Even when individuals adhere to certain routines, they tend to exaggerate the significance of their actions, which indicates that they may partially conceal their true identities or behaviors to conform to their social roles (Goffman, 2018: 48).

In this regard, the sociology of everyday life aims to analyze individuals' interaction processes to understand how social reality is continuously constructed and sustained. For instance, the body language, speech patterns, and routine actions individuals employ during interactions play a critical role in the formation of both individual and collective identities. This can be explained through Goffman's "dramaturgical metaphor," where individuals, much like actors on a stage, strive to create specific impressions in everyday life. Therefore, the sociology of everyday life investigates how seemingly ordinary interactions form the foundation of social order and ensure its continuity.

In the context of the sociology of everyday life, ethnomethodology examines the realities that emerge during individuals' interactions in daily life through empirical investigation. Rather than focusing on "actors" or "individuals," ethnomethodologists center their attention on "members." This approach suggests that individuals should not be studied in isolation but in the context of their activities within a community and their relationships with large-scale structures. It is essential to analyze members not as individuals per se but in terms of the practices they use to construct social structures and engage in everyday interactions. Consequently, ethnomethodologists are not concerned with micro or macro structures themselves but with the practices that shape individuals' feelings and experiences in relation to these types of structures. The goal of Garfinkel and other ethnomethodologists is to offer a new perspective on sociology's interest in large- and small-scale objective structures (Ritzer, 2015: 126-127).

The reality of everyday life is based on a network of shared understandings and assumptions whose veracity is not questioned. With ethnomethodology, Garfinkel developed different ways and tools to reveal and analyze the traditions underlying the micro-intersections that everyday life touches. Garfinkel encouraged his students to conduct social experiments (violation experiments) to deconstruct routine actions and identify the resulting situations (Kalekin-Fishman, 2013: 717). According to Garfinkel (2014), explanations provided during everyday activities are practical performances that construct the world they describe. This implies that "when I describe a scene from everyday life, I do not do so merely to depict the world; rather, through this very description, I 'create' or construct the social world. Making this world visible is simultaneously making my action understandable, as I demonstrate its meaning by employing the methods I use to explain it" (Coulon, 2010: 39). Garfinkel emphasizes the importance of uncovering assumptions embedded in everyday life and understanding reality. In this context, analyzing how social reality is constructed can be achieved by observing rule violations and the reactions of

others. Ethnomethodology seeks to explain how social reality is created by examining the methods individuals use in their daily lives (Macionis, 2012: 143).

In addition to all these, today, different interpretations of everyday life are given and different studies are conducted. In many studies, researchers embody the aim of penetrating social reality in its multidimensional aspects by focusing on the details that are truly illuminating in explaining ordinary actions and routines. The boundaries and ambiguity of the field of everyday life and the elements that define this field, such as ordinariness, routines and variability, are the main elements that determine the content of sociological discussions.

In conclusion, it is possible to mention the basic principles that have become evident within the discipline in discussions on the uncertainty of everyday life. The first of these is that everyday life is an ordinary world of habitual routines, taken for granted experiences and beliefs that are repeated every day (Featherstone, 1997; Sztompka, 2008). The second is that everyday life is a field of reproduction. In this space of reproduction, the actions that sustain other worlds are constantly reproduced, largely by women. Third, there is a non-reflexive dimension to the realization of experiences and everyday activities in everyday life. Individuals often do not feel the need to reflect on their daily routine actions as they perform them. Fourth, in everyday life, there is an emphasis on the non-individual in a way that embodies togetherness outside of common activities. Fifth, it brings up the heterogeneity of knowledge in everyday life (Featherstone, 1997: 55-56). While these principles emphasize the dynamism of everyday life, they also refer to the fact that sociology, which undertakes the task of studying the field, should have sufficient tools to examine the nature, form and quality of everyday interactions (Esgin, 2018: 31).

Sociologists of everyday life emphasize the concept of social order and social structure, which take their source from interaction together with the actor. Social structures, institutions and social orders cannot exist independently of the interactions in which individuals live. On the contrary, social structures are built or established from within through interactions, such as negotiation, which is one of their ways of communication. This is how people create rituals, customs and institutions, and then adapt through micro-social norms that determine their behavior. Ultimately, because of reflexivity, interaction becomes both voluntary and structured.

Sociology of Everyday Life in the French Tradition of Thought

Lefebvre and Everyday Life

The critique of everyday life plays an important role in Lefebvre's sociology. According to him, in order to understand the power relations and ideological structures underlying social structures, it is necessary to look at everyday practices. According to Lefebvre, everyday life is not only an accumulation of routine actions of individuals, but also a reflection of social relations and power dynamics. Therefore, the critique of everyday life provides an important tool for understanding the interaction of individuals with social structures, how everyday life functions ideologically and

how this is associated with social change (Akbaş, 2024: 77).

The field of interpretation of everyday life is shaped and progresses in parallel with the perception of the society in which it is lived. Therefore, the interactions within everyday life interact with the general perception of society. Understanding how economic, political and social life is formed within a society is important for understanding how everyday life functions. In this context, understanding the dynamics and interactions of everyday life is vital for grasping the overall structure of society and how everyday experiences interact with social and individual structures. This shows that everyday life is not only limited to the personal experiences of individuals, but also deeply interacts with social structures (Lefebvre, 2015: 19).

Daily life, which continues to exist culturally, has left itself to the global dimension with the change of time. The impact of the mobility and intensity of globalization on the life of the individual has increased. Today, the space and space of everyday life is constantly redefined in the dimension of a contested, displacement process. Intensity and contention are most evident in urban life. With the formation of urban life, new formations and experiences have begun to emerge in everyday life (Bennett, 2018: 16).

The main point of Lefebvre's criticism of everyday life is interpreted on the deterioration of the organic structure of everyday life. Peasant or rural life in traditional societies is transformed with industry. This transformation has created a macro-scale change in the roles, status and way of thinking in everyday life. The village system is integrated into the consumption wheel of industry. Therefore, the fabric of urban life erodes, spreads and disperses the fabric and residues of traditional life (Lefebvre, 2019: 9). In his critique of everyday life, Lefebvre highlights the disruption of the organic structure of daily life in modern society. Traditional rural lifestyles undergo a profound transformation due to the effects of industrialization. According to Lefebvre, industrialization and capitalist production relations trigger a comprehensive shift in the roles, statuses, and modes of thinking individuals hold within their daily lives. This transformation creates deep impacts not only in the economic realm but also on cultural and social structures. While rural life was traditionally based on local production systems and a closer relationship with nature, the industrial revolution gradually redefines this way of life under the influence of a consumption-driven economy. In traditional societies, individuals largely depended on the natural environment and local production systems, but with industrialization, urban migration and the spread of consumer culture have weakened these connections. Lefebvre emphasizes that this transformation, alongside the dynamics of urban life, erodes the fabric of everyday life and eradicates the remnants of traditional lifestyles.

Industrialization, on the one hand, integrates rural life into the machinery of consumption, while on the other hand, it reshapes social structures. The reorganization of roles and statuses in everyday life leads to the replacement of previously natural ways of life with a capitalist logic-driven, often alienated mode of existence. Lefebvre argues that this process radically transforms

social structures through urban life and changes the relationships that shape individuals' lives. This critique offers a significant approach to questioning the impact of modernism on the individual.

With modernity, the clarification of roles and boundaries between the public and private spheres is an important change. While in traditional societies these roles may have been clear, in modern societies the boundaries between work and private life have become increasingly blurred. In particular, factors such as the length of working hours and the constant accessibility brought about by technology cause individuals to seek to meet their personal needs in their time off from work. It may also include the desire of this modern individual to compensate in leisure time for the situations in which the intensity of his/her work life cannot be balanced in his/her private life. In this way, leisure activities can play an important role in the life of the modern individual, contributing to personal satisfaction and happiness (Lefebvre, 2012: 39). Therefore, everyday life is recognized as part of social reality.

Modern life isolates individuals existentially by exposing them to processes of grouping and segregation. This isolation may not develop in line with the individual's own wishes and awareness, and often happens insidiously over time without being noticed. This situation can lead to a sense of degeneration and alienation when it goes beyond a certain limit in the individual's daily life. Within the capitalist lifestyle, the daily life of individuals is bureaucratically structured and this structure seeks to adopt and impose certain norms in all areas. In the pre-modern period, everyday life had a structure intertwined with historical processes. However, with the modern era, everyday life has moved away from this historical root and the behaviors and thoughts of the individual have been subjected to fragmentation. This division causes the individual to become alienated from his/her own nature. In order to overcome this alienation, it is necessary to transcend the everyday.

M. De Certeau and Everyday Life

Michel de Certeau is another important figure who stands out with his studies on everyday life. De Certeau explains the purpose of everyday life studies as “revealing the models of creation of a non-unique culture” (De Certeau, 2009: 44). Instead of attempting to define everyday life, De Certeau prefers to analyze the use of everyday life. For him, how everyday life is lived, experienced and used is more important. It is not how a concept or conceptualization emerges or spreads, but how it is used in people's daily practices. This perspective focuses on understanding everyday life more deeply and how people construct meaning through these daily practices (Yılmaz, 2015: 46). For this reason, De Certeau was chosen as the main theory of the study. He argues that understanding and analyzing everyday life is not limited to a conceptual definition, but should also be realized by observing the practical use of everyday life. De Certeau gives the individual the concept of tactics in everyday life. According to him, it is the only power the individual has. Tactics is the only resource the individual has against the strategies of the structure

According to him, individuals are not passive and only follow the rules of the structure (De Certeau, 2009).

In everyday life, there are always and everywhere relations of domination. At this point, according to De Certeau, tactics come into play. What De Certeau calls “tactics” encompasses all the actions that ordinary people perform in their daily lives and repeat every day. These tactics are the form of action of the weak against the power of the dominant. “Strategy”, on the other hand, refers to all the orders in the field that the superstructure/sovereign determines and tends to set its regulatory rules. The distinction between these concepts emphasizes the power relations in daily life and how these relations are reflected on the individual (Certeau, 2009). Individuals actually continue to reproduce everyday life with every tactic they perform in their daily lives. However, this does not mean that individuals internalize the rules of the dominant. On the contrary, instead of showing that they accept the rules of the sovereign, these tactics are aimed at subverting them by slyly circumventing them. With these tactics, individuals aim to disrupt the order of the sovereign. When individuals resist these rules, it is an attempt to effectively subvert or change them rather than rejecting them outright. In this way, individuals adopt a strategic approach to question and change the dominant structures in everyday life. According to him, tactics is explained as follows:

“Many habits, attitudes and practices in our daily lives (reading, talking, walking around, going to the market or cooking, etc.) are tactics. (...) The successes of the “weak” against the “strong” (power holders, disease, violence or violence by an order, etc.), the art of scheming, tricks, traps, sleight of hand (...) special tricks, traps, sleight of hand (...) for “hunters” are all tactics” (De Certeau, 2009: 55)

De Certeau's text provides a striking framework for understanding how the micro-level practices of everyday life serve as domains of resistance and creativity from a sociological perspective. According to De Certeau, the apparent passivity of individuals within social systems is merely an illusion. The small-scale practices that constitute everyday life should be understood as creative resistance tactics employed by the "weak" against the "strong." De Certeau examines everyday practices through two key concepts: strategies and tactics. Strategy refers to the planned, organized, and predictable structures established by powerful actors (such as states, institutions, or capital). In contrast, tactics are the creative interventions individuals enact against these strategies, often unnoticed and swiftly executed. These tactics do not entirely dismantle the institutional framework but operate within it to generate hidden resistance and individual distinctiveness (De Certeau, 2009).

De Certeau emphasizes the successes of the "weak" against the "strong," highlighting the strategies that powerless individuals employ to survive and adapt to systems. Here, "weakness" does not solely signify material or physical vulnerability but also indicates social, cultural, and political disparities. However, this does not imply that individuals are entirely powerless. On the contrary, within their circumstances, individuals deploy creative tactics such as "scheming,

gaming, and maneuvering," reshaping the spaces delineated by the system. De Certeau's metaphors of "trickery" and "play" add multidimensional significance to individuals' everyday actions. For instance, in the act of reading, the reader does not merely consume a text passively; instead, they reinterpret the text according to their experiences and intellectual world. Through this process, the individual re-creates the text, producing unique meanings. Similarly, seemingly mundane activities such as cooking or walking represent microdomains of resistance generated by individuals.

In this context, De Certeau's theory reveals that everyday life is not a passive sphere but a domain imbued with creativity and resistance. Although the strategies of the powerful often represent hierarchical systems, individuals' ability to act tactically within these strategies underscores the fluidity and openness of social structures to intervention. Ultimately, De Certeau's notion of tactics highlights the creativity and micro-level social agency underlying individuals' apparent passivity. This perspective calls for sociology to extend beyond macro-level analyses of power and authority to focus on understanding the essence of everyday practices at the micro level.

Table 1. Differences between tactics and strategy

CONCEPTS	DEFINITIONS	FEATURES	EXAMPLES
STRATEGY	Organized and planned structures determined by powerful actors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long term. • Spatial control. • Centralized. • Created by the superstructure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional policies. • Urban planning. • Legal regulations.
TACTICS	Creative interventions by individuals against strategies in limited circumstances.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short-term. • Flexibility in motion. • Decentralized. • Based on daily practices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detours in everyday life. • Exploiting legal loopholes. • Social humor.

By explaining De Certeau's concepts of "strategy" and "tactics" in detail, it reveals the differences between these two basic approaches and their functional contexts. Strategy is a long-term, spatialized control mechanism established by powerful actors (e.g. states, institutions and owners of capital). Organized through a centralized structure, strategies have a regular, predictable and systematic functioning. Examples include mechanisms for the large-scale organization of social structure, such as institutional policies, urban planning and legal regulations. In contrast, tactics are creative responses by individuals to strategies, acting with limited resources and often characterized by flexibility. Tactics are short-term, decentralized and based on the ordinary practices of everyday life. This offers individuals the opportunity to indirectly bend or change the rules set by powerful structures. For example, taking detours, exploiting legal loopholes or mocking powerful structures through social humor represent forms of resistance by individuals. This analysis shows that strategy and tactics are not only opposed to each other, but also in a kind of interaction. While strategy represents the pursuit of power and control, tactics are a site of creative resistance by individuals. By operating in the space determined by the powerful, tactics allow individuals to use this space in their own unique ways. This reveals how individuals resist

the domination of powerful structures through their everyday practices and their capacity to create meaning. De Certeau's conceptual framework thus emphasizes the importance of micro-level practices of resistance in social analysis.

The ordinary individual, acting quickly and cautiously against the strategic power of the sovereign, plays various games and creatively develops forms of resistance to sovereignty. These forms of resistance are repeated every day and constantly reproduced, never exhausted. Although individuals oppose all the arrangements of sovereignty, this resistance often takes place invisibly. In taking these actions, individuals appear to accept the rules of the sovereign. But these actions are a kind of strategic tactics to question and subvert the sovereign. Such actions are not always done in the same way; instead, individuals vary in their actions. But in order to do so, the individual must first accept the strategies employed by the sovereign in its domain. In this way, the individual can develop covert and diverse strategic approaches to deal with the sovereign (De Certeau, 2009). De Certeau emphasizes that we should look at the creativity, intelligence and tactics used by the weak against the strong. What is important is the freedom of action of the weak against the strong. In this direction, strategy is “(...) the weighing and measuring of power relations formed by the isolation of a subject of will and a subject of power by a certain environment.” (De Certeau, 2009: 54). Strategy is the order established by the superstructure. However, the main order is the order of tactics produced by the individual in accordance with his/her own specific goals. Here, the weaker one always uses the space of the other, that is, the one who creates the system. He does not have a space of his own. It is here, in the space of the system maker, that the weak one produces actions that will disrupt its order. For example, actions such as poaching are tactics against the dominant order. According to De Certeau, habits such as reading or going to the market are tactics that people routinely apply in daily life (De Certeau, 2009: 103-110). Through these tactics, they (the weak) constantly infiltrate the domain of the dominant and have the opportunity to change the rules of the game. Therefore, De Certeau emphasizes their cunning against the structure and its oppression when dealing with everyday practices such as reading, eating, walking.

Conclusion

The French intellectual tradition offers a multi-layered approach that combines historical, philosophical and sociological dimensions in its social analysis. Within this tradition, the sociology of everyday life has gained an important place by focusing on the micro-level interactions of individuals with their environment and society. This field is based on a critique of modernity and a perspective that makes social transformations traceable in the daily practices of individuals.

French thinkers paved the way for uncovering the meaning of individuals' actions in everyday life and their relationship with social structures. De Certeau, as one of the key figures in this field, focused on analyzing individuals' use of “strategy” and “tactics” in everyday practices. De

Certeau demonstrated how individuals can be creative and resilient within systems over which they often have no control. This approach emphasizes that the modern individual is an active producer of meaning rather than a passive recipient. His insights show that individuals can act in unique ways against power structures and redefine social spaces.

Henri Lefebvre contributes greatly to these debates with his approach that questions social and spatial patterns through the rhythms of daily life. Lefebvre's work has been instructive in seeing everyday life as a site of production and reproduction of social power. De Certeau reveals that the ordinary practices ingrained in the daily lives of individuals can in fact be the stage for a social resistance. His concept of tactics is a concrete manifestation of this resistance; individuals can challenge systems by developing creative strategies under limited conditions.

The French tradition of thought, with its contributions to the sociology of everyday life, allows us to understand the complex relationships between social change and individual creativity. These approaches show that individuals are capable of producing their own worlds of meaning, rather than passively accepting social structures. The French perspective offered by the sociology of everyday life in this context is not only a tool for social analysis, but also an effective framework for analyzing the meaning-making capacities of individuals and communities. This perspective strikingly demonstrates that social transformation is shaped not only by macro structures but also by the most mundane details of everyday life.

References

- Adler, P. A. Adler, P. Fontana, A. (1987). Everyday life sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 13(1). 217-235.
- Akbaş, A. (2024). Henri Lefebvre's sociology: A critique of everyday life. *Habitus Toplumbilim Dergisi*. (5). 73-94.
- Bennett, A. (2018). *Culture and everyday life*. trans. Nagehan Tokdoğan, Burcu Şenel and Umut Yener Kara. Ankara, Phoenix Publications.
- Burkitt, I. (2014). The time and space of everyday life. *Cultural studies*, 18(2-3). 211-227.
- Coulon, A. (2010). *Ethnomethodology*. Translation: Ümit Tatlıcan. İstanbul, Küre Publications.
- Crow, G. Pope, C. (2008). Editorial foreword: Sociology and everyday life. *Sociology*, 42(4). 597-600.
- De Certeau, M. (2009). *Exploration of everyday life I: Action, practice, the arts of production*, Translation: Lale Arslan Özcan. Ankara, Dost Publications.

Douglas, J. D. (1970). *Understanding everyday life: Toward the Reconstruction of Sociological Knowledge*. Jack Douglas (Ed.). Otlcago, Aldine Publishing Company.

Durdu, Z. (2014). *Fundamental concepts and founding ideas in sociology*. Ankara, Detay Publications.

Durkheim, E. (2004). *The rules of the sociological method*. Translation: Cenk Saraçoğlu. İstanbul, Bordo Siyah Publications.

Edinsel, K. (2014). *Sociological thought and analysis: factors, formation processes and effects 1*. İstanbul, Kabala Publications.

Esgin, A. (2018). *Sociology of everyday life: historical process and basic principles*. A. Esgin, G. Çeğin (Ed.). *Sociology of everyday life: themes, problematics and itineraries (13-34)* in. Ankara, Phoenix Publications.

Featherstone, M. (1997). *Undoing culture: Globalization, postmodernism and identity*. London, Sage Publication.

Featherstone, M., ve Hepworth, M. (2005). *Images of ageing: Cultural representations of later life*. V. Bengtson, P. Coleman, T. Kirkwood ve M. Johnson (Ed.). *The Cambridge Handbook of Age and Aging (354-362)* in Cambridge, Cambridge University.

Gardiner, M. (2016). *Critiques of Everyday Life: An Introduction*. trans.Babacan Taşdemir, Burak Özçetin, Deniz Özçetin, Ankara, Heretik Publications.

Goffman, E. (2014). *Stigma*. Translation: Levent Ünsaldı. Ankara, Heretik Publications.

Goffman, E. (2018). *Encounters: Two Studies in the Sociology of Interaction*. Translation: Sercan Çalcı. Ankara, Heretik Publications.

Kabakçı, E. (2019). *Establishing Sociology: Montesquieu, Tocquevillei Comte, Durkheim*. İstanbul, Vadi Publications.

Kilminster, R. (2008). *Phenomenology, dictionary of modern social thought*, Translation: Melih Pekdemir. İstanbul, İletişim Publications.

Kalekin-Fishman, D. (2013). *Sociology of everyday life*. *Current Sociology*. 61(5-6). 714-732.

Lefebvre, H. (2012). *Criticism of everyday life I*. trans. Işık Ergüden. İstanbul, Sel/Düşünsel Publications.

Lefebvre, H. (2015). Criticism of everyday life II & Foundations of the sociology of everyday life. trans. Işık Ergüden. Sel/Düşünsel Publications.

Lefebvre, H. (2019). The urban revolution. Translation: Selim Sezer. İstanbul, Sel/Kentsel Publications.

Macionis, J. J. (2012). Sociology. trans. Hüsamettin İnanç, Yusuf Şahin, Tuğça Poyraz Tacoğlu etc. Ankara, Nobel Publications.

Marx, K. (2003). Kapital. Translation: Alaattin Bilgi. Eskişehir, Eriş Publications.

McLuhan, A. Pawluch, D. Shaffir, W. Haas, J. (2014). The cloak of incompetence: a neglected concept in the sociology of everyday life. *The American Sociologist*, 45(4). 361-387.

Ritzer, G. S. (2015). Modern Sociological Theory. trans. Irmak Ertuna Howison. Ankara, De ki Publications.

Sheringham, M. (2006). Everyday life, theories and practices from surrealism to the present. New York, Oxford University Press.

Sztompka, P. (2008). The focus on everyday life: A new turn in sociology. *European Review*, 16(1). 23-37.

Yılmaz, F. G. G. (2015). Daily life practices and tactics of Turkish people living in Germany: The case of Aachen, Germany [Unpublished PhD Thesis]. Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University.

Weber, M. (2008). Essays in Sociology. Translation: Taha Parla. İstanbul, Deniz Publications.

Weber, M. (2017). The Methodology of the Social Sciences. trans. Vefa Saygın Öğütle. İstanbul, Küre Publications.