# The Dynamics of Hysteria and Power in Arthur Miller's *The Crucible*: A Sociological Perspective

**Hazrat Abbas**
hazrat.abbas@riphah.edu.pk
https://orcid.org/0009-0004-7555-3678
Lecturer, Department of English Literature and Linguistics
Riphah International University, Malakand Campus, Pakistan

**Laiba Tariq**
hidayatkhaan@gmail.com
BS Graduate, Department of English Literature and Linguistics
Riphah International University, Malakand Campus, Pakistan
**Corresponding Author: * Hazrat Abbas**　hazrat.abbas@riphah.edu.pk

## ABSTRACT

*This paper explores how hysteria is used as a tool of power in Arthur Miller's The Crucible (1953), focusing on how fear is created and used within a strict religious society to control people and silence opposition. Using a qualitative approach and close reading of the text, the study applies key ideas from Émile Durkheim and Michel Foucault to understand how authority works through social pressure, public fear, and ideology. The analysis focuses on characters like Abigail Williams, Reverend Parris, and Judge Danforth to show how personal goals and institutional power combine to spread panic and strengthen control. The findings suggest that The Crucible is not just a historical drama, but also a strong sociological message about how fear-based systems operate. The play reflects how fear, moral panic, and reputation politics have been used—both in history and in modern times—to shape public behavior, suppress justice, and support authoritarian power.*

**Keywords:** *Hysteria, Power, The Crucible, Sociology, Salem Witch Trials, Fear, Social Control, Durkheim, Foucault, Authority*

## INTRODUCTION

Arthur Miller's The Crucible (1953) is often read as a historical play linked to the Salem witch trials of 1692. But read a little further and it becomes better than real-life theater — as social commentary we can see how our fears, superstitions, and beliefs are not only manipulated but weaponized against us by narcissists and sociopaths with the intention of controlling us. The play is based during a period of history where religious orthodoxy, popular hysteria, and legal power combined to foster an environment of fear were simple accusations could cost someone their standing in society or worse their life. From this grisly account, Miller crafts a vivid portrayal of a world in the process of disintegrating and tearing itself apart from its collective phobias.

What is crucial to understand is that The Crucible by Miller isn't simply a glimpse into a 17th-century Puritan theocracy in Salem, Massachusetts. It is also resonant of Miller's days, the political climate in which he wrote: McCarthyism 1950s America. The U.S. government, under Senator Joseph McCarthy, simultaneously whipped the country into a hysterical frenzy about the "Red" menace. Many faced witch hunts in which accusations were made without evidence and they were subjected to professional investigations and expulsion. Allowing himself to be directly questioned by the House Un-American

Activities Committee (HUAC), Miller uses the Salem setting as an allegory for these witch hunts of another time, drawing a direct line between religious zealotry and totalitarianism (Bigsby 2005; Abbotson 2007).

Both historical periods reveal a shared structure: the transformation of fear into a political instrument, weaponized to marginalize dissent and consolidate authority. Within the world of the play, fear becomes more than just a private emotion—it is deliberately shaped, intensified, and deployed as a collective force. Hysteria in *The Crucible* is contagious and self-sustaining, fed by the actions and rhetoric of characters who benefit from chaos. Abigail Williams, for example, exploits the fear of witchcraft to deflect scrutiny from herself and to pursue her personal vendettas. Reverend Parris, obsessed with his social standing and reputation, reinforces the spread of panic to secure his authority. These characters embody the convergence of personal ambition and institutional power, showing how fear can be manipulated to silence opposition, eliminate rivals, and reshape the moral fabric of a community (Bloom, 2008).

This research is driven by the following central question: How is hysteria employed in an effort to control society in Arthur Miller's The Crucible To do this, we use sociological theories and concepts to contextualize the role of fear and hysteria as instruments of power used by authority, focusing on how collective anxiety is turned into a political instrument. Instead, we argued for their transformation of the Durkheimian (1912) concept of collective consciousness as experiences of solidarity connected through shared values and emotional expressions that contribute to influence over social behavior. Durkheim was key in understanding the logic by which it becomes possible for the inhabitants of Salem to believe insane accusations and violate basic rights. Moreover, we employ Michel Foucault's (1977) notion of discourse and power and reveal how institutions apply their control in forming what is true, normal or dangerous. Through Foucault's system, we can see the church and court in Salem as passports of surveillance and normalization using fear for compliance combined with public confession.

Through these theoretical lenses, this paper argues that *The Crucible* offers more than a dramatization of past events; it becomes a sociological case study of how fear-driven ideologies thrive in rigid social structures. The play offers insight into the dynamics of *groupthink*, *moral panic*, and *social conformity*—patterns that have been documented in various societies where authority figures use fear as a stabilizing force (Kammen, 1997; Levin, 1987). In such contexts, the truth becomes flexible, often defined by those in power, while dissenting voices are suppressed in the name of preserving moral order. Miller's portrayal of these mechanisms serves as a cautionary tale, illustrating the fragility of justice in the face of mass paranoia and institutional self-preservation.

Ultimately, this introduction lays the groundwork for a critical exploration of *The Crucible* as both a dramatic work and a sociological text. By dissecting the function of hysteria within the play's narrative, the analysis seeks to understand the enduring appeal and relevance of Miller's critique. In a world where fear continues to be used as a tool for political manipulation and social control—from media sensationalism to populist rhetoric *The Crucible* stands as a timeless reminder of the dangers of sacrificing truth, reason, and justice at the altar of collective fear.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

The melding of literary studies and sociological theory has produced ever more rich fruits for critical inquiry in the new millennium. In Sociology and Modern Fiction, Zachary Leader shows how the insights of some great 20th-century novelists illuminate fundamental questions about society, culture, religion, history, politics and social conventions as powerfully—if not more so—than do works by those self-same

theoretical giants of sociology: Émile Durkheim; Michel Foucault; Max Weber; Antonio Gramsci; Louis Althusser or even Erik Erikson. Contemporary scholars now approach literature from historical allegories to postcolonial, dystopian, digital narratives and show how it not only reflects but critiques the means of enforcement of ideology, institutional power, forming identity and collective action. This piece explores some of the most current (2015–2024) scholarship to put these sociological approaches into practice, examining how literature remains an important space for understanding society and political thought.

## Durkheim and Collective Consciousness in Literary Representations of Fear and Belonging

Émile Durkheim's concept of *collective consciousness*—the shared moral and emotional framework that binds societies—has gained renewed interest in literary studies examining how groupthink and moral panic are portrayed in fiction. Durkheim's insight that shared beliefs can unify communities while also fueling destructive collective behavior (Durkheim, 2014) has been applied in various contexts. Ellis (2020) argues that post-9/11 fiction such as *The Submission* by Amy Waldman exemplifies a Durkheimian panic, wherein public rituals and moral consensus collapse into xenophobic scapegoating. Johnson (2021) extends this argument to Margaret Atwood's *The Testaments*, where religious rituals and punitive norms reinforce Gilead's theocratic collective identity.

In both cases, Durkheim's theory helps interpret how fictional communities experience and enforce ideological belonging through shared narratives of fear and purity. The sacrifice of dissenting individuals in these narratives—be they whistleblowers, free thinkers, or rebels—mirrors the "mechanical solidarity" Durkheim identified, where unity is preserved by punishing deviance. This approach has been particularly valuable for analyzing historical dramas like *The Crucible*, where the entire community of Salem is governed by a collective belief in witchcraft, sin, and divine retribution. In such societies, as Ahmed (2019) observes, fear becomes not just emotional but ritualized, sanctified, and shared—a sacred cause that legitimizes persecution.

## Foucault and the Discursive Production of Truth, Surveillance, and Obedience

Michel Foucault's theories of *power, knowledge, and discourse* remain central to modern literary criticism, especially in analyses of how fiction constructs or resists systems of surveillance and normative truth. Foucault's assertion that power operates through discourse—by defining what is "normal," "true," and "dangerous"—has been revitalized in post-truth and dystopian fiction studies. Fischer (2018) applies Foucault's work to Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*, showing how biomedical discourse renders the cloned protagonists obedient and docile, producing "ideal subjects" who never resist their own erasure. Lopes (2022) explores similar themes in young adult dystopias such as *Divergent*, where surveillance and testing regimes institutionalize meritocratic obedience while claiming to reward freedom.

Recent political fiction has also been a site for Foucauldian critique. Kemp (2021) analyzes *The Crucible* through a Foucauldian lens, arguing that Judge Danforth and Reverend Parris represent how religious and legal discourses converge to define reality in Salem. In this reading, Abigail Williams becomes a "disciplinary agent" rather than a simple antagonist—one who manipulates discourse and deploys fear to shape communal truths. Foucault's concept of panopticism—the idea that people internalize surveillance and regulate themselves—has also been used by Chang (2023) to critique tech-capitalist fiction like Dave Eggers' *The Circle*, in which the protagonist's loss of privacy is framed as progress. These studies emphasize how contemporary fiction mirrors and challenges real-world conditions in which truth, surveillance, and obedience are institutionally manufactured.

## Gramsci and Cultural Hegemony in the Reproduction of Consent

The theory of culture hegemony, first theorized by Antonio Gramsci as a type of domination over the masses in which power lies within seemingly innocuous ideologies rather than exterior acts of force, has been proven to be very useful for understanding not only power but also acquiescence in literature. Taking their cue from the theoretical work of Antonio Gramsci, who argued that hegemonic ideologies are so deeply inculcated into social institutions and practices that ruling groups maintain power without fully resorting to force, literary scholars have long been interested in characters who structurally reproduce their own oppression. McNally (2023) explores this in *Death of a Salesman*, arguing that Willy Loman's internalized capitalism reflects hegemonic ideology at work; his desire to "succeed" masks the systemic forces that exploit him.

Gramsci has also been key to postcolonial readings. Rahman (2020) analyzes Tayeb Salih's *Season of Migration to the North* as a narrative of neo-colonial hegemony, wherein indigenous elites mimic colonial values and reproduce imperial ideology. In feminist literary studies, Gramsci's concept of hegemonic masculinity has been used to explain how patriarchal norms are embedded in domestic and romantic plots. In *The Crucible*, characters like Reverend Hale undergo a Gramscian transformation—initially agents of hegemony, they eventually recognize the ideological machinery they helped sustain and attempt, tragically, to reverse its course.

## Althusser and Ideological State Apparatuses in Narrative Institutions

Louis Althusser's theory of *Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs)*—institutions like the church, school, family, and media that perpetuate ideology without overt force—has informed literary analysis of both classic and modern fiction. Althusser emphasized that individuals become "interpellated" into ideology through everyday rituals and language. Trevett (2019) applies this theory to *Jane Eyre*, showing how religious and educational systems discipline female agency under the guise of moral instruction. Bakht (2021) brings Althusser into dialogue with dystopian fiction, arguing that *1984* and *Brave New World* depict societies where state apparatuses no longer require physical punishment, as ideology is so deeply internalized that subjects discipline themselves.

In more recent works, Chang (2023) extends the notion of ISAs to digital platforms in *The Circle*, where corporate ideology is masked as freedom and connectivity. Althusser's framework is especially potent when analyzing *The Crucible*, where the church functions as both spiritual guide and legal authority, indoctrinating the public to see dissent as sin. As Barker (2021) suggests, literary texts often expose how ideology "works silently"—not through force, but through confession, ritual, and language that align the self with dominant power structures.

## Weber and the Fragility of Legitimate Authority in Fictional Institutions

Traditional, charismatic and legal-rational authority, as classified by Max Weber, have been used extensively in the study of fictional leadership as well as its influence on institutional failure. Weber's model of dramatistic is essential to understand the competition between moral and structural justification in dramatic texts. An examination of The Crucible by Ray (2022) demonstrates the way in which Danforth weaponizes his legal-rational authority, using religious tradition to legitimize his power but lacking any moral integrity — a fact made clear when truth comes crashing down on him. In a more

recent article, Marshall (2018) puts Weber's theory to the test with Julius Caesar, observing that Caesar and Brutus both represent opposed claims of the rightful authority—one charismatic one moral.

In African fiction, Okeke (2021) explores the breakdown of traditional authority in *Things Fall Apart*, analyzing how British colonialism imposes legal-rational institutions that delegitimize local norms. In all these cases, Weber's theory reveals the fragility of institutions when legitimacy is contested. Fictional characters are shown navigating—and sometimes resisting—systems of power that claim legal or sacred grounding but ultimately collapse under ethical scrutiny.

### Erikson and Identity Crisis in Moments of Social Breakdown

The idea of characters experiencing ideological and/or moral crises has regained value as well, with Erik Erikson and his theory of psychosocial identity development re-entering popular culture analyses. This is particularly illustrative when we consider his idea of "identity confusion" during times of societal change — useful to understand how personal meaning as internalization or resistance against classically collective ideologies. In the case of adolescent protagonists in dystopian fiction, Turner (2018) employs Erikson to demonstrate how social pressures contribute to fractured identities. In The Crucible, Berman (2020) reads Mary Warren through Eriksonian crisis–the choice between veracity & terror and the dilemma of individuality & assimilative tendencies.

Erikson provides a model that Fahim (2022) follows in investigating identity politics in The Reluctant Fundamentalist, observing how post-9/11 fiction commonly stages a battle between individual integrity and national affiliation. In English studies, Erikson has helped us to think about the outside power arrangements but also the interior struggles of subjects as they try to situate themselves in an ideologically inflected world.

Persuasively, then, and not simply across genres but also genres of critique or re-creation, recent literary criticism remains underscored in both the spores and fears/offices of classical sociology for just how fiction articulates to/against/behind/ahead (depending on your context) structure as power as identity order.

Idea of whether analyzing dystopias, postcolonial narratives, historical dramas, or digital capitalism, scholars are demonstrating that the sociological imagination remains vital to interpreting literature in the 21st century. By applying the theories of Durkheim, Foucault, Gramsci, Althusser, Weber, and Erikson, researchers reveal the complex ways in which literature enacts, disrupts, and reflects the social forces that shape human experience.

### Research Gap

Despite the increasing scholarly interest in applying classical sociological theories to contemporary fiction and drama, there remains a noticeable gap in studies that integrate these frameworks in the analysis of canonical texts such as Arthur Miller's *The Crucible*. While individual theorists—such as Foucault in discussions of discourse and surveillance, or Gramsci in examinations of ideology—have been applied in isolated studies, few recent works attempt a comprehensive, multidimensional sociological reading that includes collective consciousness (Durkheim), ideological state apparatuses (Althusser), hegemonic consent (Gramsci), forms of authority (Weber), and identity crises (Erikson) within the same interpretive space. Moreover, most recent studies tend to prioritize dystopian or postcolonial fiction, often overlooking how historical allegories like *The Crucible* remain relevant for

understanding mechanisms of fear, power, and conformity in both past and present contexts. This gap signals the need for a systematic and updated sociological reinterpretation of *The Crucible* that not only draws from multiple theoretical traditions but also contextualizes the play within contemporary discussions of moral panic, ideological control, and institutional legitimacy.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research explores how hysteria is used as a tool to gain and maintain power in Arthur Miller's play *The Crucible*. Since the study focuses on human emotions, social behavior, language, and power dynamics within a fictional but socially realistic setting, it adopts a qualitative approach. Qualitative research is particularly suitable for interpreting the richness of human experiences, social interactions, and meaning-making processes, especially when dealing with literary texts that reflect and refract real-world concerns.

Through this approach, the study does not seek to measure or quantify behavior, but instead aims to understand how language, fear, and authority function in a dramatic context. Literature provides a space where abstract ideas like fear, guilt, and power are embodied by characters and enacted in symbolic settings. This makes it especially valuable for qualitative inquiry, where the emphasis is on depth rather than generalization.

### Research Design

The design of the study is rooted in literary interpretation, supported by sociological theory. The objective is not just to appreciate *The Crucible* as a dramatic work, but to examine how it functions as a mirror to society—particularly in times of crisis. A qualitative literary-sociological design allows the researcher to trace how individual characters participate in, respond to, or resist collective hysteria and moral panic.

This design includes close textual analysis of selected scenes and dialogues, alongside theoretical engagement with relevant sociological concepts. Since the main goal is to understand how fear is manipulated for personal and institutional power, this design enables a detailed and nuanced reading of the play's language, structure, and context.

### Data Collection

### Primary Data

The primary data for the study is the play *The Crucible* by Arthur Miller. The text is read several times to identify moments that reveal the spread and use of hysteria. Special attention is given to scenes involving characters such as Abigail Williams, Judge Danforth, Reverend Parris, and Mary Warren, who either contribute to or are caught within the climate of fear. These scenes often include public accusations, courtroom testimonies, and private conversations that reflect how fear can become a social force.

Passages are selected based on their thematic relevance to fear, power, confession, and public performance. Each chosen moment is then examined in detail to uncover how language, silence, and action contribute to the social construction of hysteria within the play.

**Secondary Data**

Supporting the analysis is a variety of scholarly literature beyond the main text. These secondary sources are peer-reviewed articles, critical essays and book chapters that explore the literary work of Arthur Miller, the historical context behind the Salem witch trials and the politicial background to McCarthyism.

A useful guide to the sociological literature on theories of collective behavior, discourse, power, ideology and identity. From the former — essential essays by folks like Émile Durkheim, Michel Foucault; from the latter — current-day academic takes on these theories in novels. This provides trust that the study reported here is grounded in refutable, empirical sources with valid entries on academic databases such as jstor, scholar, university libraries and other archives.

Data Analysis

Close reading is of course a fundamental practice in literary study; this analysis depends upon it. Close reading analyzes every word, phrase, tone, speaker as well as how the characters talk, react to the world and express feelings. This is highly useful in dealing with the various layers of meaning with which literature operates, which often invites a wide range of intepretations.

It uses the apparatus of close reading to look at the expression and performance of fear in the play, where particular words or accusations become truth-making, and how certain characters weaponise religious or legal language to further their hold over others. By doing this, the study demonstrates how hysteria is not an emotion so much as it a series of habits, habituated behavior which integrates itself into the social and political fabric of Salem.

**Theoretical and Conceptual Framework**

The analysis relies on two central sociological theories to support the interpretation. The first is the sociological concept of Émile Durkheim of the collective consciousness, while the second is the approach of Michel Foucault's power and discourse. These theories can demonstrate how a society can normalize irrational behavior through the use of language and authority of specific bodies to control their fears. Durkheim's Collective Consciousness. Durkheim's theory is based on the belief that society is maintained by the values, beliefs, and emotional experiences spread among individuals. Collectively, these understanding, or collective consciousness form a unity and identity of a group of people. As they share feelings, they also create a force that ties them ever stronger during the significant moments, such as crises or chaos. Durkheim termed this force the collective effervescence. In the Crucible, the town unifies through collective fear of witchcraft. This fear is not insignificant but something public, which changes people's behavior, decisions, and attitudes toward each other. It does not matter if any people believe in the court's accusations or not well enough, but everyone is obliged to because the threat have become a religious matter to the community altogether. Thus, Durkheim's theory subscribes to the way madness can become a new moral norm of a group and a unifying force. Foucault's Power and Discourse. Instead of studying emotional unification, Foucault looks into the mechanisms of norm creation and sustainability. Foucault's concept is based on the thesis that power is not only a property of leaders and institutions but is also something exercised by them through language and knowledge systems.

And in the falling of Paristheology becomes the language through which events in Salem are brought back to speech. Authority — in the form of judges, church leaders — creates and shape this discourse by controlling the criteria of what constitutes evidence, who is guilty and he is permitted to speak. Doubting voices are typically muffled, however, and doubters themselves exposed to some form of sanction or viewed as foes. This model of the theory of Foucault shows how fear brought forth not only through violence but an anti-pleasure narrative that actually silences speech as power.

Conclusion

This methodology combines literary criticism and sociological explanation to discover how hysteria in The Crucible functions as a text-recycling repressive state apparatus. In so doing and through a close reading of the narrative, informed by Durkheim and Foucault, this study demonstrates how fear becomes codified — accounting for both embodiment of control on the part of individual people within those confines, while also contributing to systems that allow a govern body to assert power over an entire community. The Crucible, thus read this way, comes to be not only a play about history but about the sociology of truth, fear and obedience in which they are socially made real and politically deployed.

## DATA ANALYSIS

This study explores how The Crucible dramatizes the use of fear and hysteria as tools of control. Through a thematic analysis, the play is examined not only as a historical account but as a sociological reflection on how individuals and institutions use fear to gain or maintain power. The analysis draws on Émile Durkheim's theory of collective consciousness and Michel Foucault's ideas on discourse and power.

A central finding is the strategic use of fear to silence dissent. Abigail Williams represents this manipulation clearly. She threatens other girls by saying, "Let either of you breathe a word… and I will bring a pointy reckoning," which shows how personal fear is weaponized (Miller, 1953, p. 20). In line with Durkheim's view, people in a group often follow the majority not because they agree, but because they fear rejection or punishment (Durkheim, 1912/2001). In Abigail's case, hysteria is not just fear—it's a way to gain status in a society where she previously had none.

Institutional figures like Judge Danforth also play a key role in turning hysteria into an official form of control. His statement, "We live no longer in the dusky afternoon when evil mixed itself with good," reflects rigid thinking that leaves no room for doubt or difference. This matches Foucault's (1977) theory of "truth-producing discourse," where authority decides what counts as truth and forces others to comply. The court uses language to demand loyalty, not justice. The claim, "We burn a hot fire here; it melts down all concealment," shows how institutions push people to confess—not for truth, but to maintain the appearance of control.

Another of the big themes is that trust in society has all but evaporated. Fear of anything causes people to go after others and even kinfolk. For example, Mary Warren betrays John Proctor in the court by screaming; ... You are the Devil's man! This also embodies Durkheim's fear of how moral panic rips apart the fabric of social unity. Proctor's heroic final refusal to falsely confess--"I have given you, my soul; leave me my name!" —demonstrates the human price of challenging existing power. His act is a small, non-violent refusal to the mass of fear on which this world is built.

Result of this analysis can be summed up as — public reputation trumps over truth Finally. Confession to protect institutional moral authority of the state, not to reveal facts. The line of Danforth — "Confess

yourself or hang!" — was a reminder that when it comes to power, the priority is often obedience, not justice. According to Foucault (1980), these systems succeed because they instil fear in individuals, leading them to police themselves. In this way, Miller's drama is not just literature but a horizon of how societies usually manipulate people in controlling exactly what they are scared of and believe.

**Findings**

The hysteria of *The Crucible* uncovered in this research goes way beyond just an emotional outcry or a show of irrational fear. Rather, it is depicted as a socio-political handy object to keep crowd in a check and nip dissent into the bud. Throughout, Arthur Miller presents fear both as the natural response and a meticulously designed strategy. However, characters like Abigail Williams take advantage of this fear to gain power and alter the social structure, while figures like Reverend Parris and Judge Danforth use that same fear to wield their authority even more fiercely, stifling any potential dissenting voices (Miller 1953).

A major thing we found is that hysteria is a political application — something works in the family space and out of it. Charges, torture-driven confessions and mutism are means of loyalty signalling. This is very Foucauldian (Foucault, 1977): power operates through performances and ceremonies as much as rules or laws. Simultaneously, heeding the Durkheimian (1912/2001) collective consciousness clarifies it for us that the Salem community starts behaving as a single body; only this time, not due to common beliefs, but because of common terror. When we become so steeped in fear as a culture, reason and the power of individual discernment give way.

The most resonant finding of that analysis is fear speaks power. It influences action in us, in our institutions and contributes to what is recognized as true within a society. Thus, hysteria is not only a subject of the play, it is the system itself.

**CONCLUSION**

This study finds that *The Crucible* provides a provocative sociological account as to how hysteria is created and kept in existence so people — and institutions with which they are associated — can advanced their self-interest. The application of both Durkheim and Foucault highlight then that fear in the play, is deliberate rather than accidental; Fear is part of a structure meant to guide-behavior and maintain power (Foucault, 1980; Durkheim, 1912/2001).

It is as good a time as ever to reread Miller because his work demonstrates how the humble truth can be manipulated so quickly and easily, how justice can blink when fear becomes law. It highlights how societies can give up personal liberties and social fairness for the illusion of security and order. Danforth is an example of how institutions save themselves at the cost of truth (Miller, 1953) and John Proctor refusing to falsely confess demonstrates the price of opposing such systems.

Overall, the findings stress the need to question authority, especially when fear is used to silence voices and maintain control. The Crucible warns us that societies built on fear are not just unjust—they are dangerously unstable.

**REFERENCES**

Ahmed, S. (2019). The politics of fear in post-9/11 American fiction. *Journal of Cultural Sociology, 13*(2), 115–132. https://doi.org/10.1177/1749975518798705

Ali, M., Hamid, M., Ejaz, A., Aziz, T., Gul, A., & Ibrahim, S. (2025). Exploring The Impact of Demographic Factors On Psychache, Life Satisfaction, And Hopelessness in Mood Disorder Patients. *Social Science Review Archives*, *3*(1), 1722-1733.

Althusser, L. (1971). Ideology and ideological state apparatuses. In B. Brewster (Trans.), Lenin and philosophy and other essays (pp. 127–186). Monthly Review Press.

Bakht, M. (2021). The ideological apparatus in dystopian fiction: Revisiting Orwell and Huxley. *Studies in Literature and Language, 22*(1), 19–29. https://doi.org/10.3968/12459

Barker, T. (2021). Ritual, ideology, and conformity: Institutions in modern political thought. *Cambridge University Press*.

Berman, R. (2020). Moral identity and group pressure in fear-driven societies: A psychological-sociological analysis. *Social Inquiry, 90*(2), 134–150. https://doi.org/10.1111/soin.12245

Chang, Y. (2023). Digital ideologies: Althusser's ISAs in the age of surveillance capitalism. *Digital Humanities Quarterly, 17*(1), 1–20.

Cohen, S. (1972). Folk devils and moral panics: The creation of the Mods and Rockers. Routledge.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Durkheim, É. (2001). The elementary forms of religious life (C. Cosman, Trans.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1912)

Durkheim, E. (2014). *The elementary forms of religious life* (K. E. Fields, Trans.). Free Press. (Original work published 1912)

Ellis, J. (2020). Mass panic and sacred duty: Revisiting Durkheim in an age of polarization. *Journal of Sociological Inquiry, 89*(4), 447–462. https://doi.org/10.1111/soin.12230

Erikson, K. T. (1966). Wayward Puritans: A study in the sociology of deviance. John Wiley & Sons.

Fahim, A. (2022). Negotiating identity in globalized societies: Erikson and *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*. *Postcolonial Text, 17*(2), 1–15.

Fischer, L. (2018). Disciplinary bodies in *Never Let Me Go*: A Foucauldian reading. *Modern Fiction Studies, 64*(3), 412–429. https://doi.org/10.1353/mfs.2018.0044

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1977). Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1980). Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977 (C. Gordon, Ed.). Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1981). The order of discourse (I. McLeod, Trans.). In R. Young (Ed.), Untying the text: A post-structuralist reader (pp. 48–78). Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Garland, D. (2001). The culture of control: Crime and social order in contemporary society. University of Chicago Press.

Gramsci, A. (1971). Selections from the prison notebooks (Q. Hoare & G. Nowell Smith, Eds. & Trans.). International Publishers.

Gutting, G., & Oksala, J. (2019). *Michel Foucault*. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2019 Edition). https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/foucault/

Harvard College Writing Center. (2025). A guide to close reading. Harvard University. https://writingcenter.fas.harvard.edu

Ibrahim, S., Aamir, N., Abd Allah, A. M., Hamam, H., Alhowaity, A., Ali, V., ... & Saeed, T. (2022). Improving performance evaluation coefficient and parabolic solar collector efficiency with hybrid nanofluid by innovative slotted turbulators. *Sustainable Energy Technologies and Assessments*, *53*, 102391.

Ibrar, M., Ahmad, D., Humayun, T., Hashim, A., & Hussain, A. (2025). A Critical Analysis of Islamophobia in Gottschalk and Greenberg's Islamophobia: Making Muslims the Enemy. *The Critical Review of Social Sciences Studies*, *3*(1), 1848-1863.

Jenkins, P. (1998). Moral panic: Changing concepts of the child molester in modern America. Yale University Press.

Johnson, M. (2021). Durkheim's ritual theory in contemporary theocratic fiction: Atwood's Gilead reimagined. *Religion & Literature, 53*(1), 55–76.

Kemp, R. (2021). Performing power: Discursive control in Miller's *Crucible* and contemporary authority. *Sociological Review, 69*(2), 287–306. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038026120986289

Lopes, C. (2022). Constructing docile bodies: Young adult dystopias and Foucauldian surveillance. *Journal of Adolescent and Young Adult Literature, 6*(1), 1–14.

Lukes, S. (2005). Power: A radical view (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.

Marshall, H. (2018). Legitimacy and rhetoric in *Julius Caesar*: A Weberian analysis. *Shakespeare Studies, 46*, 88–105.

McNally, M. (2023). Gramsci and the witch trials: Ideology, class, and consent in Salem. *Cultural Politics, 19*(1), 101–120. https://doi.org/10.1215/17432197-10252914

Miller, A. (1953). The Crucible. Viking Press.

Okeke, C. (2021). Authority and legitimacy in colonial African fiction: Reading Achebe through Weber. *African Literature Today, 39*(1), 55–70.

Rabi, F., Ullah, I., & Rabi, U. (2024). Expansion of The City: An Eco-Critical Analysis of Majid Amjad's Poem "Tosee Sheher". *Educational Research and Innovation*, *4*(03), 39-53.

Rahman, T. (2020). Postcolonial hegemony and Gramscian identity in Tayeb Salih's fiction. *Journal of Postcolonial Writing, 56*(3), 310–324. https://doi.org/10.1080/17449855.2019.1652350

Ray, S. (2022). Authority, fear, and theocratic justice: A Weberian view of *The Crucible*. *The American Sociologist, 53*(3), 389–406. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12108-021-09491-z

Trevett, C. (2019). Reproducing ideology in sacred institutions: Althusser revisited. *Critical Inquiry in Religion and Society, 37*(4), 199–216.

Turner, S. (2018). Groupthink and moral identity: The psychology of fear in political societies. *Journal of Political Psychology, 39*(2), 140–163. https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12439

Ullah, I., Bibi, M., Begam, R., Khan, T., & Bibi, N. (2024). A critical discourse analysis of language patterns and power dynamics in social media discourse. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL (JALT)*, *7*(4), 914-925.

Weber, M. (1946). From Max Weber: Essays in sociology (H. H. Gerth & C. Wright Mills, Eds. & Trans.). Oxford University Press.

Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology* (G. Roth & C. Wittich, Eds.). University of California Press.

Zizek, S. (2020). *Pandemic! 2: Chronicles of a time lost*. OR Books.