SPAIS School of Sociology, Politics and International Studies

SOCIM3101 Contemporary Sociological Theory

Teaching Block: 1   **Weeks:** 1-12

Unit Owner:	Dr Dan Whillis	Level:	M/7
Phone:	0117 928 8402	**Credit points:**	20
Email:	D.Whillis@bristol.ac.uk	**Prerequisites:**	None
Office:	**1.02, 10 Priory Road**	**Curriculum area:**	N/A
Unit owner office hours:	**Please see SPAIS MSc Blackboard for details** (Please note, there are no regular office hours during Reading Week)		

Timetabled classes:

Please see your personal online timetable for details.

You are also expected to attend **ONE** seminar each week. Your online personal timetable will inform you to which group you have been allocated. Seminar groups are fixed: you are not allowed to change seminar groups without permission from the office.

Weeks 6, 12, 18 and 24 are Reading Weeks; there is NO regular teaching in these weeks.

In addition to timetabled sessions there is a requirement for private study, reading, revision and assessments. Reading the required readings in advance of each seminar is the _minimum_ expectation. The University Guidelines state that one credit point is broadly equivalent to 10 hours of total student input.

Learning Outcomes
By the end of the unit, students should be able to:
- exposit and analyse a range of schools and thinkers in modern sociology
- develop a critical account of developments and debates in social theory
- show familiarity with the key ideas and concepts of a variety of theorists
- compare and contrast theories and theorists according to specified themes of analysis

Requirements for passing the unit:
- Satisfactory attendance at seminars
- Completion of all formative work to an acceptable standard
- Attainment of a composite mark of all summative work to a passing standard (50 or above)

Details of coursework and deadlines

Assessment:	Word count:	Weighting:	Deadline:	Day:	Week:
Formative: Critical review of ONE published work by a major theorist	1000	0%	27th October, 2017	Friday	5
Summative - essay	4,000 words	100%	9.30 am 11 January 2018	Thursday	AW1

- Summative essay questions will be made available on the SPAIS MSc Admin Blackboard site.
- Instructions for the submission of coursework will be emailed prior to the submission deadline.
- Assessment in the school is subject to strict penalties regarding late submission, plagiarism and maximum word count. See Appendix.
- Marking criteria can be found in the Appendix.

Teaching arrangements

The unit is taught via one fifty-minute lecture and one fifty-minute seminar per week. The lecture will essentially provide an overview of the theories, thinkers and concepts in question each week, while the seminar will aim to solidify knowledge and open up discussion in a structured manner. Not everyone will be at the same level. Some people will be coming to these ideas for the first time, while others will be seeking to push beyond their existing knowledge of them, and the expectation is that those falling into the latter camp will be willing and able to explicate and demonstrate ideas for the former.

Unit aims

- To introduce students to the key thinkers and paradigms of modern sociology
- To give a coherent and connected account of the way sociological theory has developed in the Twentieth century
- To encourage a critical and independent approach to theoretical understanding
- To convey a sense of current debate amongst sociological theorists

Unit description

This unit aims to provide a broad grounding in the ways sociologists and others have conceptualised the social world since the days of Marx, Weber, and Durkheim. It takes a roughly historical approach, tracking the development of themes and concepts through the twentieth century up to today, so that we can make sense of the social and intellectual context in which different ideas emerged. We'll see the reactions to the big events and movements of the last hundred years, including fascism, consumerism, globalisation and feminism, but we'll also see that the story of sociology has revolved around different stances and counter-stances on a variety of conceptual oppositions, such as conflict/consensus, individual/society, agency/structure, micro/macro, subjective/objective, male/female, white Western/other, substance/relation, and even human/nonhuman. Not only have there been contrasting theoretical attempts to understand and explain sociology's key 'object' – modern society – but, as we will see, there have also been significant 'reflexive' movements within social thought to critically examine *itself*, probing some of the presuppositions, blind spots, and even prejudices of the discipline.

Coursework

For formative assessment you are expected to write one short piece (1000 words) that should take the form of a critical book review of one published work by a major theorist. The chosen work need not be a whole book; it can be a substantial chapter or a significant shorter article. More information – and a list of suggested titles – will be provided in seminars. There is scope for tackling something beyond the list, but you must OK your choice with me before submission (to ensure that you are tackling a major theorist – not a secondary text – and that you are choosing a theorist from within the broad parameters of this unit).

Summative assessment is by way of a (maximum) 4000 word essay to be submitted in January (see cover page for details).

Reading

There is no 'set text' which you have to buy, since the required readings for each week are provided electronically. However, reading about the same theories in as many places as possible is a really useful way of clarifying and filling out knowledge. So, it is well worth complementing the essential readings with textbooks, and you might find it a good idea to buy one (or more) which you like. Having a theory textbook always on hand will pay huge dividends for the rest of your degree.

Complementary and background readings are given from some textbooks more than others in the reading lists for each week. The ones that crop up most often, and from amongst which you might want to pick one to buy, are:

Calhoun, C. et al. eds. (2012) *Contemporary Sociological Theory* (3rd Ed), Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell (HM51 CON)
  This Reader contains many short pieces from most of the thinkers or themes we look at alongside very clear and concise section summaries.

Craib, I. (1992) *Modern Sociological Theory* (2nd Ed), Hemel Hempstead: Harvester (HM24 CRA)
  Very clear and lively, but it is getting old now so has a few gaps.

Crow, G. (2005) *The Art of Sociological Argument*, Basingstoke; New York: Palgrave Macmillan (HM445 CRO)
  Good on the context and style of a select number of key theorists, all of whom are relevant and several of whom we will be addressing directly.

Harrington, A. ed. (2005) *Modern Social Theory: An Introduction*. Oxford University Press (HM61 MOD)
  A good all-rounder, which also contains a glossary of terms and ideas and biographies of key thinkers.

McLennan, G. (2011) *Story of Sociology*, London: Bloomsbury. (HM24 MAC)
  An invaluable reminder/primer on the development of modern social thought, with Chapters 7 to 10 providing a concise overview of the contents of this course. **If you are new to sociological theory then this is a very good place to start**.

Ritzer, G. & Goodman, D. (2004) *Modern Sociological Theory* (6th Ed), New York: McGraw-Hill (HM24 RIT)
  Very comprehensive and straightforward, but a little dry.

Scott, J. ed. (2007) *Fifty Key Sociologists: The Contemporary Theorists*, London: Routledge (HM447 FIF)
  Focuses on individual thinkers rather than theories or historical development.

Seidman, S. (2013) *Contested Knowledge: Social Theory Today* (5th Ed), Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell (HM585 SEI)
  Readable and engaging, and tries to cover both US and European developments, but there are some notable holes in its coverage.

Stones, R. ed. (2008) *Key Sociological Thinkers*, Basingstoke: Palgrave (HM51 KEY).
  Like Scott, focuses on thinkers.

Textbooks come in all styles and you'll have to work out which type works best for you by trying out a few from the library. They often approach the topic in different ways too, not just because all textbooks are underpinned in some way by the agendas, ideas and nationality of their authors, but in terms of whether they prioritise focusing on themes (such as Harrington), thinkers (such as Stones) or the broader historical story of theory (such as Seidman). The third category is perhaps the most in tune with the structure of the unit, though the others are very handy for getting your head around particular concepts or the ideas of particular individuals.

There are masses of other theory textbooks in the library jostling for student attention which you might want to check out too. Only a selection is listed below. The more accessible texts are starred (*).

Baert, P. and de Silva, F. (2010) *Social Theory in the Twentieth Century and Beyond* (2nd Ed), Cambridge: Polity (HM24 BAE; an older edition (by Baert alone) is also available)
Callinicos, A. (1999) *Social Theory: A Historical Introduction*, New York University Press (H51 CAL)
Clarke, S. (2006) *From Enlightenment to Risk: social theory and contemporary society*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan (HM435 CLA)
*Dillon, M. (2010) *Introduction to Sociological Theory*, Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell (HM585 DIL)

Dodd, N. (1999) *Social Theory and Modernity*, Cambridge: Polity Press (HM19 DOD)

Elliott, A. (ed) (1999) *The Blackwell Reader in Contemporary Social Theory*, Oxford: Blackwell (HM24 BLA)

*Elliott, A. (2009) *Contemporary Social Theory: An Introduction*, London: Routledge (HM585 ELL; eBook)

Elliott, A. and Turner, B. (Eds) (2001) *Profiles in Contemporary Social Theory*, London: SAGE (HM585 PRO)

Gane, N. (2004) *The Future of Social Theory*, London: Continuum (H61.15 GAN)

Giddens, A. & Turner, J. (1987) *Social Theory Today*, Cambridge: Polity Press (HM24 SOC)

Hall, S. et.al. (Eds) (1995) *Modernity and its Futures*, Cambridge: Polity Press (HM73 MOD)

Kilminster, R. (2000) *The Sociological Revolution*, London: Routledge (HM19 KIL)

Law, A. (2015) *Social Theory for Today*, London: SAGE (HM585 LAW)

Layder, D. (2012) *Understanding Social Theory* (2nd Ed), London: SAGE (HM24 LAY; eBook)

Lemert, C. (1993) *Social Theory: The Multicultural and Classic Readings*, Boulder: Westview Press (HM51 SOC)

Lopez, J. & Scott, J. (2000) *Social Structure*, Buckingham: Open University Press (HM706 LOP)

May, T. (1996) *Situating Social Theory*, Buckingham: OUP (HM24 MAY)

*Ransome, P. (2010) *Social Theory for Beginners*, Bristol: Policy Press. (H61 RAN)

Ritzer, G. (2003) *The Blackwell Companion to Major Contemporary Social Theorists*, Oxford: Blackwell (H61 BLA)

*Ritzer, G. (2008) *Sociological Theory* (7th Ed), Boston; London: McGraw-Hill (HM24 RIT)

Ritzer, G. & Smart, B. (eds.) (2000) *Handbook of Social Theory*, London: SAGE (H51 HAN)

Scott, J. (2012) *Sociological Theory: Contemporary Debates* (2nd Ed) Aldershot: Edward Elgar (HM24 SCO)

Scott, J. (2006) *Social Theory: central issues in sociology*, London: Sage (HM435 SCO)

Swingewood, A. (2000) *A Short History of Sociological Thought* (3rd Ed), Basingstoke: Macmillan Press (HM19 SWI)

Turner, B. (2009) *The New Blackwell Companion to Social Theory*, Oxford: Blackwell (H61 NEW; eBook)

You are also encouraged to have a concerted go at reading more of the works of the actual theorists we look at. Many of them can be tough going, but if they get you thinking, even if you don't understand everything, then it's worth it. Besides which, the more you read them, the easier it becomes (theory really is a practice).

Do also browse the leading theory journals online, as most articles will contain a concise summary of the theory they're looking at before they use, attack, or develop it. The main ones are:

Theory, Culture and Society
Sociological Theory
European Journal of Social Theory

Finally, a word on websites and online resources. There is a ridiculous amount of material online about sociological theory, some of it good, most of it very bad and to be avoided. Marxists.org is a very useful site, and the Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy (plato.stanford.edu) and the Internet Encyclopaedia of Philosophy (iep.utm.edu) contain many useful and relevant entries written by reputable folks. Google Books and Google Scholar are also stock-in-trade resources for accessing books and journal articles. Wikipedia, however, is not to be trusted. Sure, use it for an initial orientation if you like, but never take what it says as the final word: the quality and accuracy can be very hit and miss. In any case, if you draw on online resources for assessments, they need to be referenced in exactly the same way as any other source, but it is generally best to **avoid relying on websites for assessed work altogether**.

YouTube can be useful for watching videos on different theories, concepts or thinkers and getting a fresh perspective. Best to try to stick to interviews or conferences with actual theorists, or introductions from teachers at other universities – there are loads of student presentations online which are mostly of dubious quality, as well as plenty of weird ramblings by random people. There are some links to useful videos on blackboard.

Lecture schedule

Week 1	Introduction
Week 2	Micro-sociological theory
Week 3	Critical theory
Week 4	The integrative sociology of Pierre Bourdieu
Week 5	The post-structuralism of Michel Foucault
Week 6	**Reading week**
Week 7	Feminist theory and the critique of gender
Week 8	Postmodernity and postmodernism
Week 9	Reflexive modernity
Week 10	Post-colonial theory and the critique of Eurocentrism
Week 11	Bruno Latour and actor-network theory
Week 12	**Reading week**

Week 1: Introduction

This week's lecture will introduce the course. We'll begin by thinking a little about what 'sociological theory' actually *is* and what it's *for*, picking out some of the key concerns and questions that have guided the ideas covered in the course. We'll also get to grips with some of the basic vocabulary of sociological theory, such as micro/macro, agency/structure and subjectivity/objectivity, and reflect on the relationship between theory and empirical research. The lecture will also briefly outline one of the characteristic concerns of modern sociology: the problem of social order. What makes society tick; what holds it together? To get the ball rolling, we will consider three classic approaches to this issue that were prominent in the mid-twentieth century: functionalism, rational choice theory, and conflict theory.

Essential Reading
Craib, I. (1992) 'What's wrong with theory and why we still need it.' Ch.1 in *Modern Social Theory: From Parsons to Habermas*, pp.3-13.
Holmwood, J. (2005) 'Functionalism and its Critics.' Ch.4 in Harrington, A. (Ed) *Modern Social Theory: An Introduction*, pp.87-109.

Further reading
General:
Harrington, A. ed. (2005) 'Introduction: What is Social Theory?' in *Modern Social Theory: An Introduction*, pp.1-15.
Jenkins, R. (2002) 'What is Sociology?' Ch.2 in *Foundations of Sociology: Towards a Better Understanding of the Human* World, pp.31-8.
Joas, H. & Knöbl, W. (2009) 'What is theory?' Ch.1 in *Social Theory: Twenty Introductory Lectures*, pp.1-19
Layder, D. (2006) 'A Map of the Terrain.' Ch.1 in *Understanding Social Theory*, pp.1-12
McLennan, G. (2011) Chapters 1-6 in *Story of Sociology*

Seidman, S. (2013), 'Preface' and 'Introduction,' in *Contested Knowledge*

Parsons, Mills, and Rational Choice Theory:
Alexander, J. (1992) 'Shaky Foundations'. *Theory and Society*, 21 (2): 203-17.
Baert, P. and de Silva, F. (2010) 'The Invasion of Economic Man'. Ch.4 in *Social Theory in the Twentieth Century and Beyond*
Becker, G. (1993) 'Nobel Lecture: The Economic Way of Looking at Behaviour' *Journal of Political Economy*, 101(3): 385-409.
Coleman, J. (1993) 'The Rational Reconstruction of Society' *American Sociological Review*, 58(1): 1-15.
Craib, I. (1992) 'Parsons' & 'Rational Choice Theory'. Chs 3 & 4 in *Modern Social Theory*
Crow, G. (2005) 'Talcott Parsons: Sociology as Systematic Reflection' and 'Charles Wright Mills: Sociology as an Imaginative Craft'. Chs 5 & 6 in *The Art of Sociological Argument*.
Layder, D. (2006) 'The Legacy of Talcott Parsons,' Ch.2 in *Understanding Social Theory*, pp.15-38.
McLennan, G. (2011) 'Talcott Parsons' & 'Exchange/rational choice theory'. In *Story of Sociology*, pp.102-112 & 117-19
Mills, C.W. (1958) 'Grand Theory' & 'Abstracted Empiricism'. Chs 2 & 3 in *The Sociological Imagination*
Parsons, T. (1937) *The Structure of Social Action*
Parsons, T. (1951) *The Social System*
Ritzer, G. & Goodman, D. (2004) 'Structural Functionalism, Neofunctionalism and Conflict Theory' & 'Exchange, Network and Rational Choice Theories'. Chapters 3 & 8 in *Modern Sociological Theory*
Scott, J. (2007) 'Talcott Parsons,' in *Fifty Key Sociologists,* pp.187-93.
Scott, J. (2012) 'Rational Choice and Social Exchange,' Ch.4 in *Sociological Theory*.
Seidman, S. (2013) 'The Grand Theory of Talcott Parsons and of Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann,' Ch.5 in *Contested Knowledge*, pp.67-79.
Stones, R. (2008) 'Talcott Parsons,' in *Key Sociological Thinkers*.
Swingewood, A. (2000) 'Functionalism,' Ch. 6 in *A Short History of Sociological Thought*, pp.137-160.

Week 2: Micro-sociological theory

This week we begin to explore a variety of theories that see the world as a product of self-aware, reflective people acting on the basis of the meanings they attach to things picked up through interaction. The focus is above all on the workings of everyday life and is directly opposed to the grand theoretical schemes of functionalism (outlined in Week 1), which tended to portray people as the 'dupes' of large-scale cultural structures. We'll look closely at two of these perspectives: symbolic interactionism and ethnomethodology.

Essential Reading

Baert, P. and de Silva, F. (2010) 'The Enigma of Everyday Life.' Ch.3 in *Social Theory in the Twentieth Century and Beyond*, pp.90-124.
Blumer, H. (1969) 'The Methodological Position of Symbolic Interactionism,' Ch.1 in *Symbolic Interactionism*, pp. 1-21.

Further reading
General:
Berger, P. and Luckmann, T. (1967) *The Social Construction of Reality*
Branaman, A. (2001) 'Erving Goffman' in Elliott and Turner (Eds) *Profiles in Contemporary Social Theory*
Calhoun, C et al (2007) *Contemporary Sociological Theory*, Part 1: Micro-Sociology
Craib, I. (1992) 'Symbolic Interactionism' and 'Society as a Conspiracy.' Ch.5 & 6 in *Modern Social Theory*
Crossley, N. (2011) *Toward Relational Sociology*
Crow, G. (2005) 'Erving Goffman: sociology as an eye for detail,' Ch.7 in *The Art of Sociological Argument*
Giddens, A. (1976) *New Rules of Sociological Method*
Gouldner, A. (1971) *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology*
Hilbert, R.A. (2009) 'Ethnomethodology and Social Theory'. Ch.8 in B.S. Turner (ed.) *The New Blackwell Companion to Social* Theory, pp.159-178
McLennan, G. (2011) *Story of Sociology*, pp. 98-102, 121-4,
Outhwaite, W. (2005) 'Interpretivism and Interactionism.' Ch.5 in Harrington, A. (Ed) *Modern Social Theory*, pp.110-31.
Ritzer, G. and Goodman, D. (2004) 'Symbolic Interactionism' and 'Ethnomethodology.' Ch.6 & 7 in *Modern Sociological Theory*

Schutz, A. (1967) *The Phenomenology of the Social World*
Scott, J. (2007) *Fifty Key Sociologists*, entries on Howard S. Becker, Harold Garfinkel and Erving Goffman
Stones, R. (2008) *Key Sociological Thinkers*, Chapters on Blumer, Goffman and Garfinkel

Symbolic interactionism:
Athens, L. (2002) 'Domination: the Blind Spot in Mead's Analysis of the Social Act,' *Journal of Classical Sociology*, Vol.2 (1): 25-42.
Becker, H. (1982) *Art Worlds*
Blumer, H. (1969/1991) *Symbolic Interactionism*
Denzin, N. (1992) *Symbolic Interactionism and Cultural Studies*
Goffman, E. (1959) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*
Goffman, E. (1961) *Asylums*
Goffman, E. (1963) *Stigma*
Goffman, E. (1982) 'The Interaction Order.' *American Sociological Review*, 48 (1): 1-17.
Hochschild, A. (1983) *The Managed Heart*
Mead, G. H. (1934) *Mind, Self and Society*
Plummer, K. (1991) *Symbolic Interactionism*
Rock, P. (1979) *The Making of Symbolic Interactionism*

Ethnomethodology:
Button, G. (1991) *Ethnomethodology and the Human Sciences*
Garfinkel, H. (1967) *Studies in Ethnomethodology*
Heritage, J. (1984) *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*
Livingston, E. (1987) *Making Sense of Ethnomethodology*
Sharrock, W. and Anderson, B. (1986) *The Ethnomethodologists*

Week 3: Critical theory

While the 'micro' theories considered in Week 2 were largely US-led reactions against functionalism, in Europe criticism of mainstream sociology – and society – drew heavily on the resources of Marxism, albeit in new ways. As well as recognition of certain conceptual problems with orthodox Marxism (such as economic reductionism), the rise of fascism and Stalinism, the persistence of capitalism, and the spread of mass media and consumerism, all gave rise to a number of attempts to refashion Marx's ideas in ways that could explain the apparent failure of the project of universal progress and emancipation – and potentially reboot it. Different efforts to rework Marx in this context surfaced, but we'll focus on just the most influential: the 'critical theory' of the Frankfurt School, including the work of Jürgen Habermas.

Essential Reading
Kellner, D. (2005) 'Western Marxism,' Ch.7 in Harrington, A. (Ed.) *Modern Social Theory: An Introduction*, pp.154-170
Marcuse, H. (1964/2007) 'One Dimensional Man.' In Calhoun, C. *et al* (Eds) *Classical Sociological Theory* (2nd ed.) pp.390-397
Elliott, A. (2009) 'Contemporary Critical Theory'. Ch.6 in *Contemporary Social Theory: An Introduction*, pp.155-185

Further reading
Adorno, T. (2001) *The Culture Industry*
Anderson, P. (1976) *Considerations on Western Marxism*
Baert, P. (2001) 'Jürgen Habermas,' Bowie, A. (2001) 'Theodor Adorno,' and Kellner, D. (2001) 'Herbert Marcuse,' in Elliott and Turner (Eds) *Profiles in Contemporary Social Theory*
Calhoun et al (2007) *Contemporary Sociological Theory*, Part 8: The Sociological Theory of Jurgen Habermas.
Clarke, S. (2005) *From Enlightenment to Risk*, Chapters 2, 3 and 4
Craib, I. (1992) 'The Frankfurt School' and 'Jurgen Habermas,' Chs 11 & 12 in *Modern Social Theory*
Dodd, N. (1999) 'Horkheimer, Adorno and Marcuse,' Ch.3 in *Social Theory and Modernity*
Edgar, A. (2006) *Habermas: The Key Concepts*
Elliott & Turner (Eds) (2001) *Profiles in Contemporary Social Theory*. Chapters by Baert on Habermas; Bowie on Adorno; Kellner on Marcuse

Erikson, E. O. and Jarle Weigård (2003) *Understanding Habermas: communicating action and deliberative democracy*

Fraser, N. (1989) *Unruly Practices*

Frith, S. (2007) *Taking Popular Music Seriously*

Gramsci, A. (1971) *Selections from Prison Notebooks*

Habermas, J. (1979) *Communication and the Evolution of Society*

Habermas, J. (1984-7) *The Theory of Communicative Action* (2 Vols)

Habermas, J. (1989) *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*

Held, D. (1980) *Introduction to Critical Theory*

Honneth, A. (1996) *The Struggle for Recognition*

Honneth, A. (2007) *Disrespect*, esp. Chap 3

Horkeheimer, M. and Adorno, T. (1969) *Dialectic of Enlightenment*

Horkheimer, M. and Adorno, T. (1973) *Aspects of Sociology*

Joseph, J. (2005) *Marxism and Social Theory*

Layder, D. (2006) 'Habermas's Lifeworld and System,' Ch.10 in *Understanding Social Theory*, pp.213-238

Marcuse, H. (1964) *One-Dimensional Man*

Outhwaite, W. (1994) *Habermas*

Outhwaite, W. (1996) *The Habermas Reader*

Ritzer, G. and Goodman, D. (2004) 'Varieties of Neo-Marxian Theory,' Ch.4 in *Modern Sociological Theory*

Scott, J. (2007) *Fifty Key Sociologists*, entry on Jurgen Habermas

Seidman, S. (2013) 'The Critical Theory of Jürgen Habermas,' Ch.8 in *Contested Knowledge*, pp.119-31.

Slater, P. (1977) *Origins and Significance of the Frankfurt School*

Stones, R. (2008) *Key Sociological Thinkers*, Chapters on Theodor Adorno and Jürgen Habermas

Don't forget many writings by most Marxists are available for free at www.marxists.org

Week 4: The integrative sociology of Pierre Bourdieu

Where functionalism, as well as some strands of Western Marxism, explained how society works by highlighting macro-structures and their role in moulding people, opposing theories placed much more emphasis on micro-level interactions and personal agency – exploring the power of individuals to shape their own lives. As a result social theory appeared to offer incompatible either/or choices: micro or macro; structure or agency. This week our attention turns to attempts to move beyond these dichotomies and develop approaches that integrate all these elements in grand theoretical syntheses. Our focus is on France's most celebrated post-war sociologist, Pierre Bourdieu. We will pay close attention to Bourdieu's central notions of 'habitus' – or socialised subjectivity – and 'field' – or abstract relations of struggle and domination vis-à-vis particular forms of power and recognition, known as 'capital'.

Essential Reading
Wacquant, L. (2008) 'Pierre Bourdieu'. Ch.16 in R. Stones (Ed) *Key Sociological Thinkers* (2nd ed.), pp.261-277

Webb, J. et al (2002) 'Cultural Field and the Habitus.' Ch.2 in *Understanding Bourdieu*, pp.21-44.

Bourdieu, P. (1998) 'Social Space and Field of Power' in *Practical Reason*, pp.31-34.

Further reading
Basic readings:
Calhoun et al (2007) *Contemporary Sociological Theory*, Part 6: The Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu

Fowler, B. (2001) 'Pierre Bourdieu' in Elliott and Turner (Eds) *Profiles in Contemporary Social Theory*

Grenfell, M. (2008) *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts*

Jenkins, R. (2002) *Pierre Bourdieu*

King, A. (2005) 'Structure and Agency.' Ch.10 in Harrington (Ed) *Modern Social Theory*, pp.221-227.

Martin, J. L. (2003) 'What is Field Theory?' *American Journal of Sociology*, 109: 1-49.

Ritzer, G. and Goodman, D. (2004) 'Agency-Structure Integration,' Ch.11 in *Modern Sociological Theory*

Scott, J. (2007) 'Pierre Bourdieu' in *Fifty Key Sociologists*

Seidman, S. (2013) 'The Critical Sociology of Anthony Giddens and Pierre Bourdieu.' Ch.10 in *Contested Knowledge*

Susen, S. and Turner, B. (eds) (2011) *The Legacy of Pierre Bourdieu*

Swartz, D. (1998) *Culture and Power: The Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu*

Webb, J. et al (2002) *Understanding Bourdieu*

Bourdieu's own works and his critics:
Alexander, J. (1995) 'The Reality of Reduction,' Ch.4 in *Fin de Siecle Social Theory*
Bourdieu, P. (1977) *Outline of a Theory of Practice*
Bourdieu, P. (1984) *Distinction*
Bourdieu, P. (1990) *In Other Words*
Bourdieu, P. (1990) *The Logic of Practice*, esp. Book I
Bourdieu, P. (1996) *The State Nobility*
Bourdieu, P. (1996) *The Rules of Art*
Bourdieu, P. (1998) *Practical Reason*
Bourdieu, P. (2000) *Pascalian Meditations*
Bourdieu, P. and Passeron, J.-C. (1990) *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*
Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L. (1992) *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*
Freire, B. (2004) 'Genetic Structuralism, Psychological Sociology and Pragmatic Actor Theory,' *Theory, Culture, & Society*, 21(3): 85-99.
Honneth, A. (1986) 'The Fragmented World of Symbolic Forms: Reflections on Pierre Bourdieu's Sociology of Culture,' *Theory, Culture, & Society*, 3(3): 55-66.
Lahire, B. (2003) 'From the Habitus to an Individual Heritage of Dispositions' *Poetics*, 31: 329-55
Lahire, B. (2011) *The Plural Actor*
Pelletier, C. (2009) 'Emancipation, equality and education: Rancière's critique of Bourdieu and the question of performativity.' *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, Vol.30 (2): 137-150

Week 5: The post-structuralism of Michel Foucault

If the theories studied in Weeks 1-4 were all variously animated by the question of how society works, this week marks the emergence of a critical twist in the tale. While that question remains of central interest, the various theorists we will cover over the coming weeks also focused attention on the significance of sociological knowledge itself. The 'scientific' neutrality of modern social thought was increasingly called into question, as was its purported claims to serve universal reason and progress. This week we concentrate on the hugely influential work of Michel Foucault. According to conventional accounts, the human sciences are engaged in the essentially positive and impartial pursuit of the 'truth' about social relations and human selfhood. Foucault, however, was interested in the ways in which the human and medical sciences have in practice used 'truth' and 'knowledge' to divide and regulate populations and produce (certain kinds of) 'selves.' This had led to a fertile tradition of research on discourse and power. We'll consider his efforts to provide an 'archaeology of knowledge' and 'genealogy of power,' as well as his notions of 'governmentality' and 'bio-power'.

Essential Reading
Danaher, G. *et al* (2000) 'Questions of Knowledge,' Ch.2 in *Understanding Foucault*, pp.13-29
Rabinow, P. (1984) 'Introduction' in *The Foucault Reader*, pp 1-29.
Foucault, M. (2012) 'Discipline and Punish.' Ch.21 in Calhoun *et al* (Eds) *Contemporary Sociological Theory*, pp.314-321

Further reading
General:
Ashenden, S. 'Structuralism and Post-Structuralism,' Ch.9 in Harrington, A. ed. (2005) *Modern Social Theory: An Introduction*, pp 202-14.
Barry, A. et al (1996) *Foucault and Political Reason*
Belsey, C. (2002) *Poststructuralism: A Very Short Introduction*
Burchell, G. et al (1991) *The Foucault Effect*
Calhoun, C. et al (2007) *Contemporary Sociological Theory*, Part 4: The Sociological Theory of Michel Foucault
Clarke, S. (2006) 'Michel Foucault: Reason and Unreason – From the Ship of Fools to Disciplinary Society.' Ch.5 in *From Enlightenment to Risk*, pp.84-109
Craib, I. (1992) 'The World as a Logical Pattern: An Introduction to Structuralism,' Ch.8 in *Modern Social Theory*, pp.131-148
Crow, G. (2005) 'Michel Foucault: sociology as shocking,' Ch.8 in *The Art of Sociological Argument*

Danaher, G. et al (2000) *Understanding Foucault*
Fraser, N. (1989) *Unruly Practices*, esp. Part I
Habermas, J. (1987) *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*
Howells, C. (2001) 'Jacques Derrida,' in Elliott, and Turner (Eds) *Profiles in Contemporary Social Theory*
Katz, S. (2001) 'Michel Foucault,' in Elliott, and Turner (Eds) *Profiles in Contemporary Social Theory*
Layder, D. (2006) 'Foucault and the Postmodern Turn,' Ch.6 in *Understanding Social Theory*, pp.115-138
Mills, S. (2005) *Michel Foucault*
Poulantzas, N. (1978) *State, Power, Socialism*
Rabinow, P. (1984) *The Foucault Reader*
Ransome, P. (2010) 'Discourse and power: post-structuralist social theory,' Ch.10 in *Social Theory for Beginners*, pp.239-267
Ritzer, G. and Goodman, D. (2004) 'Structuralism, Poststructuralism and the Emergence of Postmodern Social Theory,' Ch.13 in *Modern Sociological Theory*, pp.453-64
Rose, N. (1990) *Governing the Soul*
Rose, N. (1996) *Inventing Ourselves*
Rose, N. (1999) *Powers of Reason*
Scott, J. (2007) 'Michel Foucault' in *Fifty Key Sociologists*
Seidman, S. (2013) 'Michel Foucault's Disciplinary Society,' Ch.13 in *Contested Knowledge*, pp.175-87.
Stones, R. (2008) 'Michel Foucault' in *Key Sociological Thinkers*
Swingewood, A. (2000) 'Structuralism and Post-structuralism,' Ch.8 in *A Short History of Sociological Thought*, pp.183-201.
Taylor, D. (2011) *Michel Foucault: Key Concepts*

Foucault's own books:
Foucault, M. (1967) *Madness and Civilization*
Foucault, M. (1970) *The Order of Things*
Foucault, M. (1972) *The Archaeology of Knowledge*
Foucault, M. (1973) *The Birth of the Clinic*
Foucault, M. (1979) *Discipline and Punish*
Foucault, M. (1980) *Power/Knowledge*
Foucault, M. (1984-8) *The History of Sexuality* (3 vols)
Foucault, M. (2007) *Security, Territory, Population*

Week 6: Reading week

There are no lectures or seminars this week. Instead you should use the time to catch up on reading and start thinking about the summative assessment.

Week 7: Feminist theory and the critique of gender

For much of the 20th century social theory was the preserve of white Western men – certainly the vast majority of thinkers so far surveyed fall in to this rather exclusive category. However, a number of social changes began to open the social and human sciences to new voices and perspectives interested in previously ignored modes of social being and domination. Over the next few weeks we will look at several such developments that, in part, built on the critical insights of Foucault and poststructuralist thought. To begin with we will consider the evolution of feminist theory in recent decades. Feminism sought to denaturalise the gender divide and masculine domination, arguing that the key structure of society was patriarchy and that sociology's task was to explore the ways in which patriarchy is lived and reproduced. The idea that, far from being natural, gender is a learned, social performance also paved the way for the emergence of queer theory, which we will also touch on this week.

Essential Reading
Seidman, S. (2013) 'Feminist Theory/Masculinity Studies.' Ch. 14 in *Contested Knowledge*, pp.205-225
Smith, D. (1987) 'Introduction,' Ch.1 in *The Everyday World as Problematic*, pp.1-13.
Butler, J. (1988) 'Performative Acts and Gender Constitution,' *Theatre Journal*, 40 (4), pp.519-31.

Further reading

Adkins, L. (2005) 'Feminist Social Theory.' Ch.11 in Harrington (Ed) *Modern Social* Theory, pp.233-51.

Adkins, L. and Skeggs, B. (2005) *Feminism After Bourdieu*

Butler, J. (1990) *Gender Trouble*

Butler, J. (1993) *Bodies that Matter*

Chafetz, J. (1997) 'Feminist Theory and Sociology' *Annual Review of Sociology*, 23: 97-120.

Clough, P. T, (2003) 'Judith Butler,' Ch.13 in Ritzer, G. (Ed) *The Blackwell Companion to Major Contemporary Social Theorists*

Collins, P. H. (2000) *Black Feminist Thought*

Collins, P. H. (2012) 'Black Feminist Epistemology,' Ch.27 in Calhoun et al (Eds) *Contemporary Sociological Theory*, pp.407-416

Connell, R. (1987) *Gender and Power*

Connell, R. W. (1992) 'A Very Straight Gay: Masculinity, Homosexual Experience, and the Dynamics of Gender,' in *American Sociological Review*, Vol.57(6), pp.735-751

Connell, R. (2005) *Masculinities*

Crow, G. (2005) 'Ann Oakley: Sociology as Emancipation,' Ch.9 in *The Art of Sociological Argument*

England, P. (ed.) (1993) *Theory on Gender/Feminism on Theory*

Evans, M. (2009) 'Feminist Theory.' Ch.12 in Turner (Ed) *The New Blackwell Companion to Social Theory*

Gane, N. (2004) 'Judith Butler,' Ch.3 in *The Future of Social Theory*

Gershenson, G. & Williams M. (2001) 'Nancy Chodorow' in Elliott and Turner (Eds) *Profiles in Contemporary Social Theory*

Harding, S. (1981) *The Science Question in Feminism*

McLennan, G. (1995) 'Feminism, Epistemology and Postmodernism' *Sociology*, 29(3): 391-409.

Marinucci, M. (2010) *Feminism Is Queer: The intimate connection between queer and feminist theory*

Oakley, A. (1974) *Housewife*

Oakley, A. (1974) *The Sociology of Housework*

Ransome, P. (2010) 'Feminist social theory,' Ch.11 in *Social Theory for Beginners*, pp.269-289

Ritzer, G. & Goodman, D. (2004) 'Modern Feminist Theory' Ch.9 in *Modern Sociological Theory*, pp.302-49

Scott, J. (2007) *Fifty Key Sociologists*, entries on de Beauvoir, Butler, Firestone, Oakley, and Smith

Seidman, S. (1996) *Queer Theory/Sociology*

Seidman, S. (2013) 'Lesbian, Gay, and Queer Theory/Heterosexual Studies.' Ch.16 in *Contested Knowledge*

Smith, D. (1987) *The Everyday World as Problematic*

Smith, D. (1990) *Texts, Facts and Femininity*

Smith, D. (1990) *The Conceptual Practices of Power*

Smith, D. (2012) 'The Conceptual Practices of Power,' Ch.26 in Calhoun et al (eds) *Contemporary Sociological Theory*, pp.398-406

Stein, A. & Plummer, K. (1994) '"I Can't Even Think Straight" 'Queer' Theory and the Missing Sexual Revolution in Sociology', *Sociological Theory*, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp.178-187

Walby, S. (1989) *Theorizing Patriarchy*

Widerberg, K. (2008) 'Dorothy E. Smith.' In R. Stones (Ed) *Key Sociological Thinkers*

Week 8: Postmodernity and postmodernism

If 'modernity' was the historical period studied by the classics, up to the early- to mid-twentieth century, then the drastic changes in society since then mean we've moved into a brand new era which can be described as 'post-modern' – or so at least claimed many sociologists and philosophers in the 1980s. The collapse of rigid hierarchies and boundaries, the fragmentation and plurality of ways of life and the increased importance of the media were all said to be its hallmarks. Some, influenced by post-structuralism, took this in fairly dramatic directions, arguing that social science itself should embrace the post-modern and reject any pretence to grand narratives and overarching explanations of the world. Others, mostly influenced by Marx or Weber, were more interested in exploring postmodern culture through a more traditional sociological lens.

Essential Reading

Ritzer, G. & Goodman, D. (2004) 'Postmodern Social Theory' in *Modern Sociological Theory*, pp.468-485

Bauman, Z. (1992) 'A Sociological Theory of Postmodernity.' Ch.9 in *Intimations of Postmodernity*, pp.187-204

Further reading
General:
Anderson, P. (1998) *The Origins of Postmodernity*
Clarke, S. (2005) 'Post Modernism, Post Modernity and Hyperreality.' Ch.6 in *From Enlightenment to Risk*
Craib, I. (1992) 'Post-structuralism and Postmodernism' Ch.10 in *Modern Social Theory*, pp 177-96.
Elliott & Turner (Eds) *Profiles in Contemporary Social Theory.* Chapters by Gane on Baudrillard; Homer on Jameson; Seidler on Lyotard; Smart on Bauman
Pakulski, J. (2009) 'Postmodern Social Theory.' In Turner (Ed) *The New Blackwell Companion to Social Theory*, pp.251-280
Smart, B. (2005) and Delanty, G. (2005) 'Modernity and Postmodernity Parts I and II' Ch.12 and 13 in Harrington, A. (Ed.) *Modern Social Theory: An Introduction*
Seidman, S. (2013) 'The Postmodern World of Jacques Derrida, Jean-Francois Lyotard and Jean Baudrillard' and 'Zygmunt Bauman's Sociology of Postmodernity,' Chs 11 & 13 in *Contested Knowledge*
Scott, J. (2007) *Fifty Key Sociologists*, entries on Baudrillard and Bauman
Stones, R. (2008) 'Zygmunt Bauman' in *Key Sociological Thinkers*

Baudrillard, J. (2001) *Selected Writings*
Bauman, Z. (1987) *Legislators and Interpreters*
Bauman, Z. (1988) *Freedom*
Bauman, Z. (1989) *Modernity and the Holocaust*
Bauman, Z. (1992) *Intimations of Postmodernity*
Crook, S. et al (1993) *Postmodernization*
Featherstone, M. (1992) *Consumer Culture and Postmodernism*
Habermas, J. (1987) *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*
Harvey, D. (1989) *The Condition of Postmodernity*
Hegarty, P. (2004) *Jean Baudrillard: Live theory*
Jameson, F. (1991) *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*
Jameson, F. (1998) *The Cultural Turn: Selected writings on the postmodern, 1983-1998*
Kellner, D. (1989) *Jean Baudrillard: From Marxism to Postmodernism and beyond*
Kumar, K. (2005) *From Post-Industrial to Post-Modern Society* (2nd ed)
Lash, S. (1990) *Sociology of Postmodernism*
Lash, S. And Urry, J. (1994) *Economies of Signs and Space*
Lyotard, J.-F. (1990) *The Postmodern Condition*
Pakulski, J. and Waters, M. (1996) *The Death of Class*
Sarup, M. (1993) *An Introductory Guide to Post-Structuralism and Postmodernism*
Scott, J. (2006) 'Intimations of Postmodernity,' Ch.8 in *Social Theory: Central Issues in Sociology,* pp.220-258.
Sokal, A. and Bricmont, J. (1998) *Intellectual Impostures*

Week 9: Reflexive modernity

The excesses of postmodernist sociology soon became clear and thinkers have since begun to recognise that, while we do live in times different to the past, they aren't *that* different. We may be witness to an increasingly globalised, fluid, and 'runaway' world, but it is still a *modern* world: more uncertain perhaps but still decidedly structured and structuring. Alternative epochal conceptions therefore became popular in the 1990s. Rather than moving *beyond* modernity we were entering a new phase, best captured in the notion of '*reflexive* modernity'. The ideas of Ulrich Beck are central here. In addition to his notion of the 'risk society' we will also consider the analogous depictions of 'late modernity' by Anthony Giddens and 'liquid modernity' by Zygmunt Bauman.

Essential Reading
Beck, U. (1992) 'Preface' in *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*, pp.9-16.
Giddens, A. (2012) 'The Consequences of Modernity.' Ch.35 in Calhoun et al (Eds) *Contemporary Sociological Theory*, pp. 531-545

Further reading
Archer, M. (1988) *Culture and Agency*

Archer, M. (1995) *Realist Social Theory*
Archer, M. (2000) *Being Human*
Archer, M. (2003) *Structure, Agency and the Internal Conversation*
Archer, M. (2007) *Making Our Way Through the World*
Archer, M. (2012) *The Reflexive Imperative in late Modernity*
Archer, M. (2013) *Conversations about Reflexivity*
Atkinson, W. (2010) *Class, Individualization and Late Modernity*
Bauman, Z. (2000) *Liquid Modernity*
Bauman, Z. (2001) *The Individualized Society*
Bauman, Z. and Tester, K. (2002) *Conversations with Zygmunt Bauman*
Beck, U. (1992) *Risk Society*
Beck, U. and Beck-Gernsheim, E. (2002) *Individualization*
Beck, U. et al (1994) *Reflexive Modernization*
Clarke, S. (2005) 'Risk Society and (Dis)Information,' Ch.8 in *From Enlightenment to Risk*
Davis, M. and Tester, K. (2010) *Bauman's Challenge: Sociological Issues for the 21st Century*
Giddens, A. (1990) *The Consequences of Modernity*
Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and Self-Identity*
Mythen, G. (2004) *Ulrich Beck*
Ritzer, G. and Goodman, D. (2004) 'Contemporary Theories of Modernity,' Ch.15 in *Modern Sociological Theory*
Scott, J. (2007) *Fifty Key Sociologists*, entries on Zygmunt Bauman and Ulrich Beck
Smart, B. (2001) 'Zygmunt Bauman,' in Elliott and Turner (Eds) *Profiles in Contemporary Social Theory*
Smart, B. (2005) and Delanty, G. (2005) 'Modernity and Postmodernity Parts I and II' Ch.12 and 13 in Harrington, A. (Ed.) *Modern Social Theory: An Introduction*
Stevenson, N. (2001) 'Ulrich Beck,' in Elliott and Turner (Eds) *Profiles in Contemporary Social Theory*
Stones, R. (2008) 'Anthony Giddens' and 'Zygmunt Bauman' in *Key Sociological Thinkers*

Week 10: Post-colonial theory and the critique of Eurocentrism

The rise of poststructuralist, feminist, and postmodern critiques of classical sociological ways of knowing, all of which flourished in the 1980s and 90s, have had deep and lasting effects on social theory. However, one dimension that remained relatively underexplored in sociology was its own supposedly 'Eurocentric' nature. Postcolonial theory was kick-started in the humanities in the 80s but it is only more recently that its critical insights have started to feed into mainstream sociological thinking, sparking debates about just how deeply rooted its historical and geographical biases are. Is sociology *inherently* Eurocentric? Are the longstanding 'Orientalist' tendencies of Western thought – whereby the 'West' is uncritically assumed to be modern and advanced, and the 'Rest' to be traditional and backward, and in need of the West's beneficent help – part and parcel of the 'sociological gaze,' or can there be such a thing as a genuinely *post*-colonial sociology? In tackling these questions we will chart the long and sordid history of Western colonialism and empire-building, their apparent collapse in the twentieth century, and how various critical theories emerged in their wake to challenge the persistent legacy of imperialism. In turn, we will engage with a growing number of radical calls for many of sociology's core concepts – the foundational idea of 'modernity' first amongst them – to be radically overhauled. However, we will also touch on certain considered defences of sociological thought and practice; arguments that are typically sympathetic to the postcolonial critique but which make the case that there is still much of very great value in the sociological tradition that we would be ill-advised to dismiss.

Essential Reading
Connell, R. (2007) 'Modern general theory and its hidden assumptions.' Ch.2 in *Southern Theory*, pp.27-48
Bhambra, G. (2014) 'Sociology for an 'Always-Already' Global Age'. Ch.7 in *Connected Sociologies*, pp.141-156
Go, J. (2016) 'Introduction: Social Theory beyond Empire?' In *Postcolonial Thought and Social Theory*, pp.1-17

Further reading
Amin, S. (1989) *Eurocentrism*
Bhabha, H. (1994) *The Location of Culture*

Bhambra, G. (2007a) *Rethinking Modernity: Postcolonialism and the Sociological Imagination*

Bhambra, G. (2007b) 'Sociology and Postcolonialism: Another 'Missing' Revolution?' *Sociology*, Vol.41 (5), pp.871-884

Bhambra, G. (2013) 'The Possibilities of, and for, Global Sociology: A Postcolonial Perspective.' *Political Power and Social Theory*, Vol. 24, pp.295-314

Bhambra, G. (2014) *Connected Sociologies*

Bhambra, G. (2015) 'Citizens and Others: The Constitution of Citizenship through Exclusion.' *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, Vol. 40(2) 102-114

Bhambra, G. (2016) 'Postcolonial Reflections of Sociology.' *Sociology*, Vol. 50 (5), pp.960-966

Connell, R. W. (1997) 'Why is Classical Theory Classical?' *American Journal of Sociology*, 102(6):1511-57

Connell, R. (2007) *Southern Theory*

Chakrabarty, D. (2000) *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference.*

Du Bois, W. E. B. (1905) *The Souls of Black Folk*

Fanon, F. (1963) *The Wretched of the Earth*

Fanon, F. (1967) *Black Skin, White Masks*

Gilroy, P. (1993) *The Black Atlantic*

Go, J. (2013a) 'Decolonizing Bourdieu' *Sociological Theory*, 31(1): 49-74.

Go, J. (2013b) 'Introduction: Entangling Postcoloniality and Sociological Thought.' *Political Power and Social Theory*, Vol. 24, pp.3-31

Go, J. (2016) *Postcolonial Thought and Social Theory*

Hall, S. (1992) 'The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power'. In Hall & Gieben (eds.) *Formations of Modernity*, pp. 275-331.

Lemert, C. (1994) *Social Theory: The Multicultural and Classic Readings*

Mahmood, S. (2012) *Politics of Piety*

McLennan, G. (1998) 'The Question of Eurocentrism' *New Left Review*, 231: 153-8.

McLennan, G. (2000) 'Sociology's Eurocentrism and the 'Rise of the West' Revisited' *European Journal of Social Theory*, 3(3): 275-91.

McLennan, G. (2003) 'Sociology, Eurocentrism and Postcolonial Theory' *European Journal of Social Theory*, 6(1): 69-86.

McLennan, G. (2006) *Sociological Cultural Studies*, Chapters 4, 5 and 6

McLennan, G. (2013) 'Postcolonial critique: The necessity of sociology.' In *Political Power and Social Theory*, Vol.24, pp.119-44

McLennan, G. (2014) 'Complicity, Complexity, Historicism: Problems of Postcolonial Sociology.' *Postcolonial Studies* 17(4):451-64.

Mignolo, W. D. (2009) 'Epistemic Disobedience, Independent Thought and Decolonial Freedom.' *Theory, Culture & Society* 26(7–8):159.

Said, E. (1978) *Orientalism*

Scott, J. (2007) *Fifty Key Sociologists*, entries on Frantz Fanon, Paul Gilroy, C. L. R. James, Orlando Patterson, Edward Said, and Gayatri Spivak

Seidman, S. (2013a) 'Critical Race Theory/White Studies' and 'Colonial Discourse Studies,' Chs 15 & 17 in *Contested Knowledge*

Seidman, S. (2013b) 'The Colonial Unconscious of Sociology.' *Political Power and Social Theory*, Vol. 24, pp.31-54

Spivak, G. (1988) 'Can the Subaltern Speak?' in D. Nelson and L. Grossberg (eds) *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, pp. 271-313.

Steinmetz, G. (Ed.) (2013) *Sociology and Empire: The Imperial Entanglements of a Discipline*

Turner, B.S. (2001) 'Edward Said' in Elliott and Turner (Eds) *Profiles in Contemporary Social Theory*

Wallerstein, I. (1997) 'Eurocentrism and its Avatars' *New Left Review*, 226: 93-107.

Young, R. (1990) *White Mythologies*

Week 11: Bruno Latour and actor-network theory

This week we turn our attention to a school of thought – actor-network theory (ANT) – that has been steadily gaining in influence and notoriety since the 1980s, and marks a further critical twist in the questioning of modern science and reason. Its leading proponent – the French sociologist Bruno Latour – is an increasingly influential figure in twenty-first century social thought, within sociology and beyond. The

roots of ANT lie in STS ('science and technology studies' or, alternatively, 'science, technology, and society') and empirical attempts to reveal how the supposed 'neutrality' and 'objectivity' of the natural sciences are in fact actively and politically constructed. Over the years, however, ANT has broadened its targets to encompass pretty much everything we thought we knew about our world – as exemplified in the title of Latour's most famous book: *We Have Never Been Modern*. One key aspect of ANT that we will focus on is how it seeks to go beyond '*social* constructionism' to a more 'radical constructionism' that includes the role of *nonhuman* agents in shaping the myriad networks that compose our world. Sociology, as far as Latour and his colleagues are concerned, needs to overcome its blinkered obsession with human beings, and take seriously how everything from animals to objects, microbes to weather patterns, can play an active part in making the social world. Thereby we will examine the subversive implications of ANT for sociology: how it problematises many of our conventional ways of conceptualising the social (notably our common resort to theoretical dualisms and critical, structural analysis). We will see how Latour is positively influenced by some strands of sociological theory (e.g., ethnomethodology and poststructuralism) but highly critical of others (e.g., critical theory, Bourdieu, postmodernism) – as well as some of the shortcomings of, and criticisms levelled at his own approach.

Essential Reading

Latour, B. (1993) 'Crisis'. Ch.1 in *We Have Never Been Modern*, pp.1-12

Blok, A. & Elgaard Jensen, T. (2011) 'Sociology of associations.' Ch.5 in *Bruno Latour: Hybrid Thoughts in a Hybrid World*, pp.102-129

Sayes, E. (2014) 'Actor-Network Theory and methodology: Just what does it mean to say that nonhumans have agency?' *Social Studies of Science*, Vol. 44(1), pp.134-149

Further reading

General:

Blok, A. & T. Elgaard Jensen (2011) *Bruno Latour: Hybrid Thoughts in a Hybrid World*

Boltanski, L. & Thévenot, L. (1999) 'The Sociology of Critical Capacity'. *European Journal of Social Theory*, Vol.2 (3), pp.359-377

Braidotti, R. (2013) *The Posthuman*

Elam, M. (1999) 'Living Dangerously with Bruno Latour in a Hybrid World'. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 16 (4), pp.1-24.

Guggenheim, M. & Potthast, J. (2012) 'Symmetrical twins: On the relationship between Actor-Network theory and the sociology of critical capacities'. *European Journal of Social Theory*, Vol. 15(2), 57-178

Haraway, D. (1991) 'A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century'. In *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*, pp.149-181.

Harman, G. (2009) Part 1 in *Prince of Networks: Bruno Latour and Metaphysics*

Krarup, T. M. & A. Blok (2011) 'Unfolding the social: quasi-actants, virtual theory, and the new empiricism of Bruno Latour.' *The Sociological Review*, Vol.59 (1), pp.42-63

Law, J. (1999) 'After ANT: complexity, naming and topology'. In Law & Hassard (Eds) *Actor Network Theory and After*

Law (2009) 'Actor-Network Theory and Material Semiotics'. In B.S. Turner (ed.) *The New Blackwell Companion to Social Theory*, pp.141-158

Law, J. & Hassard, J. (1999) *Actor-Network Theory and After*

McLennan, G. (2011) 'From the past to the posts'. Ch.9 in *Story of Sociology*, pp.133-155

Michael. M. (2017) *Actor-Network Theory: Trials, Trails and Translations*

Ritzer, G. and Goodman, D. (2004) 'Actor-Network Theory' in *Modern Sociological Theory*, pp.464-468

Roosth, S. & Silbey, S. (2009) 'Science and Technology Studies: From Controversies to Posthumanist Social Theory'. Ch.23 in B.S. Turner (ed.) *The New Blackwell Companion to Social Theory*, pp.451-473

Saldanha, A. (2003) 'Actor-network theory and critical sociology.' *Critical Sociology*, Vol.29 (3), pp.419-432

Sismondo, S. (2010) 'Actor-Network Theory.' In *An Introduction to Science and Technology Studies*, 81-92

Vandenberghe, F. (2002) 'Reconstructing Humants: A Humanist Critique of Actant-Network Theory.' *Theory, Culture & Society*, Vol. 19 (5/6), pp.51-67

Latour and other contemporary thinkers:

Beck, U. (2005) 'Neither Order nor Peace: A Response to Bruno Latour.' *Common Knowledge*, Vol.11 (1), pp. 1-7

Blok, A. & T. Elgaard Jensen (2011) 'Conclusion: The enlightenment project of Bruno Latour'. Ch.6 in *Bruno Latour: Hybrid Thoughts in a Hybrid World*, pp.130-150

Go, J. (2016) 'Actor-networks and English industrialization' & 'Relationalism as postcolonial theory'. In *Postcolonial Thought and Social Theory*, pp.131-142

Latour (2003) 'Is *Re*-modernization Occurring – And If So, How to Prove It? A Commentary on Ulrich Beck.' *Theory, Culture & Society*, Vol. 20(2): 35-48

Latour (2004) 'Whose Cosmos, Which Cosmopolitics? Comments on the Peace Terms of Ulrich Beck.' *Common Knowledge*, Vol.10 (3), pp. 450-462

Michael. M. (2017) 'Actor-network theory: Old and new roots' and 'ANT and some big sociological questions'. Chapters 2 & 5 in *Actor-Network Theory: Trials, Trails and Translations*, pp.10-27 & 73-94

Pyyhtinen, O. & Tamminen, S. (2011) 'We have never been only human: Foucault and Latour on the question of the Anthropos.' *Anthropological Theory*, Vol.11(2), pp.135-152

Rosa, M. C. (2016) 'Sociologies of the South and the actor-network-theory.' *European Journal of Social Theory*, Vol. 19(4) 485-502

Schinkel, W. (2007) 'Sociological discourse of the relational: the cases of Bourdieu and Latour.' *The Sociological Review*, 55 (4), 707-729

Latour's key works:

Latour & Woolgar (1979/86) *Laboratory Life: The Construction of Scientific Facts* (Princeton)

Callon & Latour (1981) 'Unscrewing the big Leviathan: How actors macro-structure reality and how sociologists help them to do so.' In K. Knorr-Cetina & A.V. Cicourel (eds) *Advances in Social Theory and Methodology: Towards an Integration of Micro-and Macro-Sociologies*, pp. 277-303.

Latour (1987) *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through Society* (Harvard)

Latour (1988) *The Pasteurization of France* (Harvard)

Latour (1993) *We Have Never Been Modern* (Harvester Wheatsheaf)

Latour (1996) *Aramis: or The Love of Technology* (Harvard)

Latour (1999) *Pandora's Hope: Essays on the Reality of Science Studies* (Harvard)

Latour (2004) *Politics of Nature: How to Bring the Sciences into Democracy* (Harvard)

Latour (2005) *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory* (OUP)

Week 12: Reading week

There are no lectures or seminars this week. You should use the week to work on your summative assessments.

Appendix A
Instructions on how to submit essays electronically

1. Log in to Blackboard (https://www.ole.bris.ac.uk/) and select the Blackboard course for the unit you are submitting work for. If you cannot see it, please e-mail f.cooper@bristol.ac.uk with your username and ask to be added.

2. Click on the "Submit Work Here" option on the left hand menu and then find the correct assessment from the list.

3. Select 'view/complete' for the appropriate piece of work. It is your responsibility to ensure that you have selected both the correct unit and the correct piece of work.

4. The screen will display 'single file upload' and your name. Enter your candidate number as a submission title, and then select the file that you wish to upload by clicking the 'browse' button. Click on the 'upload' button at the bottom.

5. You will then be shown the essay to be submitted. Check that you have selected the correct essay and click the 'Submit' button. This step must be completed or the submission is not complete.

6. You will be informed of a successful submission. A digital receipt is displayed on screen and a copy sent to your email address for your records.

Important notes

- You are only allowed to submit one file to Blackboard (single file upload), so ensure that all parts of your work – references, bibliography etc. – are included in one single document and that you upload the correct version. You will not be able to change the file once you have uploaded.

- Blackboard will accept a variety of file formats, but the School can only accept work submitted in .rtf (Rich Text Format) or .doc/.docx (Word Document) format. If you use another word processing package, please ensure you save in a compatible format.

- By submitting your essay, you are confirming that you have read the regulations on plagiarism and confirm that the submission is not plagiarised. You also confirm that the word count stated on the essay is an accurate statement of essay length.

- If Blackboard is not working email your assessment to f.cooper@bristol.ac.uk with the unit code and title in the subject line.

How to confirm that your essay has been submitted

You will have received a digital receipt by email and if you click on the assessment again (steps 1-4), you will see the title and submission date of the essay you have submitted. If you click on submit, you will not be able to submit again. This table also displays the date of submission. If you click on the title of the essay, it will open in a new window and you can also see what time the essay was submitted.

Summary of Relevant School Regulations
(Further details are in the Postgraduate taught handbook, which takes precedence)

Attendance of Seminars
SPAIS takes attendance of and participation in seminars very seriously. Seminars form an essential part of your learning and you need to make sure you arrive on time, have done the required reading and participate fully. Attendance at all seminars is monitored, with absence only condoned in cases of illness or for other exceptional reasons.
If you are unable to attend a seminar you must inform your seminar tutor. You should also provide evidence to explain your absence, such as a self-certification and/or medical note, counselling letter or other official document. If you are ill or are experiencing some other kind of difficulty which is preventing you from attending seminars for a prolonged period, please contact the Postgraduate Office or the Graduate Administration Manager who can advise on how to proceed.

Requirements for credit points
To be awarded credit points for a taught unit, students must:
- Have a satisfactory attendance record.
- Pass the summative assessment

Where there are multiple summative assessments in a unit, students must achieve the pass mark for the weighted average of the assessments (i.e. in the mark for the unit overall). They do not need to pass each individual piece of assessment.
If any of these conditions are not met, then your ability to progress through your degree may be affected.

Presentation of written work
Coursework must be word-processed. As a guide, use a clear, easy-to-read font such as Arial or Times New Roman, in at least 11pt. You may double–space or single–space your essays as you prefer. Your tutor will let you know if they have a preference.
All pages should be numbered. Ensure that the essay question appears on the first page.

Students are required to complete and include a cover page for essay/summative submissions – the template cover page will be available via the online submission point for students to complete.

Candidate numbers are required on summative work in order to ensure that marking is anonymous. Note that your candidate number is not the same as your student number. This number can be viewed in StudentInfo (https://www.bris.ac.uk/studentinfo). You should regard this number as personal to you and not share it with anyone else. The number is used to ensure that the marking of a student's work is done anonymously. Please ensure that you memorise your candidate number as you will need to write it on every assessment.

Assessment Length
Each piece of coursework must not exceed the stipulated maximum length for the assignment (the 'word count') listed in the unit guide. Summative work that exceeds the maximum length will be subject to penalties. **The word count is absolute (there is no 10% leeway, as commonly rumoured).** Five marks will be deducted for every 100 words or part thereof over the word limit. Thus, an essay that is 1 word over the word limit will be penalised 5 marks; an essay that is 101 words over the word limit will be penalised 10 marks, and so on.

The word count includes all text, tables, numbers, footnotes/endnotes, Harvard referencing in the body of the text and direct quotes. It excludes the cover page, bibliography, headers and appendices. However, appendices should only be used for reproducing documents, not additional text written by you.

Students are advised that any attempt to circumvent word count limits by changing essay format, e.g. by removing spaces in references, will be investigated. In these cases, penalties will be applied if the actual word count is exceeded and further disciplinary action may be taken.

Students should be aware that word count penalties will incur a mark reduction that may in turn impact their progress and/or overall qualification.

Referencing and Plagiarism
Students are required to reference the source materials used to inform their submitted work. Students are expected to use the Harvard referencing system as set out in the relevant section of the SPAIS *Study Guide.* Unless otherwise stated, essays must contain a bibliography. Students should consult the SPAIS *Study Guide* for full details (students can access this via the SPAIS MSc-Dip Admin Blackboard site).

Inadequate referencing in submitted work can run the risk of plagiarism. Plagiarism is the unacknowledged inclusion in a student's work of material derived from the published or unpublished work of another. This constitutes plagiarism whether it is intentional or unintentional. "Work" includes internet sources as well as printed material.

Plagiarism is a serious academic offence and penalties will be applied in such cases, as is set out in the SPAIS *Postgraduate taught handbook*. See also the relevant section of the School *Study Skills Guide* for more information.

Please note that plagiarism may lead to penalties that may prevent students found guilty of such an offence from progressing in their programme of study.

Extensions
Extensions to coursework deadlines will only be granted in exceptional circumstances. If you want to request an extension, complete a Coursework Extension Request Form (available at Blackboard/SPAIS MSC/Dip Administration/forms) and submit the form with your evidence (e.g. medical certificate, death certificate, or hospital letter) to Faye Cooper in the Postgraduate Office, 11 Priory Road or f.cooper@bristol.ac.uk .

Extension requests will not be considered if there is no supporting evidence.

All extension requests should be submitted at least 72 hours prior to the assessment deadline. If the circumstance occurs after this point, then please either telephone or see the Graduate Administration Manager in person. In their absence you can contact Faye Cooper in the PG Office, again in person or by telephone.

Extensions can only be granted by the Graduate Administration Office. They cannot be granted by unit convenors or seminar tutors.

You will receive an email to confirm whether your extension request has been granted or not.

Submitting Essays/Work for assessment
Formative work: Where applicable, details on how to submit formative work for assessment will be contained in this unit guide.

Summative work: All summative submissions ***must be submitted electronically via Blackboard***.

Electronic copies enable an efficient system of receipting, providing the student and the School with a record of exactly when an essay was submitted. It also enables the School to systematically check the length of submitted essays and to safeguard against plagiarism.

Late Submissions
Penalties are imposed for work submitted late without an approved extension. Any kind of computer/electronic failure is **not** accepted as a valid reason for an extension, so make sure you back up your work on another computer, memory stick or in the cloud (e.g. One Drive, Dropbox or another equivalent system). Also ensure that the clock on your computer is correct. The following schema of marks deduction for late/non-submission is applied to both formative work and summative work:

- Up to 24 hours late, or part thereof *Penalty of 10 marks*
- For each additional 24 hours late, or part thereof *A further 5 marks deduction for each 24 hours, or part thereof*
- Assessment submitted over one week late *Treated as a non-submission: fail and mark of zero recorded. This will be noted on your transcript.*

- The 24 hour period runs from the deadline for submission, and includes Saturdays, Sundays, bank holidays and university closure days.
- If an essay submitted less than one week late fails solely due to the imposition of a late penalty, then the mark will be capped at 50 and recorded as a second attempt.

Students should be aware that late penalties will incur a mark reduction that may in turn impact their progress and/or overall qualification.

Marks and Feedback
In addition to an overall mark, students will receive written feedback on their assessed work.

In accordance with the Faculty's Regulations and Code of Practice for Taught programmes, marks and feedback are typically returned within fifteen working days of the relevant submission deadline, unless exceptional circumstances arise in which case students will be informed of the deadline for return. The process of marking and providing detailed feedback is a labour-intensive one, with most 4000 word essays taking at least 45 minutes to assess and comment upon. Summative work also needs to be checked for plagiarism and length and moderated by a second member of staff to ensure marking is fair and consistent.

If work is submitted late, then it may not be possible to return feedback within fifteen working days.

Fails and Resits
If you fail the unit overall, you will normally be required to resubmit or resit unless you do not meet the progression requirements for your programme. Your School Office will contact you if this is the case.

Appendix C

Level 7 Marking and Assessment Criteria (Postgraduate)
All MSc/Diploma marking in the School is out of 100 on the following scale and with the following classifications:

70 and above Distinction
60-69 Merit
50-59 Pass
Below 50 Fail

Work within each of the classifications is expected to demonstrate the following attributes. Please note that markers do not weight each of these attributes equally when finalising the mark. Markers may also take into account the extent to which achievement of unit-specific intended learning outcomes (see unit guide) has been demonstrated when assessing work and arriving at the mark.

70-100: DISTINCTION
Addresses the Question Set
The work is a highly appropriate response to the question or assignment task that has been set. Coverage and selection of content is exemplary. There is clear analysis of the question or topic. Clear ability to analyse and synthesize ideas is demonstrated. At the upper end of the distinction range (marks of 80+), work will be outstanding in (where appropriate) its incorporation and use of empirical evidence/theoretical frameworks/methodological approaches in addressing the question.

Contains coherent structure and argument
The assignment is internally consistent, extremely coherent, concise and well-structured. The introduction is well focused and provides a clear indication of the rationale, key literature base used and organisation of the work. The central argument/structure of the work has a clear and logical sequence of progression. The conclusion draws insights which are logically developed from the analysis. At the upper end of the distinction range (marks of 80+), work will be outstanding in the extent to which the structure facilitates the answer to the question.

Demonstrates understanding of key concepts and/or data
A detailed understanding of key concepts and/or data will be demonstrated. At the upper end of the distinction range (marks of 80+) sustained evidence of critical understanding of concepts and/or critical analysis of data will be demonstrated.

Supports argument with appropriate evidence
The assignment demonstrates that an excellent knowledge of the topic has been gained from careful research and wide ranging reading that goes well beyond the prescribed reading list. The selection, interpretation, comparison, evaluation, and integration of evidence and source material to support the argument is extremely effective. At the upper end of the distinction range (marks of 80+), work will indicate outstanding ability to deal with complexity, contradictions or gaps in the existing academic literature.

Demonstrates critical evaluation
Work at this level will indicate a detailed and critical understanding of central theoretical and/or methodological issues as appropriate. At the upper end of the distinction range (marks of 80+) work will show extensive evidence of coherence, creativity, originality and imagination in addressing the question or topic.

Writing, Background Reading, Referencing and Bibliographic format
The work is extremely well presented, with minimal grammatical or spelling errors. It is written in a fluent and engaging style that demonstrates sufficient background reading, with exemplary referencing and bibliographic formatting in accordance with the required conventions. At the upper end of the distinction range (marks of 80+), the work will be virtually error-free in these respects.

60-69: MERIT

Addresses the Question Set
The work is a very appropriate response to the set question or assignment task. The question is addressed comprehensively, and a convincing and coherent argument is maintained in doing so. There is very good coverage of content and some evidence of an ability to think critically in relation to the question or topic will be shown. Where appropriate, the work will illustrate good comprehension of the theoretical implications of the set question or assignment.

Contains coherent structure and argument
The structure of the assignment is sound. The introduction is relevant and provides the reader with a clear guide to the central argument and the overall structure of the work. The conclusion will highlight and reflect upon the key points of argument developed within the main body of the essay and relative to the set question or assignment.

Demonstrates understanding of key concepts and/or data
A sound understanding of relevant key concepts and/or date has been developed and demonstrated, with key related issues and debates identified and discussed.

Supports argument with appropriate evidence
Overall there is a very good selection and use of sources which are well integrated, interpreted and evaluated. The work will demonstrate the ability to be selective in the range of material used. Some independent reading and research that goes beyond the prescribed reading list will be demonstrated, although the range of evidence used will be more restricted in comparison with an assignment awarded a higher grade.

Demonstrates critical evaluation
The work will clearly demonstrate a capacity to synthesise and critically evaluate source materials and/or debates in relation to the set question or assignment rather than simply describe or summarise them.

Writing, Background Reading, Referencing and Bibliographic format
The work is clear and fluent and largely conforms to referencing and bibliographic conventions. It has been well edited and demonstrates sufficient background reading. Proof-reading has resulted in there being few grammatical or spelling errors.

50-59: PASS

Addresses the Question Set
The work is a reasonably appropriate response to the set question or assignment task. All aspects of the set question or topic have been addressed. The work will show some comprehension of the underlying theoretical/methodological implications of the question where appropriate, but there may be limitations in the understanding of how these issues relate to the question.

Contains coherent structure and argument
The assignment has been effectively structured, although more careful editing may have improved the overall coherence of argument. The introduction is well focused and provides a sense of the central argument and overall organisation. The conclusion provides a summary of the discussion, although may be primarily descriptive in nature and may fail to reflect upon or support the argument fully.

Demonstrates understanding of key concepts and/or data
A basic level of understanding of relevant key concepts and/or data has been demonstrated, though there may be some errors and/or gaps in the knowledge and understanding. Key related issues have been identified and discussed but without many significant insights being developed.

Supports argument with appropriate evidence
The argument will be supported by reference to and incorporation of some relevant evidence, but with scope for greater range and depth of evidence. The work will indicate a generally clear understanding

of appropriate evidence, but this may be presented in an uncritical/descriptive manner and/or insufficiently incorporated into the overall argument in response to the set question or assignment tack.

Demonstrates critical evaluation
A good range of relevant content has been covered, and there is some attempt at analysis but a tendency to be descriptive rather than critical. Work in this classification may also exhibit a tendency to assert/state points of argument rather than argue on the basis of reasoning and evidence.

Writing, Background Reading, Referencing and Bibliographic format
The style of writing is appropriate and presents few comprehension difficulties for the
reader. The assignment is not as fluently written as it might have been, and there may be scope for improvement in spelling and grammar. There is evidence of sufficient background reading. Referencing and bibliographic formatting generally conform to the conventions, but there may be scope for further improvement in accuracy and consistency in accordance with the required conventions.

0-49 FAIL
Addresses the Question Set
Although some attempt will have been made, the work largely fails to address and/or significantly misunderstands the set question or assignment task. At the lower end of the fail range (marks of 0-40) there is little or no understanding of the set question or assignment task in evidence.

Contains coherent structure and argument
The work does not contain a sufficiently structured argument, and may be ineffectively organised. The introduction may lack a clear rationale or statement of argument, and/or may lack a clear outline of the overall structure of the assignment. The conclusion may lack any indication of insights in relation to the set question or assignment task. At the lower end of the fail range (marks of 0-40) the structure of the work may be incoherent or illogical, and/or the work may lack a clearly developed argument.

Demonstrates understanding of key concepts and/or data
There is limited knowledge and understanding of key concepts and/or data, with significant errors and/or omissions in this respect. At the lower end of the fail range (marks of 0-40) there may be significant lack of awareness or understanding of key concepts and/or data.

Supports argument with appropriate evidence
Few key points of appropriate evidence are identified and/or there may be very little attempt at analysis of evidence, with the work tending towards excessive description. At the lower end of the fail range (marks of 0-40) evidence referred to and included in the work may not be relevant to the addressing the set question or assignment task.

Demonstrates critical evaluation
The approach is typified by a general lack of critical evaluation in relation to relevant literature and issues. Work that simply asserts rather than argues a case may also fall into this classification. The use of sources may be excessively derivative of existing work, with little or no indication of an ability to independently analyse relevant material. At the lower end of the fail range (marks of 0-40) there is little or no evidence of critical evaluation.

Writing, Background Reading, Referencing and Bibliographic format
The standard of writing presents difficulties for the reader, with frequent grammatical and spelling errors to a degree that inhibits communication. The range and depth of background reading may be insufficient. The approach to referencing and bibliographic formatting does not follow the required conventions to a sufficiently consistent level. At the lower end of the fail range (marks of 0-40) the use of language may present considerable comprehension difficulties for the reader. The assignment may not meet stipulations in terms of layout and/or length, and the approach to referencing may not meet expected conventions