English sociological Texts. Collected by

Dr. Marwa Salaheldin

Faculty of Arts (Qena)

Department of sociology

Academic year

2022/2023

بيانات الكتاب

الكلية/ الآداب

الفرقة/ الرابعة

التخصص/ علم الاجتماع

تاريخ النشر/ أكتوبر2022

عدد الصفحات/144

أستاذ المقرر/ د. مروة صلاح الدين

Table of Contents

1. <u>Types of society</u>

The unlimited variety of premodern societies can actually be grouped into three main categories, each of which is referred to in Harris's description: hunters and gatherers (Harris calls these, 'hunter-collectors' in his description above); larger agrarian or pastoral societies (involving agriculture or the tending of domesticated animals); and non-industrial civilizations or traditional states. As table 4.2 shows, with the emergence of each successive societal type came larger societies and an increase in the size of the global human population.

The earliest societies: hunters and gatherers

For all but a tiny part of their existence on this planet, human beings have lived in hunting and gathering societies. Hunters and gatherers gain their livelihood from hunting, fishing and gathering edible plants growing in the wild. These cultures continue to exist in some parts of the world, such as in a few arid parts of Africa and

the jungles of Brazil and New Guinea. Most hunting and gathering cultures, however, have been destroyed or absorbed by the spread of Western culture (the culture of Europe, the United States, Australasia) and those that remain are unlikely to stay intact for much longer. Currently, fewer than a quarter of a million people in the world support themselves through hunting and gathering - only 0.001 per cent of the world's population.

Compared with larger societies - particularly those in the developed world - little inequality is found in most hunting and gathering groups. Hunters and gatherers do not accumulate material wealth beyond what is needed to cater for their basic wants.

Their main preoccupations are normally with religious values and with ceremonial and ritual activities. The material goods they need are limited to weapons for hunting tools for digging and building, traps and cooking utensils. Thus there is little difference among members of the society in the number of kinds of material possessions – there are no divisions of reach and poor. Differences

of position or rank tend to be limited to age and sex; men are almost always the hunters, while women gather wild crops, cook, and bring up the children. This division of labour between men and women, however, is very important: men tend to dominate public and ceremonial positions.

Hunters and gatherers are not merely -primitive' peoples whose ways of life no longer hold any interest for us. Studying their cultures allows us to see more clearly that modern institutions are far from being natural' features of all human life. Of course, we should not idealize the circumstances in which hunters and gatherers have lived, but, nonetheless, the absence of war, the lack of major inequalities of wealth and power and the emphasis on cooperation rather than competition are all instructive reminders that the world created by modern industrial civilization is not necessarily to be equated in any obvious way with 'progress'.

Pastoral and agrarian societies

About 20,000 years ago, some hunting and gathering groups turned to the raising of domesticated animals and the cultivation of fixed

plots of land as their means of livelihood. Pastoral societies are those that rely mainly on domesticated livestock, while agrarian societies are those that grow crops (practise agriculture). Many societies have had mixed pastoral and agrarian economies.

Depending on the environment in which they live, pastoralists rear and herd animals such as cattle, sheep, goats, camels and horses. Many pastoral societies still exist in the modern world, concentrated especially in areas of Africa, the Middle East and Central Asia. These societies are usually found in regions where there are dense grasslands, or in deserts or mountains. Such regions are not amenable to fruitful agriculture, but may support various kinds of livestock. Pastoral societies usually migrate between different areas according to seasonal change. Given their nomadic habits, people in pastoral societies do not normally accumulate many material possessions, although their way of life is more complex in material terms than that of hunters and gathers.

At some point, hunting gathering groups began to sow their own crops rather than simply collect those growing in the wild. This

practice first developed as what is usually called 'horticulture', in which small gardens were cultivated with the use of simple hoes or digging instruments. Like pastoralism, horticulture provided for a more assured supply of food than was possible by hunting and gathering and could therefore support larger communities. Since they were not on the move, people gaining a livelihood from horticulture could develop larger stocks of material possessions than either hunting and gathering or pastoral communities. Some people in the world still rely primarily on agriculture for their livelihood (see table 4.3).

<u>Non-industrial or traditional civilizations</u>

From about 6000 BCE onwards, we find evidence of larger societies than ever existed before, which contrast in distinct ways with earlier types (see figure 4.2). These societies were based on the development of cities, showed very pronounced inequalities of wealth and power and were associated with the rule of kings or emperors. Because they involved the use of writing, and science and art flourished, they are often called civilizations.

The earliest civilizations developed in the Middle East, usually in fertile river areas. The Chinese Empire originated in about 2000 BCE, when powerful states were also founded in what are now India and Pakistan. A number of large civilizations existed in Mexico and Latin America, such as the Aztecs of Mexico, the Mayas of the Yucatan Peninsula and the Incas of Peru.

Most traditional civilizations were also empires; they achieved the size they did through the conquest and incorporation of other peoples (Kautsky 1982). This was true, for instance, of traditional China and Rome. At its height, in the first century CE, the Roman Empire stretched from Britain in north-west Europe to beyond the Middle East. The Chinese empire, which lasted for more than 2,000 years, up to the threshold of the twentieth century, covered most of the massive region of eastern Asia now occupied by modern China. The emergence of these large-scale civilizations and empires shows that the long-term process of globalization has involved invasion, wars and violent conquest every bit as much as cooperation and mutual exchange between societies. Nevertheless,

by the dawn of the modern era, human settlement had already taken place right across the globe.

Table 4.3 Some agrarian societies remain

Country	Percentage of workers in agriculture
Rwanda	90
Uganda	82
Ethiopia	80
Nepal	76
Bangladesh	63
How the industrialized societies differ	
Japan	4.6
Australia	3.6
Germany	2.8
Canada	2.0
United Kingdom	1.4

United States   0.7

Source: CIA World Factbook 2007

The modern world: the industrialized societies

What has happened to destroy the forms of society which dominated the whole of history up to two centuries ago? The answer, in a word, is industrialization - a term we introduced in chapter 1. Industrialization refers to the emergence of machine production, based on the use of inanimate power resources (like steam or electricity). The industrial societies (sometimes also called 'modern' or 'developed' societies) are utterly different from any previous type of social order and their development has had consequences stretching far beyond their European origins.

In even the most advanced of traditional civilizations, most people were engaged in working on the land. The relatively low level of technological development did not permit more than a small minority to be freed from the chores of agricultural production. Modern technology has certainly transformed the ways of life

enjoyed by a large proportion of the human population. As the economic historian David Landes (1969) has observed:

Modern technology produces not only more, faster; it turns out objects that could not have been produced under any circumstances by the craft methods of yesterday. The best Indian hand-spinner could not turn out yarn so fine and regular as that of the [spinning] mule; all the forges in eighteenth-century Christendom could not have produced steel sheets so large, smooth and homogeneous as those of a modern strip mill. Most important, modern technology has created things that could scarcely have been conceived in the pre-industrial era; the camera, the motor car, the airplane, the whole array of electronic devices from the radio to the high-speed computer, the nuclear power plant, and so on almost ad infinitum.

Even so, the continuing existence of gross global inequalities means that such technological development is still not equally shared. The modes of life and social institutions characteristic of the modern world are radically different from those of even the recent past. During a period of only two or three centuries — a

minute sliver of time in the context of human history — human social life has been wrenched away from the types of social order in which people lived for thousands of years.

A central feature of industrial societies today is that a large majority of the employed population work in factories, or shops rather than in agriculture. And over 90 per cent of people live in towns and cities, where jobs are to be found and new job opportunities are created. The largest cities are vastly greater in size than the urban settlements found in traditional civilizations. In the cities, social life becomes more impersonal and anonymous than before and many of our day-to-day encounters are -with strangers rather than with individuals known to us. Large-scale organizations, such as business corporations or government agencies come to influence the lives of virtually everyone.

A feature of modern societies concerns their political systems, which are more developed government and intensive than forms of government in traditional states. In traditional civilizations, the political authorities (monarchs and emperors) had little direct

influence on the customs and habits of most of their subjects, who lived in fairly self-contained local villages. With industrialization, transportation and communication became much more rapid, making for a more integrated 'national' community.

The industrial societies were the first nation-states to come into existence. Nation-states are political communities, divided from each other by clearly delimited borders rather than the vague frontier areas that used to separate traditional states. National governments have extensive powers over many aspects of citizens' lives, framing laws that apply to all those living within their borders. Virtually all societies in the world today are nation-states. The application of industrial technology has by no means been limited to peaceful processes of economic development. From the earliest phases of industrialization, modern production processes have been put to military use and this has radically altered ways of waging war, creating weaponry and modes of military organization much more advanced than those of non-industrial cultures. Together, superior economic strength, political cohesion and

military superiority account for the seemingly irresistible spread of Western ways of life across the world over the past two centuries. Once again, as we noted in our discussion of older types of society, we have to acknowledge that the globalization process has very often been characterized by violence and conquest.

Global development

From the seventeenth to the early twentieth century, the Western countries established colonies in numerous areas that were previously occupied by traditional societies, using their superior military strength where necessary. Although virtually all of these colonies have now attained their independence, the policy of colonialism was central to shaping the social map of the globe as we know it today (colonialism was discussed in chapter 1 in relation to the coffee trade). In some regions, such as North America, Australia and New Zealand, which were only thinly populated by hunting and gathering communities, Europeans became the majority population. In other areas, including much of Asia, Africa and South America, local populations remained in the majority.

Societies of the first of these types, including the United States, have become industrialized and are often referred to as developed societies. Those in the second category are mostly at a much lower level of industrial development and are often referred to as developing societies, or the developing world. Such societies include China, India, most of the African countries (such as Nigeria, Ghana and Algeria) and those in South America (for example, Brazil, Peru and Venezuela). Since many of these societies are situated south of the United States and Europe, they are sometimes referred to collectively as the South and contrasted to the wealthier, industrialized North. This is a generalization, though, and as countries of the global south become industrialized, this simple division of the world becomes less and less accurate.

You may often hear developing countries referred to as part of the Third World. The term Third World was originally part of a contrast drawn between three main types of society found in the early twentieth century. First World countries were (and are) the industrialized states of Europe, the United States, Canada,

Greenland, Australasia (Australia and New Zealand), South Africa and Japan. Nearly all First World societies have multiparty, parliamentary systems of government. Second World societies meant the communist countries of what was then the Soviet Union (USSR) and Eastern Europe, including, for example, Czechoslovakia, Poland, East Germany and Hungary. Second World societies had centrally planned economies, which allowed little room for private property or competitive economic enterprise. They were also one-party states: the Communist Party dominated both the political and economic systems. For some 75 years, world history was affected by a global rivalry known as the Cold War, between the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries on the one hand and the capitalistic societies of the West and Japan on the other. Today that rivalry is over. With the ending of the Cold War and the disintegration of communism in the former USSR and Eastern Europe, the Second World has effectively disappeared.

Even though the Three Worlds model is still sometimes used in sociology textbooks, today it has outlived whatever usefulness it

might once have had as a way of describing the countries of the world. For one thing, the Second World of socialist and communist countries no longer exists and even exceptions such as China are rapidly adopting capitalist economies. It can also be argued that the ranking of First, Second and Third Worlds always reflected a value judgement, in which 'first' means 'best' and 'third' means 'worst'. It is therefore best avoided.

The developing world

Many developing societies are in areas that underwent colonial rule in Asia, Africa and South America. A few colonized areas gained independence early, like Haiti, which became the first autonomous black republic in January 1804. The Spanish colonies in South America acquired their freedom in 1810, while Brazil broke away from Portuguese rule in 1822. However, most nations in the developing world have become independent states only since the Second World War, often following bloody anti-colonial struggles. Examples include India, a range of other Asian countries (like Burma, Malaysia and Singapore) and countries in Africa

(including, for example, Kenya, Nigeria, Zaire, Tanzania and Algeria).

While they may include peoples living in traditional fashion, developing countries are very different from earlier forms of traditional societies. Their political systems are modelled on systems that were first established in the societies of the West — that is to say, they are nation-states. While most of the population still live in rural areas, many of these societies are experiencing a rapid process of urban development.

Although agriculture remains the main economic activity, crops are now often produced for sale in world markets rather than for local consumption. Developing countries are not merely societies that have `lagged behind' the more industrialized areas. They have been in large part created by contact with Western industrialism, which has undermined earlier, more traditional systems. Conditions in some of the most impoverished of these societies have deteriorated rather than improved over more recent years.

There are still around one billion people living on the equivalent of less than one US dollar a day.

The world's poor are concentrated particularly in South and East Asia and in Africa and Latin America, although there are some important differences between these regions. For example, poverty levels in East Asia and the Pacific have declined over the past decade, while they have risen in the nations of sub-Saharan Africa. During the 1990s, the number of people living on less than one dollar per day in this region has grown from 241 million to 315 million(World Bank 2004). There have also been significant increases in poverty in parts of South Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean. Many of the world's poorest countries also suffer from a serious debt crisis. Payments of interest on loans from foreign lenders can often amount to more than governments' investments in health, welfare and education.

Newly industrializing countries

While the majority of developing countries are not as economically developed as the societies of the West, some have successfully embarked on a process of industrialization_ These countries are sometimes referred to as newly industrializing countries (NICs), including Brazil and Mexico in Latin America and Hong Kong, South Korea, Singapore and Taiwan in East Asia. The rates of economic growth of the most successful NICs, such as those in East Asia, are several times those of the Western industrial economies. No developing country figured among the top 30 exporters in the world in 1968, but 25 years later South Korea was in the top 15.

The East Asian NICs have shown the most sustained levels of economic prosperity. They are investing abroad as well as promoting growth at home. South Korea's production of steel has doubled in the last decade and its shipbuilding and electronics industries are among the world's leaders. Singapore is becoming the major financial and commercial centre of Southeast Asia. Taiwan is an important presence in the manufacturing and

electronics industries. All these changes in the NICs have directly affected countries such as the United States, whose share of global steel production, for example, has dropped significantly over the past 30 years. Types of society in the modern world are summarized in table 4.4.

2. <u>CIVIL SOCIETY</u>

Civil society (from the Latin civilis societas) is the realm of independent activity and voluntary association that is not organized by the state. The origin of the term is often traced to the Scottish Enlightenment philosopher Adam Ferguson (1723–1816) and his Essay on the History of Civil Society (1767). Ferguson saw the new commercial civilization then displacing the older clan-based feudal order of the Scottish Highlands as enhancing individual liberty through the introduction of "civil society," "civil life," and "economic society." In the same intellectual tradition, another Scottish Enlightenment philosopher and social theorist, Adam Smith (1723–1790), referred to the notion of civil society as the capacity of human communities for autonomous self-organization. For both Ferguson and Smith, the example of the free, self-regulating economic market demonstrated the possibility of social organization without the heavy-handed supervision of the state.

But it was the German idealist philosopher Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel who first drew the boundary between the spheres of state and society in his Elements of the Philosophy of Right (1820). For Hegel, civil society (bürgerliche Gesellschaft) was the realm of the particular counterpoised to the state. It occupied the mesolevel (or intermediate stage) between the dialectical opposites of the macrocommunity of the state and the microcommunity of the family. In his view, civil society was a temporary mode of relations interposed between the individual (or the family) and the state, which was to be transcended when particular and common interests combined.

Today the study of civil society focuses on the causal link between democratization and the nonpolitical aspects of the contemporary social order, leaving open to debate the question of whether or not there is incongruence and conflict between civil society and the state. The existence of a self-organized, vibrant, and fully developed civil society that is free of the state and has numerous autonomous public arenas within which various voluntary

associations regulate their own activities and govern their own members is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for a viable democracy and the transition from an authoritarian or totalitarian regime to a democratic one.

Civil society discourse has more recently drawn on the experience of the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe, where the anticommunist opposition embraced the revival of civil society as its raison d'être during the years leading up to the revolutions of 1989. In fact the downfall of communism has often been linked theoretically to the revolt of residual or nascent civil society against the political intolerance and ideological rigidity of the communist state.

3.   <u>IMPERIALISM</u>

Derived from the noun 'empire', this denotes the political and economic domination of one or more countries by another. The classic empires of modern times were the Ottoman, which at the start of the 19th century covered the Balkans and the Middle East, and the British, which at the end of the 19th century extended over enough of the globe for its officials to boast that the sun never set on the empire. Empires have differed in the way that the imperial centre has ruled its overseas territories. The French, for example, imposed their language and culture on their colonial possessions and treated some of them (Algeria, for example)in many respects as if they were parts of France. The British generally remained distant from those they ruled, preferring to work through existing social and political structures.

One of the main reasons for imperial expansion was economic: a cheap source of raw materials, an outlet for surplus population, and a captive market for finished goods. The European nations

abandoned their overseas possessions, in part, because they had become a financial drain and because liberation movements were raising the costs –military and economic – of continued rule. They were also an embarrassment in that even the best-run colonies denied to native people the civil and political rights which in the 20th century were taken-for-granted at home.

Critics of US foreign policy and cultural expansion from the 1950s onwards talk of 'American imperialism' but this is a rather casual usage. What is clear is that the influence the USA exercises over large parts of the world is quite different from Ottoman or British imperialism in that it does not rest on constant military presence or the formation of permanent colonies but can be exercised through preferential trade terms, local military proxies and the rapid deployment of military force. Unlike the popular British support for its empire, Americans are highly ambivalent about direct involvement in the affairs of foreign countries.

4. .<u>LIBERALISM</u>

There are two common meanings of liberalism, which unfortunately clash. In the history of political thought, liberalism is a doctrine developed in Europe from the late 17th century onwards (most closely associated with the British philosophers John Stuart Mill, John Locke, David Hume and Jeremy Bentham) which argued against authoritarian and absolutist forms of government and in favour of freedom of speech, association and religion, and the right to private property. These are the men of the Enlightenment, now scorned as representing the sort of exhaustive and comprehensive worldview that is impossible in postmodern societies. Their thinking was grounded in rationality; it assumed that a liberal society was one that self-interested right-thinking people would choose. It was also firmly linked to capitalism and the laissez-faire economics of Adam Smith.

Liberalism is also used loosely to mean an attitude of general toleration and a position on the left wing of any contemporary

debate. The clash between the two meanings arises because the world has moved on a long way since the time of Mill. The rights which the first liberals argued for are now almost universally taken-for-granted and the state, insofar as it interferes in the operations of the free market, does so not to protect a small landed aristocracy but to safeguard working people and promote the interests of minorities excluded from full citizenship. Hence the basic terms of political debate have shifted. To be a liberal in the 1780s was to be radical. In the 1980s economic liberals such as Margaret Thatcher (UK Prime Minister1979–90) and Ronald Reagan (US President 1980–88) were reactionary: keen to reverse the 20th century expansion of the state.

5.   .SOCIAL CAPITAL

The term social capital refers either to the capacity of an individual to obtain valued material or symbolic goods by virtue of his or her social relationships and group memberships or to the capacity of a plurality of persons to enjoy the benefits of collective action by virtue of their own social participation, trust in institutions, or commitment to established ways of doing things. The former capacity has been called "relational social capital" and the latter "institutional social capital" (Krishna 2000). The common element underlying both types of social capital is social embeddedness. Individual and collective action alike are enabled and constrained by the resources that actors can leverage within and between levels of social structure.

Two contemporary social theorists who developed the concept's theoretical potential are Pierre Bourdieu and James S. Coleman. Bourdieu arrived at the concept independently, while Coleman built on economist and policy analyst Glenn Loury's use of the

term to designate all the family, class, and neighborhood characteristics that affect mactors' investments in human capital. Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) define social capital as the actual or potential resources at play in the "field of the social"—that is, in the sphere of "mutual acquaintance and recognition" (p. 1991). For Bourdieu, modern society is an ensemble of relatively autonomous fields—for example, the religious field, the linguistic field, the economic field, each with its own strategic logic and specific form of capital—religious capital, linguistic capital, economic capital, and so on. Of these, the most important, the one that exerts the greatest force on the other fields, is the economic. Having limited social capital to the sphere of direct social relations, Bourdieu devoted his prodigious research efforts to the study of other forms of capital, particularly cultural capital.

Coleman (1988) derived the concept of social capital from the premises of rational choice theory. Starting out from the spare premises of utility-maximizing, resource-bearing actors, each controlling assets of differential value to others, Coleman erected

an impressive theoretical edifice extending to interdependent corporate groups ("corporate society"). These premises required him to see social capital as an unintended, emergent phenomenon chiefly found in social structures characterized by "closure." The effective monitoring and sanctioning of behavior that closure provides builds interpersonal trust, generates the authority required for collective action, and allows actors to pool their resources for new projects and endeavors.

6. <u>Modernity and Modernism</u>

The term (modernity) denotes that package of characteristics that define modern societies and distinguish them from early formations. There is some dispute about when we date the onset of modernity but there widespread agreement about the following list of characteristics: industrial capitalist economies, democratic political organisation and a flexible social structure based on class.

The implied contrast is with agrarian feudal economies which had autocratic polities a rigid social structure based on estates. There is more disagreement about the sociopsychological or cultural correlates of those structural changes but many scholars suggest that modernity involves the commodification and rationalisation of many spheres of a fragmentation of experience, and an acceleration of daily life. Since the 1980s it been argued by some that contemporary societies have acquired a distinctive postmodern quality while others see only a steady intensification of the characteristics of modernity

itself. This latter view is sometimes described as 'late' or 'high' modernity.

But **modernism** denotes an artistic and cultural movement (1880s–1950s) represented by such figures as Pablo Picasso in painting, James Joyce and T.S. Elliot in literature, Igor Stravinksy in music and the Bauhaus movement in architecture. Modernism marked a confident break with earlier notions of good taste and style. In art and literature, modernist work tended to be deliberately unrealistic and nonrepresentational: words were used in unusual ways and pictures did not look like conventional depictions of their subjects.

In architecture, modernism tended to mean machine-like and functional. Buildings were unadorned and starkly attractive. Many modernists were inspired by new technologies, the strength and speed of the industrial and the availability of new industrial materials; they celebrated the wonders of modernity. This is mentioned here only to clarify that postmodernism is the 'ism' of the postmodern rather than the 'post' of 'modernism'.

7. .SOCIAL MOBILITY

The term ''social mobility'' describes the nature and amount of change in social position over time. In principle, this change can be defined for any social entity. Thus, one can study the ''collective mobility'' of classes, ethnic groups, or entire nations in terms of, for example, average health status, literacy, education, or gross domestic product per capita. More commonly, the term is used in connection with the movement of individuals or families. However, even though social mobility typically is defined with respect to micro units of society, the pattern of mobility across those units generally is considered a core characteristic of a society's social structure, and the study of this mobility generally is recognized as a fundamental area of macro-level sociology.

Social mobility typically is conceptualized in terms of the quantity of movement and the distribution of its direction and distance. The different rates that together constitute the mobility structure of a society is highly complex, however, for several reasons. First,

societies have more than one dimension along which mobility can occur. Thus, one can speak of occupational mobility, social class mobility, educational mobility, job mobility, income mobility, wealth mobility, and so on. In principle, one also can use the term ''social mobility'' to describe movement among non-hierarchical social statuses, such as religious affiliation mobility and geographic mobility or mobility across categories that describe attitudes, belief systems, life styles, and the like. The dominant use of the term

in the literature, however, concerns mobility along a social hierarchy that defines a dimension of social inequality in a society. Second, even with

respect to a single hierarchy, the mobility structure is not easy to summarize. A different rate of mobility can be calculated with respect to each combination of origin and destination position along the social hierarchy in question. Empirically, it may be possible to summarize this collection of rates accurately in terms of a function of the social distance between origin and destination or in terms of specific relationships between the origin and

destination categories. In general, however, an accurate summary cannot be expressed in terms of a single number. Thus, for each social hierarchy, there is not a single rate of social mobility but a core set of rates that, taken together, can be termed the structure of mobility with respect to the particular hierarchical dimension.

Social mobility is an important issue in sociology for several reasons. For one thing, it is relevant to social equity. Philosophical and moral evaluations of social inequality often depend not only on the level of inequality in a society but also on the extent to which individuals or families can leave disadvantaged states during their lifetimes or across generations. Social mobility is also an important explanatory factor in social theory. The basic stratification variables affect a wide variety of social outcomes and behaviors, but these effects accumulate over time; social mobility therefore affects outcomes by changing the states and durations of these key explanatory variables. The societal rate of mobility also may have macro-level consequences. An early conjecture in this area appears in the work of Werner Sombart, who argued that the failure of early

twentieth century socialist parties in the United States stemmed in part from the high rate of American social mobility, which prevented the formation of strong class identification.

8. <u>SOCIAL STRATIFICATION</u>

In all complex societies, the total stock of valued resources is distributed unequally, with the most privileged individuals and families receiving a disproportionate share of power, prestige, and other valued resources. The term ''stratification system''refers to the constellation of social institutions that generate observed inequalities of this sort. The key components of such systems are (1) the institutional processes that define certain types of goods as valuable and desirable, (2) the rules of allocation that distribute those goods across various positions or occupations (e.g., doctor, farmer, ''housewife''), and (3) the mobility mechanisms that link individuals to positions and generate unequal control over valued resources. The inequality of modern systems is thus produced by two conceptually distinct types of ''matching'' processes: The jobs, occupations, and social roles in society are first matched to ''reward packages'' of unequal value, and the individual members

of society then are allocated to the positions defined and rewarded in that manner.

There are, of course, many types of rewards that come to be attached to social roles (see Table1). The very complexity of modern reward systems arguably suggests a multidimensional approach to understanding stratification in which analysts specify the distribution of each of the valued goods listed in Table 1. Although some scholars have advocated a multidimensional approach of this sort, most have opted to characterize stratification systems in terms of discrete classes or strata whose members are similarly advantaged or disadvantaged with respect to various assets (e.g., property and prestige) that are deemed fundamental. In the most extreme versions of this approach, the resulting classes are assumed to be real entities that predate the distribution of rewards, and many scholars therefore refer to the ''effects'' of class on the rewards that class members control (see the following section for details).

The goal of stratification research has thus devolved to describing the structure of these social classes and specifying the processes by which they are generated and maintained. The following types of questions are central to the field:

1. What are the major forms of class inequality in human history? Is such inequality an inevitable feature of human life?

2. How many social classes are there? What are the principal ''fault lines'' or social cleavages that define the class structure? Are those cleavages strengthening or weakening with the transition to advanced industrialism?

3. How frequently do individuals cross occupational or class boundaries? Are educational degrees, social contacts, and ''individual luck'' important forces in matching individuals to jobs and class positions? What other types of social or institutional forces underlie occupational attainment and allocation?

Types of Assets, Resources, and Valued Goods Underlying Stratification Systems

Asset Group	Selected Examples	Relevant
1. Economic	Ownership of land, farms, factories, professional practices, businesses, liquid assets, humans (i.e., slaves), labor power (e.g., serfs)	Karl Marx, Erik Wright
2. Political	Household authority (e.g., head of household); workplace authority (e.g., manager); party and societal authority (e.g., legislator); charismatic leader	Max Weber, Ralf Dahrendorf
3. Cultural	High-status consumption practices; "good manners"; privileged lifestyle	Pierre Bourdieu, Paul DiMaggio
4. Social	Access to high-status social networks, social ties, associations and clubs, union memberships	W. Lloyd Warner, James Coleman
5. Honorific	Prestige; "good reputation"; fame; deference and derogation; ethnic and religious purity	Edward Shils, Donald Treiman
6. Civil	Rights of property, contract, franchise, and membership in elective assemblies; freedom of association and speech	T H. Marshall, Rogers Brubaker
7. Human	Skills; expertise; on-the-job training; experience; formal education; knowledge	Kaare Svalastoga, Gary Becker

Table 1

4. What types of social processes and state policies maintain or alter racial, ethnic, and sex discrimination in labor markets? Have these forms of discrimination been weakened or strengthened in the transition to advanced industrialism?

5. Will stratification systems take on new and distinctive forms in the future? Are the stratification systems of modern societies gradually shedding their distinctive features and converging toward a common (i.e., postindustrial) regime?

These questions all adopt a critical orientation to human stratification systems that is distinctively modern in its underpinnings. For the greater part of history, the existing stratification order was regarded as an immutable feature of

society, and the implicit objective of commentators was to explain or justify that order in terms of religious or quasi-religious doctrines. During with the Enlightenment, critical ''rhetoric of equality'' gradually emerged and took hold, and the civil and legal advantages of the aristocracy and other privileged status groupings were accordingly challenged. After these advantages were largely eliminated in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, that egalitarian ideal was extended and recast to encompass not only such civil assets voting rights but also economic assets in the form of land, property, and the means of production. In its most radical form, this economic egalitarianism led to Marxist interpretations of human history, and it ultimately provided the intellectual underpinnings for socialism. While much of stratification theory has been formulated in reaction against these early forms of Marxist scholarship, the field shares with Marxism a distinctively modern (i.e., Enlightenment) orientation that is based on the premise that individuals are ''ultimately morally equal'' (see Meyer 1994, p.733; see also Tawney 1931). This premise implies

that issues of inequality are critical in evaluating the legitimacy of

modern social systems.

9. <u>ETHNOGRAPHY</u>

Definition

A research method located in the practice of both sociologists and anthropologists, and which should be regarded as the product of a cocktail of methodologies that share the assumption that personal engagement with the subject is the key to understanding a particular culture or social setting. Participant observation is the most common component of this cocktail, but interviews, conversational and discourse analysis, documentary analysis, film and photography, life histories all have their place in the ethnographer's repertoire. Description resides at the core of ethnography, and however this description is constructed it is the intense meaning of social life from the everyday perspective of group members that is sought.

Distinctive Features

Closely linked with, but actually the product of, various forms of fieldwork, ethnography is a particularly valuable resource for

researchers seeking to unpack cultures or social settings that are hidden or difficult to locate. For instance, the researcher may seek to understand the culture of places and spaces such as the factory, or the school, or alternatively the ethnographer may be interested in processes such as childhood, ageing, sexuality or death. Whatever the focus of the ethnographer, the method is marked out by the intensity of the relationship between the researcher and the field, and in particular, the researcher and his/her informants. The latter is, of course, a natural bona fide resident of the social setting that is being studied, while the researcher is to varying extents an outsider whose motivation for being there is research-led.

Ethnography is based on the assumption that every social group is distinctive in its own right, and in order to explore this distinction researchers must engage with the group on its own ground. With participant observation at the core of ethnographic research, this requires the ethnographer to adopt a role within the setting being studied that enables a smooth blending with the rules, codes and expectations of the locals, and that is pragmatic, serving the

instrumental objectives of the study. Ethnographers have found roles for themselves in a multitude of formal institutions such as schools, the police, factories, churches, prisons and businesses. They have also negotiated roles within a wide range of settings and cultures such as street gangs and poor neighbourhoods.

All of these fieldwork settings require the construction of a practical and convincing role or 'front' that enables data to be gleaned with a varying degree of personal impact on the field setting. Strategically this involves varying levels of involvement from complete observer, where the researcher remains unobtrusive and observes the group in action, through to the complete participant who is a full member of the social group, and is fully involved in the group's activities (see Gold, 1958 for a full discussion of his four-part model of the ethnographer's role).

10. <u>Postmodernism.</u>

<u>1. Origins of Postmodernism</u>

The term 'postmodernism' has been used in Latin- American literary criticism since the 1930s, and in Anglo-American debates since the 1940s, in order to designate new forms of expression in their relationship with the aesthetic of modernism. In history, the term was used by the British historian Arnold Toynbee in A Study of History in 1947 and designated the latest phase of Western civilization. In sociology, it was introduced by Amitai Etzioni's book The Active Society in 1968. Starting with the early 1970s, the term appeared more and more frequently in sociological texts in France, North America, and the UK. At that time, it was already common stock in literary theory and criticism. An essay written by the French philosopher Jean Francois Lyotard, The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge (1979) played a seminal role in making this term widely known and used in the social sciences. Therefore, postmodernism was partially a conceptual import; its

discussion in the 1970s was part of a wider innovative movement in the discipline, marked, among others, by the rise of social constructivism and feminism. At the same time, it continued and reformulated a series of topics already present in sociology.

The intellectual roots of sociological postmodernism can be identified in the works of some key nineteenth and early twentieth century philosophers, sociologists, and linguists. Karl Marx's critique of capitalism, Georg Simmel's analysis of modernization processes, Friedrich Nietzsche's critique of epistemology, and Ferdinand de Saussure's theory of language play here a prominent role. The French structuralist movement (Claude Le _vi-Strauss's anthropology, Roland Barthes's semiotic theory, Jacques Lacan's psychoanalysis), and the poststructuralist one (Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida), Ludwig Wittgenstein's later works, and Cliford Geertz's anthropology have also played a considerable role. Among other influences there are the Frankfurt School (Walter

Benjamin, Theodor Adorno, Max Horkheimer, and Herbert Marcuse), symbolic interactionism, ethnomethodology, and phenomenological sociology.

2.Postmodernism in Sociology

Prominent fields of postmodernist research have been work and organizations, political action, science and technology, commodification, consumption, gender, media, and popular culture. Classical sociological topics like symbolic consumption have been further explored and enriched. Sociological postmodernism has also pioneered domains like computers and the Internet. It is to be expected that in the future postmodernist research will evolve in the direction of concrete field studies, with an emphasis on the cultural forms induced by computers and the Internet.

In sociology, postmodernism designates (a) a cluster of theoretical and meta-theoretical approaches; (b) an analysis of postmodernity,

understood as encompassing the social and cultural features of late capitalism;

(c) an extension of sociological inquiry to new domains; and (d) new forms of sociological expression. Sociological postmodernism is thus a form of sociological analysis, a kind of sociological sensibility, and a sociologists' social and intellectual condition at the same time. Its varieties share a series of theoretical and methodological premises but differ in their conclusions and research programs. Core common elements are: (a) avoiding recourse to a set of universally valid assumptions as theoretical and methodological foundations, together with (b) the key role ascribed to notions like subject, identity, text, and symbol in the analysis of society.

11. <u>IDENTITY</u>

Identity can be thought of as the cover term for the names humans impute and avow in the course of interacting with others and orienting themselves to their various social worlds. A central principle of interaction between humans, or humans and the other objects that constitute their world, is that interaction is minimally contingent on the identification of the objects involved. In other words, before we can act toward or interact with some object, it must be situated in time and place. To do so is to give the object a name in the sense of classifying it as a member of a particular category (e.g., a soldier, a woman, a man, a chef, a student, and so on). Such naming entails the imputation and/or avowal of identities.

Not all identities are the same, however, as there are at least three types of identity that are featured in the relevant literature on identity in the social sciences: social identity, personal identity, and collective identity. The three types are often interconnected and

overlap in the fashion of a Venn diagram. From a sociological standpoint, social identity is the foundational or anchoring concept in that it is grounded in and derives from social roles, such as police officer, physician, or mother, or broad social categories, such as gender, racial, ethnic, and national categories. This structural grounding is captured in the parallel concepts of "role identities" and "categorical identities." Interactionally, social identities can be both imputed or avowed. They are imputed when ego assigns to alter an identity based on alter's presumed category membership (She is a feminist!) or the role alter is thought to be playing (She is a teacher!) or the role ego would like alter to be playing, which is referred to as altercasting (You are my friend, aren't you?). In each of these cases, a social identity is ascribed to others, and interaction is likely to proceed in terms of this identity.

Social identities can also be avowed or claimed, as when ego announces, "I am a Serb" or "I am a wine connoisseur" or "I am a professor." It is because of such category-based avowals that some social psychologists define social identity in terms of self-

definitions or identifications associated with social category memberships, or as one's self-concept derived from one's knowledge of membership in a social group, as well as the emotional significance that this membership produces.

But such self-definitions are perhaps more appropriately conceptualized as personal identities, which also include aspects of one's biography and life experiences that congeal into relatively distinctive personal attributes that function as pegs upon which social identities can be hung (Goffman 1963). The importance of distinguishing between social and personal identities rests not only on the fact that the latter are self-designations rather than other-attributions, but is also suggested by the observation that individuals sometimes reject other-imputed social identities, especially when they imply social roles or categories that are demeaning and contradictory with an idealized self-concept (Snow and Anderson 1987). Such observations suggest that personal identities may sometimes be grounded in social identities that

derive from role incumbency or category-based memberships but without necessarily being determined by those social identities.

The term self-concept has been used to explain the negotiation or compromise that is reached between an individual's ideal conception of the self and the information they receive from the social world, with the resulting negotiation capturing the tension that often exists between an individual's social and personal identities. The psychologist Erik Erikson can be read as attempting to conceptualize this tension or discordance with his concept of ego identity, which functions to ensure sameness and continuity in one's identity.

Collective identity, the third major type of identity, overlaps with the kindred concepts of social and personal identities but yet differs from them. It is loosely defined as a shared sense of "weness" or "one-ness" that derives from shared statues, attributes, or relations, which may be experienced directly or imagined, and which distinguishes those who comprise the collectivity from one or more perceived sets of others (Polletta and Jasper 2001). Identifying with

a collectivity is often based on an individual's social identity, such as identifying as an ethnic minority or a citizen of a particular country, but such category-based associations do not automatically give rise to collective identity. Instead, the development and expression of collective identity is often triggered by contests pitting one group against another, as in the case of the World Cup and the Olympics, by unanticipated events, such as the World Trade Center terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, or by threats to group or community integrity or viability, as in the case of much social movement activity. A significant part of the power of collective identity comes from the collective solidarity, efficacy, and agency it provides, which individuals are not as likely to experience via their personal or social identities.

12. <u>Positivism and antipositivism</u>

Positivism

The overarching methodological principle of positivism is to conduct sociology in broadly the same manner as natural science. An emphasis on empiricism and the scientific method is sought to provide a tested foundation for sociological research based on the assumption that the only authentic knowledge is scientific knowledge, and that such knowledge can only arrive by positive affirmation through scientific methodology .

Our main goal is to extend scientific rationalism to human conduct.... What has been called our positivism is but a consequence of this rationalism[

—Émile Durkheim, The Rules of Sociological Method(1895)

The term has long since ceased to carry this meaning; there are no fewer than twelve distinct epistemologies that are referred to as positivism. Many of these approaches do not self-identify as "positivist", some because they themselves arose in opposition to

57

older forms of positivism, and some because the label has over time become a pejorative term by being mistakenly linked with a theoretical empiricism. The extent of antipositivist criticism has also diverged, with many rejecting the scientific method and others only seeking to amend it to reflect 20th-century developments in the philosophy of science. However, positivism (broadly understood as a scientific approach to the study of society) remains dominant in contemporary sociology, especially in the United States .

Loïc Wacquant distinguishes three major strains of positivism: Durkheimian, Logical, and Instrumental. None of these are the same as that set forth by Comte, who was unique in advocating such a rigid (and perhaps optimistic) version. While Émile Durkheim rejected much of the detail of Comte's philosophy, he retained and refined its method. Durkheim maintained that the social sciences are a logical continuation of the natural ones into the realm of human activity, and insisted that they should retain the same objectivity, rationalism, and approach to causality.[35] He

developed the notion of objective sui generis "social facts" to serve as unique empirical objects for the science of sociology to study .

The variety of positivism that remains dominant today is termed instrumental positivism. This approach eschews epistemological and metaphysical concerns (such as the nature of social facts) in favour of methodological clarity, replicability, reliability and validity. This positivism is more or less synonymous with quantitative research, and so only resembles older positivism in practice. Since it carries no explicit philosophical commitment, its practitioners may not belong to any particular school of thought. Modern sociology of this type is often credited to Paul Lazarsfeld, who pioneered large-scale survey studies and developed statistical techniques for analysing them. This approach lends itself to what Robert K. Merton called middle-range theory: abstract statements that generalize from segregated hypotheses and empirical regularities rather than starting with an abstract idea of a social whole.

Anti-positivism

Reactions against social empiricism began when German philosopher Hegel voiced opposition to both empiricism, which he rejected as uncritical, and determinism, which he viewed as overly mechanistic. Karl Marx's methodology borrowed from Hegelian dialecticism but also a rejection of positivism in favour of critical analysis, seeking to supplement the empirical acquisition of "facts" with the elimination of illusions. He maintained that appearances need to be critiqued rather than simply documented. Early hermeneuticians such as Wilhelm Dilthey pioneered the distinction between natural and social science ('Geisteswissenschaft'). Various neo-Kantian philosophers, phenomenologists and human scientists further theorized how the analysis of the social world differs to that of the natural world due to the irreducibly complex aspects of human society, culture, and being.+

In the Italian context of development of social sciences and of sociology in particular, there are oppositions to the first foundation of the discipline, sustained by speculative philosophy

in accordance with the antiscientific tendencies matured by critique of positivism and evolutionism, so a tradition Progressist struggles to establish itself.

At the turn of the 20th century the first generation of German sociologists formally introduced methodological anti-positivism, proposing that research should concentrate on human cultural norms, values, symbols, and social processes viewed from a resolutely subjective perspective. Max Weber argued that sociology may be loosely described as a science as it is able to identify causal relationships of human "social action"—especially among "ideal types", or hypothetical simplifications of complex social phenomena. As a non-positivist, however, Weber sought relationships that are not as "historical, invariant, or generalisable" as those pursued by natural scientists. Fellow German sociologist, Ferdinand Tönnies, theorised on two crucial abstract concepts with his work on "Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft" (lit. community and society). Tönnies marked a sharp line between the realm of concepts and the reality of social action: the first must be treated

axiomatically and in a deductive way ("pure sociology"), whereas the second empirically and inductively ("applied sociology")

[Sociology is] ... the science whose object is to interpret the meaning of social action and thereby give a causal explanation of the way in which the action proceeds and the effects which it produces. By 'action' in this definition is meant the human behaviour when and to the extent that the agent or agents see it as subjectively meaningful ... the meaning to which we refer may be either (a) the meaning actually intended either by an individual agent on a particular historical occasion or by a number of agents on an approximate average in a given set of cases, or (b) the meaning attributed to the agent or agents, as types, in a pure type constructed in the abstract. In neither case is the 'meaning' to be thought of as somehow objectively 'correct' or 'true' by some metaphysical criterion. This is the difference between the empirical sciences of action, such as sociology and history, and any kind of prior discipline, such as jurisprudence, logic, ethics, or aesthetics

whose aim is to extract from their subject-matter 'correct' or 'valid' meaning.

— Max Weber, The Nature of Social Action 1922

Both Weber and Georg Simmel pioneered the "Verstehen" (or 'interpretative') method in social science; a systematic process by which an outside observer attempts to relate to a particular cultural group, or indigenous people, on their own terms and from their own point of view. Through the work of Simmel, in particular, sociology acquired a possible character beyond positivist data-collection or grand, deterministic systems of structural law. Relatively isolated from the sociological academy throughout his lifetime, Simmel presented idiosyncratic analyses of modernity more reminiscent of the phenomenological and existential writers than of Comte or Durkheim, paying particular concern to the forms of, and possibilities for, social individuality. His sociology engaged in a neo-Kantian inquiry into the limits of perception, asking 'What is society?' in a direct allusion to Kant's question 'What is nature?

The deepest problems of modern life flow from the attempt of the individual to maintain the independence and individuality of his existence against the sovereign powers of society, against the weight of the historical heritage and the external culture and technique of life. The antagonism represents the most modern form of the conflict which primitive man must carry on with nature for his own bodily existence. The eighteenth century may have called for liberation from all the ties which grew up historically in politics, in religion, in morality and in economics in order to permit the original natural virtue of man, which is equal in everyone, to develop without inhibition; the nineteenth century may have sought to promote, in addition to man's freedom, his individuality (which is connected with the division of labor) and his achievements which make him unique and indispensable but which at the same time make him so much the more dependent on the complementary activity of others; Nietssche may have seen the relentless struggle of the individual as the prerequisite for his full development, while socialism found the same thing in the suppression of all

competition – but in each of these the same fundamental motive was at work, namely the resistance of the individual to being leveled, swallowed up in the social-technological mechanism.

13. <u>Visual sociology</u>

Visual sociology is an area of sociology concerned with the visual dimensions of social life. This subdiscipline is nurtured by the International Visual Sociology Association (IVSA),[1] which holds annual conferences and publishes the journal, Visual Studies.[2]

Because of the interests of its founders, the IVSA tends to be concerned with photography and documentary filmmaking within a sociological context. However, visual sociology – theoretically at least – includes the study of all kinds of visual material and the visual social world, and uses all kinds of visual material in its methodologies.

Similarly, the newly formed British Sociological Association Visual Sociology Study Group[3] offers UK-based researchers and academics working in a broad range of sub-disciplines within sociological fields a network in which to explore existing and emerging visual research methods and methodologies.

1. Theory and method

There are at least three approaches to doing visual sociology:

- Data collection using cameras and other recording technology[edit]

In this context, the camera is analogous to a tape recorder. Film and video cameras are particularly well suited as data gathering technologies for experiments and small group interactions, classroom studies, ethnography, participant observation, oral history, the use of urban space, etc. The tape recorder captures things that are not preserved in even the best researchers' field notes. Similarly, tape recordings preserve audible data not available in even the most carefully annotated transcripts: timbre, the music of a voice, inflection, intonation, grunts and groans, pace, and space convey meanings easily (mis)understood but not easily gleaned from written words alone. By opening another channel of information, visual recordings preserve still more information. For instance, the raised eyebrow, the wave of a hand, the blink of an eye might convert the apparent

meaning of words into their opposite, convey irony, sarcasm, or contradiction. So, regardless of how one analyzes the data or what is done with the visual record, sociologists can use cameras to record and preserve data of interest so it can be studied in detail.

- Visual recording technology also allows us to manipulate the data. Visual recordings have long been employed by natural scientists because they make it possible to speed up, slow down, repeat, stop, and zoom in on things of interest. It is the same in the social sciences, recordings facilitate the study of phenomena that are too fast, or too slow, or too infrequent or too big or too small to study directly "in the life." Most importantly, through editing visual sociologists can juxtapose events to produce meanings. Sociologists may also be able to put cameras in places where one would not put a researcher: where it is dangerous, or where a person would be unwelcome, or simply to remove the observer effect from particular situations, e.g., studying social behavior among school children on a playground.

- Photo elicitation is another technique of data gathering. This methodological tool is a combination of photography as the visual equivalent of a tape recorder, and ethnography or other qualitative methods. Photo elicitation techniques involve using photographs or film as part of the interview—in essence asking research subjects to discuss the meaning of photographs, films or videos. In this case the images can be taken specially by the researcher with the idea of using them to elicit information, they can belong to the subject, for example family photographs or movies, or they can be gathered from other sources including archives, newspaper and television morgues, or corporate collections. Typically the interviewee's comments or analysis of the visual material is itself recorded, either on audio tape or video, etc.

  - Photo voice is a related research method in which researchers give those being studied still or movie cameras. Research participants are taught to use the image making technology but are then responsible for making photos or

movies which are subsequently analyzed either by the researchers or the participants, or both.

In any case, in this first sense visual sociology means including and incorporating visual methods of data gathering and analysis in the work of sociology. This method has recently been transferred to other academic disciplines, notably having been pioneered in contemporary religious research.[4][5] Visual sociology has also been employed as a useful tool to 'make the familiar strange' and can be a particularly effective research approach for working with children and marginalised groups.

2. Studying visual data produced by cultures

Visual sociology attempts to study visual images produced as part of culture. Art, photographs, film, video, fonts, advertisements, computer icons, landscape, architecture, machines, fashion, makeup, hair style, facial expressions, tattoos, and so on are parts of the complex visual communication system produced by members of societies. The use and understanding of visual images is governed by socially established symbolic codes. Visual

images are constructed and may be deconstructed. They may be read as texts in a variety of ways. They can be analyzed with techniques developed in diverse fields of literary criticism, art theory and criticism, content analysis, semiotics, deconstructionism, or the more mundane tools of ethnography. Visual sociologists can categorize and count them; ask people about them; or study their use and the social settings in which they are produced and consumed. So the second meaning of visual sociology is a discipline to study the visual products of society— their production, consumption and meaning.

3. Communication with images and media other than words

A third dimension of visual sociology is both the use of visual media to communicate sociological understandings to professional and public audiences, and also the use of visual media within sociological research itself.

In this context, visual sociology draws on the work of Edward Tufte, whose books Envisioning Information and The Visual Display of Quantitative Information address the communication of quantitative information. Visual sociology considers the logics of presentation of sociological and anthropological documentarians and ethnographers like Robert Flaherty, Konrad Lorenz, Margaret Mead and Gregory Bateson, and Frederick Wiseman. Visual sociology also requires the development of new forms—for example, data driven computer graphics to represent complex relationships e.g., changing social networks over time, the primitive accumulation of capital, the flow of labor, relations between theory and practice.

14. <u>Sociology of culture</u>

"Cultural Sociology" redirects here. For the journal, see Cultural Sociology (journal). The sociology of culture, and the related cultural sociology, concerns the systematic analysis of culture, usually understood as the ensemble of symbolic codes used by a member of a society, as it is manifested in the society. For Georg Simmel, culture referred to "the cultivation of individuals through the agency of external forms which have been objectified in the course of history". Culture in the sociological field is analyzed as the ways of thinking and describing, acting, and the material objects that together shape a group of people's way of life.

Contemporary sociologists' approach to culture is often divided between a "sociology of culture" and "cultural sociology"—the terms are similar, though not interchangeable.[1] The sociology of culture is an older concept, and considers some topics and objects as more or less "cultural" than others. By way of contrast, Jeffrey C. Alexander introduced the term cultural

sociology, an approach that sees all, or most, social phenomena as inherently cultural at some level.[2] For instance, a leading proponent of the "strong program" in cultural sociology, Alexander argues: "To believe in the possibility of cultural sociology is to subscribe to the idea that every action, no matter how instrumental, reflexive, or coerced [compared to] its external environment, is embedded to some extent in a horizon of affect and meaning."[3] In terms of analysis, sociology of culture often attempts to explain some discretely cultural phenomena as a product of social processes, while cultural sociology sees culture as a component of explanations of social phenomena.[4] As opposed to the field of cultural studies, cultural sociology does not reduce all human matters to a problem of cultural encoding and decoding. For instance, Pierre Bourdieu's cultural sociology has a "clear recognition of the social and the economic as categories which are interlinked with, but not reducible to, the cultural.

The elements of a culture

As no two cultures are exactly alike they do all have common characteristics. [8]

A culture contains:

1. Social Organization: Structured by organizing its members into smaller numbers to meet the cultures specific requirements. Social classes ranked in order of importance (status) based on the cultures core values. In example: money, job, education, family, etc.

2. Customs and Traditions: Rules of behavior enforced by the cultures ideas of right and wrong such as is customs, traditions, rules, or written laws.

3. Symbols: Anything that carries particular meaning recognized by people who share the same culture.[9]

4. Norms: Rules and expectations by which a society guides the behavior of its members. The two types of norms are mores and folkways. Mores are norms that are widely observed and have a

great moral significance. Folkways are norms for routine, casual interaction.[9]

5. Religion: The answers to their basic meanings of life and values.

6. Language: A system of symbols that allows people to communicate with one another.[9]

7. Arts and Literature: Products of human imagination made into art, music, literature, stories, and dance.

8. Forms of Government: How the culture distributes power. Who keeps the order within the society, who protects them from danger, and who provides for their needs. Can fall into terms such as Democracy, Republic, or Dictatorship.

9. Economic Systems: What to produce, how to produce it, and for whom. How people use their limited resources to satisfy their wants and needs. Can fall into the terms Traditional Economy, Market Economy, Command Economy, Mixed Economy.

10. Artifacts: Distinct material objects, such as architecture, technologies, and artistic creations.

11. Social institutions: Patterns of organization and relationships regarding governance, production, socializing, education, knowledge creation, arts, and relating to other cultures.

15. <u>Sociology of the Internet</u>

The sociology of the Internet involves the application of sociological theory and method to the Internet as a source of information and communication. Sociologists are concerned with the social implications of the technology; new social networks, virtual communities and ways of interaction that have arisen, as well as issues related to cybercrime.

The Internet—the newest in a series of major information breakthroughs—is of interest for sociologists in various ways: as a tool for research, for example, in using online questionnaires instead of paper ones, as a discussion platform, and as a research topic. The sociology of the Internet in the stricter sense concerns the analysis of online communities (e.g. as found in newsgroups), virtual communities and virtual worlds, organizational change catalyzed through new media such as the Internet, and social change at-large in the transformation from industrial to informational society (or to information society). Online

communities can be studied statistically through network analysis and at the same time interpreted qualitatively, such as through virtual ethnography. Social change can be studied through statistical demographics or through the interpretation of changing messages and symbols in online media studies.

Emergence of the discipline

The Internet is a relatively new phenomenon. As Robert Darnton wrote, it is a revolutionary change that "took place yesterday, or the day before, depending on how you measure it."[1] The Internet developed from the ARPANET, dating back to 1969; as a term it was coined in 1974. The World Wide Web as we know it was shaped in the mid-1990s, when graphical interface and services like email became popular and reached wider (non-scientific and non-military) audiences and commerce.[1][2] Internet Explorer was first released in 1995; Netscape a year earlier. Google was founded in 1998.[1][2] Wikipedia was founded in 2001. Facebook, MySpace, and YouTube in the mid-2000s. Web 2.0 is still emerging. The amount of information available on the

net and the number of Internet users worldwide has continued to grow rapidly.[2] The term 'digital sociology' is now becoming increasingly used to denote new directions in sociological research into digital technologies since Web 2.0.

Research trends

According to DiMaggio et al. (1999),[2] research tends to focus on the Internet's implications in five domains:

1. inequality (the issues of digital divide)

2. public and social capital (the issues of date displacement)

3. political participation (the issues of public sphere, deliberative democracy and civil society)

4. organizations and other economic institutions

5. cultural participation and cultural diversity

Early on, there were predictions that the Internet would change everything (or nothing); over time, however, a consensus emerged that the Internet, at least in the current phase of development, complements rather than displaces previously

implemented media.[2] This has meant a rethinking of the 1990s ideas of "convergence of new and old media". Further, the Internet offers a rare opportunity to study changes caused by the newly emerged - and likely, still evolving - information and communication technology (ICT).

Social impact

The Internet has created social network services, forums of social interaction and social relations, such as Facebook, MySpace, Meetup, and Couch Surfing which facilitate both online and offline interaction.

Though virtual communities were once thought to be composed of strictly virtual social ties, researchers often find that even those social ties formed in virtual spaces are often maintained both online and offline [3][4]

There are ongoing debates about the impact of the Internet on strong and weak ties, whether the Internet is creating more or less social capital,[5][6] the Internet's role in trends towards social

isolation,[7] and whether it creates a more or less diverse social environment.

It is often said the Internet is a new frontier, and there is a line of argument to the effect that social interaction, cooperation and conflict among users resembles the anarchistic and violent American frontier of the early 19th century.

Social impact

The Internet has created social network services, forums of social interaction and social relations, such as Facebook, MySpace, Meetup, and Couch Surfing which facilitate both online and offline interaction.

Though virtual communities were once thought to be composed of strictly virtual social ties, researchers often find that even those social ties formed in virtual spaces are often maintained both online and offline [3][4]

There are ongoing debates about the impact of the Internet on strong and weak ties, whether the Internet is creating more or

less social capital,[5][6] the Internet's role in trends towards social isolation,[7] and whether it creates a more or less diverse social environment.

It is often said the Internet is a new frontier, and there is a line of argument to the effect that social interaction, cooperation and conflict among users resembles the anarchistic and violent American frontier of the early 19th century.[8]

In March 2014, researchers from the Benedictine University at Mesa in Arizona studied how online interactions affect face-to-face meetings. The study is titled, "Face to Face Versus Facebook: Does Exposure to Social Networking Web Sites Augment or Attenuate Physiological Arousal Among the Socially Anxious," published in Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking.[9] They analyzed 26 female students with electrodes to measure social anxiety. Prior to meeting people, the students were shown pictures of the subject they were expected to meet. Researchers found that meeting someone face-to-face after looking at their photos increases arousal, which the study linked to an

increase in social anxiety. These findings confirm previous studies that found that socially anxious people prefer online interactions. The study also recognized that the stimulated arousal can be associated with positive emotions and could lead to positive feelings.[10]

Recent research has taken the Internet of Things within its purview, as global networks of interconnected everyday objects are said to be the next step in technological advancement.[11] Certainly, global space- and earth-based networks are expanding coverage of the IoT at a fast pace. This has a wide variety of consequences, with current applications in the health, agriculture, traffic and retail fields.[12] Companies such as Samsung and Sigfox have invested heavily in said networks, and their social impact will have to be measured accordingly, with some sociologists suggesting the formation of socio-technical networks of humans and technical systems.[13][14] Issues of privacy, right to information, legislation and content creation will come into public scrutiny in light of these technological changes.

In March 2014, researchers from the Benedictine University at Mesa in Arizona studied how online interactions affect face-to-face meetings. The study is titled, "Face to Face Versus Facebook: Does Exposure to Social Networking Web Sites Augment or Attenuate Physiological Arousal Among the Socially Anxious," published in Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking.[9] They analyzed 26 female students with electrodes to measure social anxiety. Prior to meeting people, the students were shown pictures of the subject they were expected to meet. Researchers found that meeting someone face-to-face after looking at their photos increases arousal, which the study linked to an increase in social anxiety. These findings confirm previous studies that found that socially anxious people prefer online interactions. The study also recognized that the stimulated arousal can be associated with positive emotions and could lead to positive feelings.[10]

Recent research has taken the Internet of Things within its purview, as global networks of interconnected everyday objects are

said to be the next step in technological advancement.[11] Certainly, global space- and earth-based networks are expanding coverage of the IoT at a fast pace. This has a wide variety of consequences, with current applications in the health, agriculture, traffic and retail fields.[12] Companies such as Samsung and Sigfox have invested heavily in said networks, and their social impact will have to be measured accordingly, with some sociologists suggesting the formation of socio-technical networks of humans and technical systems.[13][14] Issues of privacy, right to information, legislation and content creation will come into public scrutiny in light of these technological changes.

16. Computational sociology

Computational sociology is a branch of sociology that uses computationally intensive methods to analyze and model social phenomena. Using computer simulations, artificial intelligence, complex statistical methods, and analytic approaches like social network analysis, computational sociology develops and tests theories of complex social processes through bottom-up modeling of social interactions.[1]

It involves the understanding of social agents, the interaction among these agents, and the effect of these interactions on the social aggregate.[2] Although the subject matter and methodologies in social science differ from those in natural science or computer science, several of the approaches used in contemporary social simulation originated from fields such as physics and artificial intelligence.[3][4] Some of the approaches that originated in this field have been imported into the natural

sciences, such as measures of network centrality from the fields of social network analysis and network science.

In relevant literature, computational sociology is often related to the study of social complexity.[5] Social complexity concepts such as complex systems, non-linear interconnection among macro and micro process, and emergence, have entered the vocabulary of computational sociology.[6] A practical and well-known example is the construction of a computational model in the form of an "artificial society", by which researchers can analyze the structure of a social system.[2][7]

History

Background

In the past four decades, computational sociology has been introduced and gaining popularity[according to whom?]. This has been used primarily for modeling or building explanations of social processes and are depending on the emergence of complex behavior from simple activities.[8] The idea behind emergence is

that properties of any bigger system don't always have to be properties of the components that the system is made of.[9] The people responsible for the introduction of the idea of emergence are Alexander, Morgan, and Broad, who were classical emergentists. The time at which these emergentists came up with this concept and method was during the time of the early twentieth century. The aim of this method was to find a good enough accommodation between two different and extreme ontologies, which were reductionist materialism and dualism.[8]

While emergence has had a valuable and important role with the foundation of Computational Sociology, there are those who do not necessarily agree. One major leader in the field, Epstein, doubted the use because there were aspects that are unexplainable. Epstein put up a claim against emergentism, in which he says it "is precisely the generative sufficiency of the parts that constitutes the whole's explanation".[8]

Agent-based models have had a historical influence on Computational Sociology. These models first came around in the

1960s, and were used to simulate control and feedback processes in organizations, cities, etc. During the 1970s, the application introduced the use of individuals as the main units for the analyses and used bottom-up strategies for modeling behaviors. The last wave occurred in the 1980s. At this time, the models were still bottom-up; the only difference is that the agents interact interdependently.

Systems theory and structural functionalism

Main articles: Systems theory and Structural functionalism

In the post-war era, Vannevar Bush's differential analyser, John von Neumann's cellular automata, Norbert Wiener's cybernetics, and Claude Shannon's information theory became influential paradigms for modeling and understanding complexity in technical systems. In response, scientists in disciplines such as physics, biology, electronics, and economics began to articulate a general theory of systems in which all natural and physical phenomena are manifestations of interrelated elements in a system that has common patterns and properties. Following Émile

Durkheim's call to analyze complex modern society sui generis,[10] post-war structural functionalist sociologists such as Talcott Parsons seized upon these theories of systematic and hierarchical interaction among constituent components to attempt to generate grand unified sociological theories, such as the AGIL paradigm.[11] Sociologists such as George Homans argued that sociological theories should be formalized into hierarchical structures of propositions and precise terminology from which other propositions and hypotheses could be derived and operationalized into empirical studies.[12] Because computer algorithms and programs had been used as early as 1956 to test and validate mathematical theorems, such as the four color theorem,[13] some scholars anticipated that similar computational approaches could "solve" and "prove" analogously formalized problems and theorems of social structures and dynamics.

Macrosimulation and microsimulation[edit]

Main articles: System dynamics and Microsimulation

By the late 1960s and early 1970s, social scientists used increasingly available computing technology to perform macro-simulations of control and feedback processes in organizations, industries, cities, and global populations. These models used differential equations to predict population distributions as holistic functions of other systematic factors such as inventory control, urban traffic, migration, and disease transmission.[14][15] Although simulations of social systems received substantial attention in the mid-1970s after the Club of Rome published reports predicting that policies promoting exponential economic growth would eventually bring global environmental catastrophe,[16] the inconvenient conclusions led many authors to seek to discredit the models, attempting to make the researchers themselves appear unscientific.[2][17] Hoping to avoid the same fate, many social scientists turned their attention toward micro-simulation models to make forecasts and study policy effects by modeling aggregate changes in state of individual-level entities rather than the changes in distribution at the population level.[18] However, these micro-

simulation models did not permit individuals to interact or adapt and were not intended for basic theoretical research.

17. <u>Actor-network theory</u>

Geoffrey Bowker

Actor network theory originated in the 1980s as a movement within the sociology of science, centered at the Paris School of Mines. Key developers were Bruno Latour (Latour 1987), Michel Callon, Antoine Hennion, and John Law. It was sharply critical of earlier historical and sociological analyses of science, which had drawn a clear divide between the ''inside'' of a science (to be analyzed in terms of its adherence or not to a unitary scientific method) and its ''outside'' (the field of its application). Actor network theorists made three key moves. First, they argued for a semiotic, network reading of scientific practice. Human and non-human actors (actants) were assumed to be subject to the same analytic categories, just as a ring or a prince could hold the same structural position in a fairy tale. They could be enrolled in a network or not, could hold or not hold certain moral positions, and so forth. This profound ontological position has been the least

understood but the most generative aspect of the theory. Second, they argued that in producing their theories, scientists

weave together human and non-human actors into relatively stable network nodes, or ''black boxes.'' Thus a given astronomer can tie together her telescope, some distant stars, and a funding agency into an impregnable fortress, and to challenge her results you would need to find your own telescope, stars, and funding sources. Practically, this entailed an agnostic position on the ''truth'' of science. Indeed, they argued for a principle of symmetry according to which the same set of explanatory factors should be used to account for failed and successful scientific theories. There is no ultimate arbiter of right and wrong. Third, they maintained that in the process of constructing these relatively stable network configurations, scientists produced contingent nature–society divides. Nature and society were not pre given entities that could be used to explain anything else; they were the outcomes of the work of doing technoscience. Latour called this the ''Janus face'' of science. As it was being produced it was seen as contingent; once

produced it was seen as always and already true. Together, these three moves made the central analytical unit the work of the intermediary.

There is no society out there to which scientists respond as they build their theories, nor is there a nature which constrains them to a single telling of their stories. Rather, the technoscientist stands between nature and society, politics and technology. She can act as a spokesperson for her array of actants (things in the world, people in her lab), and if successful can black box these to create the effect of truth. The theory has given rise to a number of concepts which have proven useful in a wide range of technoscientific analyses. It has remained highly influential as a methodological tool for analyzing truth making in all its forms. The call to ''follow the actors'' – to see what they do rather than report on what they say they do – has been liberating for those engaged in studying scientists, who frequently hold their own truth and practice as if above the social and political fray. Their attention to the work of representation on paper led to the ideas of ''immutable mobiles''

and ''centers of calculation,'' which trace the power of technoscience to its ability to function as a centralizing networked bureaucracy. Indeed,

the anthropological eye of actor networked theorists – looking at work practices and not buying into actors' categories – has led to a rich meeting between the sociology of work, the Chicago School of sociology, and actor network theory. Latour's later work on the distribution of political and social values between the technical world and the social institution has opened up a powerful discourse about the political and moral force of technology. The actor network theory itself has changed significantly in recent years, including Latour's (1999) tongue in cheek denial of each of its central terms and the hyphen connecting them. This has been in response to a number of critiques that the theory privileged the powerful, Machiavellian techno scientist as world builder, without giving much opportunity for representing the invisible technicians within the networks and alternative voices from without (Star 1995).

18. <u>AFFECT CONTROL THEORY</u>

Dawn T. Robinson

Affect control theory (ACT) is an empirically grounded, mathematical theory of social interaction. David R. Heise developed the theory in the early 1970s based on symbolic interactionist insights about the primary importance of language and of the symbolic labeling of situations. Inspired by the pragmatist philosophy of early symbolic interactionists, the theory begins with the premise that people reduce existential uncertainty by developing ''working understandings'' of their social worlds. The theory presumes that actors label elements of social situations using cultural symbols available to them. After creating this working definition, the theory further argues that actors are motivated to maintain it. ACT assumes that our labeling of social situations evokes affective meanings. These are the meanings that we try to maintain during interaction. ACT makes use of three specific dimensions to measure the affective meanings associated

with specific labels, a set of equations to describe how events change those meanings, and a mathematical function to show what actions will best maintain or restore original meanings. The theory is fundamentally contained in this three part formalization: the measurement structure, the event reaction equations, and the mathematical statement of the control process. The theory is embodied in its mathematical expressions (i.e., the mathematical model predicts patterns that can then be tested empirically).

SCOPE

Scope statements specify the conditions under which a theory applies. ACT describes culturally situated social interactions. Therefore, the domain of the theory is quite broad. There are, however, some specific conditions that limit its applicability:

There is a directed social behavior. This requires an Actor who generates the behavior, a target (or Object) of the behavior,

and a Behavior that is directed toward the object person. The behavior need not be observable to all: I could admire someone without anyone else knowing about this directed behavior. In such a case, the theory's predictions would apply only to my own responses to the event.

There is at least one observer who is a member of an identified language culture. The observer can be the Actor, the Object, or a third party. It is from the perspective of this observer, or labeler, that ACT makes predictions. Participants may operate under vastly differing definitions of the situation, but always make predictions from a particular definition.

The theory applies only to labeled aspects of social experiences. This scope condition excludes behaviors that are not witnessed or interpreted by observers or participants. Picture a child pointing and laughing at a man who is unaware that he has been sitting in wet paint. The paint on the man's pants will not enter into the man's predicted response unless it becomes part of his aware ness. Picture another child shuffling across the floor to kiss

her mother good night. Predictions about the feelings of the mother generated by the event Daughter Kisses Mother are within the scope of the theory. Predictions about the startle response that the mother might feel as a result of an electrostatic shock caused by the kiss are outside the scope of the theory.

SENTIMENTS

ACT assumes that people respond affectively to every social event – the affective reaction principle. The theory describes these affective responses along three dimensions of meaning: evaluation, potency, and activity. These are universal dimensions identified by Osgood and colleagues (1975) as describing substantial variation in the affective meaning of lexicons in more than 20 national cultures. These three fundamental dimensions of meaning serve as cultural abbreviations, describing important social information about all elements of an interaction – identities, behaviors, emotions, and settings.

Evaluation. The evaluation dimension captures the amount of goodness or badness we associate with a concept. It is a bi polar

dimension of meaning that ranges from nice, warm, good to nasty, cold, bad.

Potency. The potency dimension captures the amount of strength or weakness we associate with a concept. It is a bi polar dimension of meaning that ranges from big, strong, powerful to small, weak, powerless.

Activity. The activity dimension captures the amount of liveliness or quietness we associate with a concept. It is a bi polar dimension of meaning that ranges from fast, noisy, lively to slow, quiet, inactive.

All social concepts evoke goodness, power fulness, and liveliness. These affective meanings are referred to as sentiments in the theory. Sentiments are trans situational, generalized affective responses to specific symbols that are widely shared in a culture or subculture. While the dimensions themselves are universal across cultures, symbol sentiments are products of a culture. Grandfathers come in a wide variety of shapes, sizes, colors, ages, and

demeanors. Individuals within a culture may vary widely in attitudes toward and understandings about their own grandfathers. Nonetheless, members of mainstream US culture basically agree that the general meaning of the role identity grand father is good, powerful, and relatively quiet. In contrast, our culturally shared sentiments about accountants are more neutral on the first two dimensions, and our image of rapist is extremely negative on the evaluation dimension. It is our very agreement about the generalized meanings associated with specific symbols that allows us to communicate effectively with other members of our culture. Sentiments vary cross culturally, however. Within each culture, average evaluation, potency, and activity ratings are compiled into cultural ''dictionaries'' that contain generalized meanings. ACT researchers have developed these cultural dictionaries for the US, Canada, Japan, Germany, China, and Northern Ireland. There are profiles for hundreds of identities,

and there are emotion equations that make pre dictions about the emotions that actors and objects are likely to feel during social

interaction. Among other things, these equations imply that positivity of emotion is predicted by the positivity of the transient impression, as well as the positivity of the deflection produced by that transient impression. In other words, pleasant events make us feel happy. Events that are even better than our identities will make us feel even better. When events are identity confirming, the pleasantness of an actor's emotion should reflect the goodness of his or her fundamental identity. Thus, the theory predicts that individuals operating in ''nicer'' identities will experience positive feelings more frequently than individuals operating in more stigmatized identities. The potency and activity equations reveal similar dynamics. When events push us higher in potency than our identities warrant, we experience more powerful emotions. Likewise, when events make us seem livelier than our identities warrant, we feel energized. In the case of perfectly confirming events, ACT predicts that the potency and activity of an actor's emotions will be roughly half of the potency and activity associated with that actor's fundamental identity.

19. <u>Colonialism (Neo-colonialism)</u>

Julian Go

Colonialism refers to the direct political control of a society and its people by a foreign ruling state. Essentially it is a political phenomenon. The ruling state monopolizes political power and keeps the subordinated society and its people in a legally inferior position. But colonialism has had significant cultural, social, and economic correlates and ramifications. Neocolonialism is the continued exercise of political or economic influence over a society in the absence of formal political control. Traditionally, the concept of colonialism has been associated with ''colonization,'' which refers to the transplantation or settlement of peoples from one territory to another. The word colonization is derived from the Latin colonial, meaning the settlement of people from home. But popular and scholarly uses of the term later shifted the meaning. Colonialism came to refer to political control with or without settlement. The concept also took on a more explicit ethnic, racial,

and geographical component. It increasingly came to refer to the establishment of political control by European or western powers over Asia, Latin America, and Africa. It also signified political control by one ''race'' over another ''race,'' where the latter is deemed inferior to the former. Analytically, colonialism is related to but also distinguishable from imperialism. While imperialism also refers to control by one society over another, it does not have to take the form of direct political control. It can also occur through informal political means (such as temporary military occupation), the exercise of economic power (control over finance or imposition of embargoes), or cultural influence (the spread of Hollywood movies around the world). Colonialism, by contrast, is a more specific variant of imperialism, referring to a situation whereby control is exerted directly and for a sustained duration of time. The ruling power officially declares political control over another territory and its people and institutionalizes the control through declarations of law. The colonized country is then a part of the mother country but subordinate to it. In this sense, colonialism can

be seen as one particular form of imperialism among others. Colonialism itself can take various forms and have a number of different correlates. It can involve settlement and the governance of settlers, such as British colonization of the United States, Canada, or Australia. It might also involve economic plunder or the destruction of native inhabitants, as with Spanish colonialism in South America. Colonialism might also involve the establishment of extensive bureaucratic systems designed to control territories by extracting tribute. Furthermore, colonialism can also involve a temporary state of transition from inferior political status to equal political status, whereby the colony becomes fully integrated into the mother country, such as French colonialism in some parts of Africa. Sociological thought has had varied intellectual relationships with colonialism. On the one hand, Herbert Spencer's social evolutionary theory was sometimes used, implicitly or explicitly, to justify European colonialism in Asia and Africa in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In the United States at the turn of the twentieth century, sociologists such as Franklin Giddens

advocated US colonial rule in the Philippines and elsewhere. On the other hand, Karl Marx (1906) criticized colonialism as an economic phenomenon that served the narrow economic needs of the ruling society. In Marx's view, colonialism facilitated the ''primitive accumulation'' of capital. Marx and Engels (1972) suggested that colonialism further facilitated the spread of capitalist social relations around the world. Other early works tried to specify the particular character of colonial societies. Furnivall's concept, ''plural societies,'' conceived of colonial societies as unique social forms in which people of different cultures, races, and ethnicities mingled. Later scholarship on colonialism has gone in multiple directions. Some expanded upon Marx's views on colonialism. John Hobson argued that British colonial expansion served as a necessary outlet for overaccumulation; Lenin later expanded this view to theorize colonial expansion as arising from a particular stage of capitalist development, specifically its finance and monopoly stage. A. G. Frank (1969) drewupon Marx in the 1960s to examine the economic effects of colonialism upon

colonized societies. Criticizing modernization theory, Frank argued that Latin American under development and the economic development of Europe had both been enabled by colonialism. Through colonialism, western powers extracted raw materials and profits from colonial societies to fuel their own industrialization, but that pro cess simultaneously prevented colonial societies from developing. Other scholarship took the study of colonial ism in different directions. Beginning in the 1950s and 1960s, Franz Fanon (1969) and Albert Memmi (1967) examined the forms of racial domination involved in colonialism and their cultural and psychological impact in Africa. In the late 1960s, Robert Blauner (1969) expanded the idea of colonialism to include ''internal colonialism'' and thereby theorize the difference between the experiences of white immigrants in the United States and those of African Americans and Hispanic immigrants. Later, Edward Said (1979) proposed the concept of ''Orientalism'' to capture the conceptual and ideological bases of colonialism. In Said, colonialism and associated forms of imperialism depend upon

binary concepts revolving around ''East'' and ''West,'' ''Self'' and ''Other.'' The term neocolonialism refers to relations of unequal power between countries despite the formal independence of those countries. The term suggests that, even after colonized societies attain independence, they are kept in a position of political and economic inferiority that reproduces the position they had had when they were formal colonies. In this view, formerly colonized nations remain subject to unequal exchange with western countries, become dependent upon them for capital and technology necessary for their own industrialization, and serve as places for labor exploitation and continued resource extraction by foreign firms. Politically, formerly colonized nations remain subject to various mechanisms of outside control by western powers, either through debt bondage and international institutions like the World Bank or through political pressure or direct military intervention. Consciousness of neocolonialism among formerly colonized peoples was formally declared at the 1955 Bandung conference, when representatives from Asian and African countries met to

forge cross national alliances and express opposition to colonial

rule.

20. <u>**Social Movements**</u>

James M. Jasper

Although scholarly definitions vary, common usage portrays social movements as sustained and intentional efforts to foster or retard social changes, primarily outside the normal institutional channels encouraged by authorities. Sustained implies that movements differ from single events such as riots or rallies. Their persistence often allows them to develop for mal organizations, but they may also operate through informal social networks. Intentional links movements to culture and strategy: people have ideas about what they want and how to get it, ideas that are filtered through culture as well as psychology. Movements have purposes, even when these have to do with transforming members themselves (as in many religious movements) rather than the world outside the movement. Foster or retard: although many scholars have a Whiggish tendency to view movements as progressive, dismissing regressive efforts as counter movements, this distinction seems

arbitrary and unsustainable (not to mention the unfortunate effect that different tools are then used to analyze the two types). Non institutional distinguishes movements from political parties and interest groups that are a more regular part of many political systems, even though movements frequently create these other entities and often maintain close relationships to them. Most movements today deploy some tactics within mainstream institutions, and noninstitutional protest is itself often quite institutionalized. Unsurprisingly, each of these claims about social movements has been subject to controversy and differences in emphasis.

UNDERSTANDING DISCONTENT

Theories of discontent have always reflected the historical forms protest was taking at the time, as well as each writer's own sympathies and political participation. In seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Europe, the collective expression of discontent was primarily understood through the lens of legitimate sovereignty. Economic and social dimensions of the emerging

nation state were not yet distinguished from the political, so protest both took the form of and was seen as a political act. The concept of the social movement was not yet possible. Contract theory, a primarily normative dis course, allowed thinkers such as Hobbes to argue against the legitimacy of most resistance to the state, and others such as Locke to defend revolutionary action in the face of predatory rulers. Thinkers of the time hardly noticed the activities of the lower classes. With accelerated urbanization in the nineteenth century, European intellectuals increasingly took alarm at the regular rebellions of artisans, developing the concept of the mob to explain and disparage them. Crowds came to be seen as a form of madness that caused individuals to act differently than they would when alone – a view crystallized by Gustave Le Bon in the 1890s. Although based on little empirical research, the crowd image remained vital to a number of thinkers in the early twentieth century, including Durkheim, Freud, Weber, and Parsons. Only revolutionaries such as Marx viewed urban mobs favorably, wrongly insisting that they were part of the proletariat who would

usher in a just society in the form of socialism (instead, most were the old working class of artisans whose way of life was disappearing). More sophisticated versions of crowd theory appeared in the mid twentieth century, largely in response to communism and fascism. Until the late 1960s, the dominant view of protest overemphasized the noninstitutional dimension, lumping movements together with fads, panics, and other collective behavior. Explicitly or implicitly, crowds remained the heart of this vision: the kernel on which other forms of collective behavior were somehow built. Most analysts, drawing from Le Bon, feared crowds and movements and portrayed them pejoratively, although occasional interactionists pointed to their creativity instead (in a fruitful tradition stretching from Robert Park to Ralph Turner and Lewis Killian, and on through recent theorists such as David Snow and John Lofland). How movements were sustained and what were their goals received less attention, and only occasionally did theorists link movements to social change. Suddenly everything changed. In the mid1960s, social movements were everywhere,

populated no longer by a dangerous working class but by familiar middle-class faces. In retrospect we can see various roots of this new activism: the emergence of a British and later an American new left; increasing international attention to the US Civil Rights Movement especially after the student sit ins of 1960; the 1964 confrontation that spawned the Berkeley free speech movement; anti colonial movements and revolutions around the globe. Theories soon appeared that were sympathetic to protestors. An organizational or structural paradigm, steeped in Marxism, dominated research from the 1970s to the late 1990s, highlighting the sustained dimension of movements by portraying them as linked to the core political and economic institutions and cleavages of society. No longer grouped with fads, social movements were now nearly indistinguishable from political parties. They were thought to reflect deep structural interests, especially class but also gender, race, and (eventually) sexual preference. Structural assumptions discouraged the asking of ''why'' questions, as a desire for change or inclusion was assumed. So although

movements were recognized as purposive, their purposes were taken for granted rather than empirically investigated. Attitudes and grievances assumed to be ever present were dismissed as causal factors of any importance. The essential question about movements was how they could overcome repression, especially by the state, in order to further their (already existing) interests. They were seen as insurgents or challengers, outsiders trying to gain entry into existing policies. (Scho lars disappointed by the failure of most movements of the 1960s focused naturally on the structural constraints that they had faced.) An American version of the new paradigm emphasized finances, often mobilized by paid, professional activists. Organizations require financial support, and the easiest way to attract.

this is by appealing to the privileged in society. Another is by gathering small donations from a large number of sympathizers, especially through direct mail. In the 1960s, a large social movement sector developed, with well-developed techniques for gathering funds, organizing shows of public support, and

pressuring legislators (McCarthy & Zald 1977). These developments suggested a model of movements as similar to firms in markets, competing with one another for funds, members, and attention. This research tradition is often referred to as resource mobilization due to its emphasis on funding. Another version of the structural paradigm focused on interactions between movements and the state, on the assumption that the state was usually the opponent as well as judge (under the Marxist assumption that states are instruments of the ruling class). Often dubbed ''political process,'' this tradition emphasized the need for elite allies, cracks in state repression, state crises, and other windows of opportunity in the political environment. This perspective especially fit (because it was largely derived from) the study of European labor and American civil rights movements: efforts at inclusion by well-defined groups that lasted for decades. In Europe a more comparative version devel oped, highlighting ongoing state structures (Kriesi et al. 1995). Despite its healthy focus on a movement's external environment, this approach modeled that

environment as a structure (open or closed, for example) rather than an arena of diverse strategic players, as relationships rather than interactions. Alain Touraine and his many students crafted a different version of the structural paradigm, linking contemporary movements to social structure instead of concentrating on organizational forms. Whereas the central conflict of industrial societies, Touraine (1978) argued, pitted labor against capital in a struggle over the distribution of material goods, postindustrial societies saw conflicts over cultural understandings, especially the direction in which society's increasing self-control would take it. The technocrats of capital and government sought profit and efficiency, while protestors saw these as mere means to the deeper ends of cultural identities and political rights. Touraine's vision helped scholars recognize the significance of new movements such as ecology, feminism, or gay rights, invisible under traditional structural models. More recently, Touraine has admitted that Europe and the United States have become new kinds of capitalist societies more than the postindustrial societies he had prophesied.

The technocrats won. Alongside these macrosocial visions there emerged a more individualistic view of movements which were redefined accordingly as collective action. Rooted in neoclassical micro economic theory, Mancur Olson (1965) and others cast doubt on the sustainability of movements, precisely by emphasizing the intentions of potential participants whose rationality consisted of constantly calculating whether to participate based on costs and benefits to themselves as individuals. Olson left little room for the attractions of collective solidarity and other incentives besides material benefits. As others have filled in some of these gaps, deriving solutions to the free rider problem, the rational choice approach has become less and less distinct. Many of the solutions are the organizational challenges emphasized by the mobilization and process traditions. At the turn of the millennium, the structural, Tourainian, and rational choice approaches faced deep problems, and appeared in articles most often as whipping boys for proffered alter natives. The main lacuna of all three was an inattention to cultural meanings, the socially

constructed purposes and identities of social movement groups. Even Touraine, who emphasized struggles over cultural meanings rather than material rewards, too often derived those meanings from his theory of historical change rather than empirically from the movements themselves. Accordingly, beginning in the late 1980s, considerable research and theory addressed the cultural dimensions of movements. Two concepts, frames and collective identity, dominated these efforts. David Snow, Rob Benson, and a series of collaborators did the most to theorize the nature of rhetorical frames, especially those used by activists to recruit others to their cause. Inspired by identity politics in the United States, in the 1990s the concept of collective identity was increasingly used to get at cultural meanings not already covered by frames. At first, collective identities were seen as a mobilizing rhetoric built upon a structural position or discrimination, a form of cognitive liberation (McAdam 1982). Individuals imagined themselves members of some larger community, in whose name they acted. Only later was it realized that movements themselves can foster identities without

any preexisting structural similarities – and identities can even form around movements, specific tactics such as non-violence, or particular organizations (Jasper 1997). It also took time for scholars to recognize that emotional solidarities are just as important to identities as cognitive categories are. Clearly and narrowly defined, frames and identities are important tools in our conceptual repertoire for understanding social movements, but there are additional ways to get at meanings (Jasper 1997; Goodwin & Jasper 2006). Analyses of ritual or of media coverage draw on well-established fields of anthropology and media studies. Narrative has also become popular, as stories are an important part of meetings and self-images in social movements. Although traditional narrative theory emphasizes the structuring plots of stories, others highlight the social context of storytelling. Rhetoric, which takes off from this latter point, highlights the interplay of orator and audience, building in not only interaction but intention and emotion. Like framing, naming is a key part of making sense of the world and of persuading others. Emotions are a central component

of culture, playing a role in all social movements. Basic affects like love and hate can pull a movement together or tear it apart. Reactive emotions such as anger, fear, and shock provide raw materials that organizers must transform into moral indignation. Moods such as resignation or cynicism can discourage recruits, just as those of confidence or exhilaration can attract them perhaps through the interaction rituals Collins (2001) describes. Emotions even figure in the outcomes of movements, which frequently aim to transform sensibilities such as compassion or justice.

21.   <u>Social Worlds</u>

Adele E. Clarke

The term social worlds is used in the social sciences in two main ways. One is as a generic reference to a specific situation or social con text, and the second is explicit social worlds/ arenas theory within the theoretical tradition of symbolic interactionism. In its generic form, the term social world usually refers to the relatively immediate milieu of the individuals or collectivities being stu died. It is conventionally understood as pointing at the specific contexts of the situation in which those individuals and/or collectivities are to be found. For example, reference may be made to the social world of antique collectors, professional baseball, or surfing. The usage is somewhat similar to the concept of subculture. However, (sub)cultural studies generally focus on the subculture per se (who the members are, what they do, how and why they do it, etc.), such as ''Deadhead'' or ''Trekkie'' fandoms. The generic use of social world usually points outward from the

individuals or collectivities being studied to their salient contexts as a means of explicitly situating them in sociocultural space and time. In symbolic interactionist theory over the past century, a series of concepts has been built up around the core concept of social world. Here as elsewhere, interactionists have taken a general term, elaborated it conceptually, and integrated it with related sensitizing concepts to form a theoretical/analytical framework useful in empirical research. Early Chicago School studies focused on ''social wholes'': communities of different types (e.g., ethnic communities, elite neighborhoods, impoverished slums), distinctive locales (e.g., taxi dancehalls, the stockyards), and signal events of varying temporal durations (e.g., a strike). The sociological task was to make the group the focal center and to build up a knowledge of the whole by examining it in concrete situations. Instead of emphasizing shared culture as anthropologists of the time did, these early works in the Chicago tradition focused on shared territory or geographic space and the encounters and interactions of human groups that occurred within these

environments or ecologies. These inventories of social spaces often took the form of maps. Many traditional Chicago School studies were undergirded by an areal field model – a ''map'' of some kind done from ''above,'' such as a city map modified to show ethnic, racial, elite, and other specific neighbor hoods and/or work areas, etc. Relationality was a featured concern and the communities, organizations, and kinds of sites and collectivities represented were to be viewed both in relation to one another and within their larger contexts. Blumer (1958) was a key early paper that drew upon this framing. In the 1950s and 1960s, researchers in the interactionist tradition reframed the study of social wholes by shifting to studies of work, occupations, and professions, moving from local to national and international groups. Geo graphic boundaries were dropped as necessarily salient, replaced by shared discourses (again, not culture) as boundary making and marking. Perhaps most significantly, they increasingly attended to the relationships of those groups to other social wholes, the interactions of collective actors and their discourses. Sociologists Tamotsu Shibutani (1955),

126

Rue Bucher (1962), Anselm Strauss (1978), and Howard Becker (1982) then initiated explicit social worlds theory development – the high modern version of studies of social wholes. Social worlds (e.g., a recreation group, an occupation, a theoretical tradition) generate shared perspectives that then form the basis for collective action, while individual and collective identities are constituted through commitments to and participation in social worlds. Commitment was understood as both predisposition to act and as part of identity construction. Social worlds are universes of discourse and principal affiliative mechanisms through which people organize social life. Strauss argued that each social world has at least one primary activity, particular sites, and a technology (inherited or innovative means of carrying out the social world's activities) and, once underway, more formal organizations typically evolve to further one aspect or another of the world's activities. People typically participate in a number of social worlds simultaneously and such participation usually remains highly fluid. Becker asserted that entrepreneurs, deeply committed and active

individuals, cluster around the core of the world and mobilize those around them. Shibutani viewed social worlds as identity and meaning making segments in mass society, drawing on distinctive aspects of mass culture, with individuals capable of participation in only a limited number of such worlds. Every complex social world characteristically has segments, subdivisions or subworlds, shifting as patterns of commitment alter, reorganize, and realign (Bucher 1962; Baszanger 1998).

Two or more worlds may intersect to form a new world, or one world may segment into two or more worlds. Larger arenas of concern are constituted of multiple social worlds focused on a given issue and prepared to act in some way, usually in struggles for power, authority, and legitimacy within that arena and beyond. In arenas, various issues are debated, negotiated, fought out, forced, and manipulated by representatives of the participating worlds and subworlds (Strauss 1978).

What this means methodologically is that, if one seeks to understand a particular social world, one must understand all the

arenas in which that world participates and the other worlds in those arenas and the related dis courses, as these are all mutually influential/ constitutive of that world. The boundaries of social worlds may crosscut or be more or less contiguous with those of formal organizations. This fluidity and the action focus fundamentally distinguish social worlds theory from most organizations theory (Clarke 1991). Society as a whole, then, can be conceptualized as consisting of layered mosaics of social worlds, arenas, and their discourses. As part of Chicago School interactionism, social worlds/arenas theory is a conflict theory.

There typically exist intraworld differences as well as the more conventionally expected inter world differences of perspective, commitment, and inscribed attributes. For Strauss, negotiations of various kinds – persuasion, coercion, bartering, educating, discursively and otherwise repositioning, etc. – are strategies to deal with such conflicts and are routinely engaged. Strauss (1993) also called this processual ordering live and emergent aspects of interaction.

22. <u>Socialist Feminism</u>

Ann Cronin

Socialist feminism, which draws on aspects of Marxist feminism and radical feminism, emerged in the 1970s as a possible solution to the limitations of existing feminist theory. While

Marxist feminism cites capitalism as the cause of women's oppression, radical feminism argues that women are oppressed through the system of patriarchy. Marxist feminism has been criticized for its inability to explain women's oppression outside of the logic of capitalism, and radical feminism for producing a universalistic, biologically based account of women's oppression, which pays insufficient attention to patterned differences between women. Socialist feminism attempts to overcome these problems through the production of historically situated accounts of women's oppression that focus on both capitalism and patriarchy. In Mitchell's (1975) psychoanalytic model, capitalism – the economic system – is allocated to the material level; patriarchy –

the rule of law – is allocated to the ideological level and assumed to operate at an unconscious level. While Eisenstein (1984) retains Mitchell's conceptualization of capitalism, she reassigns patriarchy to the conscious cultural level and dismisses any distinction between the two, leading to the term ''capitalist patriarchy.'' In contrast, Hartmann (1979) produces a materialist understanding of patriarchy and capitalism as two distinct but interactive systems which center on men's exploitation of women's labor. Challenging Eisenstein's single system theory, Hartmann states that patriarchy predates capitalism and exists beyond its boundaries; thus, it is inappropriate to regard them in terms of a single system. The allocation of patriarchy to either the material, cultural, or ideological level does not permit an analysis of the pervasive nature of patriarchal structures across all three levels. Simultaneously, it assumes that all social structures can be reduced to the workings of either capitalism or patriarchy, whilst assuming there is a symbiotic relationship between the two. A focus on paid work dismisses radical feminist concerns with sexuality and violence. Walby's

(1990) dual systems approach attempts to overcome these problems through a historically and socially defined understanding of patriarchy as a system of six interrelated structures (paid work; household production; culture; sexuality; violence; the state), which in contemporary society are in articulation with capitalism and racism. This model enables Walby to chart the dynamic nature of patriarchy.

23.   Sociometry

Barbara F. Meeker

The word ''sociometry'' was coined by Jacob Levi Moreno (1889–1974). Moreno, one of the pioneers of psychotherapy, is also credited with developing psychotherapeutic techniques such as psychodrama and role playing. As he used it, sociometry was a way of uncovering the underlying emotional structure of a small group by asking group members which other members they would choose or reject as partners in specific roles such as roommate or fellow team member for a work project. Moreno believed that if group activities were set up according to these preferences, the task performance and morale of the group would be maximized and individual group members would experience satisfaction, empowerment, and personal growth. Jointly with Helen Hall Jennings (Moreno 1934), he applied his methods to the assignment of girls to residential cottages in the New York Training School for Girls, concluding that the predicted positive results did occur.

Moreno also founded a journal named Sociometry to promote his research. This journal eventually became one of the official journals of the American Sociological Association where it has been for many years the primary outlet within sociology for social psychological research in general. Reflecting this more general interest, it changed its name and is now the Social Psychology Quarterly. Within research sociology, ''sociometry'' refers to the measurement aspect of Moreno's concept, not to its use as a principle for organizing groups. It also refers to results about interpersonal attraction and group structure and cohesion that have been found using socio metric techniques, and to statistical and math ematical techniques for analyzing sociometric

data. Typically, in a sociometric study respon dents are asked in a paper and pencil survey to name their best friends, or the three or five others they like best, or to rate the name of each other group member on how much the other is liked, admired, respected, or other evaluation; these ratings may extend into negative sentiments such as dislike. Some may include behavioral ratings

(such as how often the respondent talks to or works with the other). In a historical reflection of Moreno's intentions, these ratings are referred to as ''choices.'' Analyzing choices identifies social isolates (individuals neither giving nor receiving choices); mutual pairs (two individuals each choosing the other); pairs with unreciprocated choices; transitive triads (three individuals all choosing each other); sociometric stars (an individual receiving more choices than others); and cliques (a set of individuals making positive choices within the set but no choices or negative choices outside). These patterns can be displayed as a diagram called a sociogram, in which points represent individuals and arrows represent their choices. Influential early use of sociometry includes Theodore Newcomb's study of the development of friendships in two college dormitories and George Homans's emphasis on interpersonal sentiments as basic building blocks in a theory of individual and small group behavior. A large body of research in natural settings as well as in laboratories shows that the principles that affect the formation and maintenance of sociometric choice

are: (1) propinquity (or proximity) – bonds of attraction form between individuals who encounter each other in daily life; thus, sociograms show choices between people who live in adjoining rooms in dormi tories, have offices next to each other, sit in adjacent seats in a classroom, etc., or marriages that occur between persons from the same neighborhood; (2) reciprocity – attraction tends to be mutual, people choose others who they think choose them; (3) perceived similarity – individuals choose others they think share socially important characteristics, attitudes, or values; and (4) status – individuals choose others who have high prestige within the group. The principles of reciprocity and perceived similarity produce mutual attraction and increase the number of reciprocal pairs, while the principle of status produces one way or unreciprocated

often chosen. Cognitive balance theory, especially as for mulated by Fritz Heider (1958), has been used by many students of sociometry. Heider proposed that a basic principle of individual cognitive organization is that people seek to agree with others

whom they view positively and to disagree with others whom they view negatively; these are balanced states and are assumed to be stable and to provide personal satisfaction. On the other hand, when an individual finds that she or he disagrees with a positively valued other, or agrees with a negatively valued other, this is an imbalanced state which produces dis satisfaction and a motivation to change at least one bond, that is, imbalanced states are unstable. This explains both reciprocity and similarity as types of cognitive balance and also predicts that relationships among three or more persons will become transitive and positive bonds will form in larger structures transitively. Sociometric structure also concerns the relationship among behavior, attitudes, and interaction. Informal interaction tends to occur between persons who have positive bonds and such per sons tend to influence each other and hence to become similar. Thus, a sociogram can give predictions about the flow of gossip, attitude change, formation of group or organizational culture, and boundaries of cliques or conflict groups within organizations. An example of an application is work

examining effects of school integration on the interracial friendships of students (Hallinan & Smith 1982)

Concepts

- ## **Capitalism:**

  A system of economic enterprise based on market exchange. 'Capital' refers to any asset, including money, property and machines, which can be used to produce commodities for sale or invested in a market with the hope of achieving a profit. Nearly all industrial societies today are capitalist in orientation their economic systems are based on free enterprise and on economic competition.

- ## **Communism**:
  A set of political ideas associated with Karl Marx, as developed particularly by Lenin, and institutionalized in China and, until 1990, in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

- ## **Culture of poverty**

  The thesis, popularized by Oscar Lewis, that poverty is not a result of individual inadequacies, but the outcome of a larger social and cultural atmosphere into which successive generations of children are socialized. The 'culture of poverty' refers to the values, beliefs, lifestyles, habits and traditions that are common among people living under conditions of material deprivation.

- ## **Symbolic capital**
  In the work of Pierre Bourdieu - those resources that confer high status, distinction, honour and social prestige on people. For example, voluntary charity work may lead to a person being held in high esteem that would not otherwise have

accrued from their formal employment or business ownership.

- **Positivism**

The overarching methodological principle of positivism is to conduct sociology in broadly the same manner as natural science. An emphasis on empiricism and the scientific method is sought to provide a tested foundation for sociological research based on the assumption that the only authentic knowledge is scientific knowledge, and that such knowledge can only arrive by positive affirmation through scientific methodology .

"*Our main goal is to extend scientific rationalism to human conduct.... What has been called our positivism is but a consequence of this rationalism*"

Émile Durkheim, The Rules of Sociological Method(1895)

- **Anti-positivism:**

 At the turn of the 20th century the first generation of German sociologists formally introduced methodological anti-positivism, proposing that research should concentrate on human cultural norms, values, symbols, and social processes viewed from a resolutely subjective perspective.

Both Weber and Georg Simmel pioneered the "Verstehen" (or 'interpretative') method in social science; a systematic process by which an outside observer attempts to relate to a particular cultural group, or indigenous people, on their own terms and from their own point of view.

Colonialism

refers to the direct political control of a society and its people by a foreign ruling state. Essentially it is a political

phenomenon. The ruling state monopolizes political power and keeps the subordinated society and its people in a legally inferior position. But colonialism has had significant cultural, social, and economic correlates and ramifications.

- **Neocolonialism** is the continued exercise of political or economic influence over a society in the absence of formal political control.

References

1. Stockman, N. (2015) Positivism and antipositivism in sociological metatheory.

2. George Ritzer. (2007). The Blackwell encyclopedia of sociology. Malden, MA :Blackwell Pub.,

3. Giddens, A., & Sutton, P. (2009). Sociology. Cambridge: Polity.

4. Squazzoni, F. (2012). Agent-Based Computational Sociology. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.

5. Goodwin, J., & Jasper, J. (2015). The social movements reader. Chichester, West Sussex, UK: Wiley.

6. Thompson, K. (2003). The early sociology of culture. London: Routledge.

7. Nelson, K. (2010). Young Minds in Social Worlds. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

8. Giddings, F. (2012). Theory of sociology. [Place of publication not identified]: Read Books.

9. Nadel, S. (2013). Theory of social structure. London: Routledge.

10. Lovell. (2001). Socialist feminism. England.

11. Shank, D., & Lulham, R. (2016). Symbolic Interaction with Consumer Products: An Affect Control Theory Approach. Sociology Compass, 10(7).

12. Quinlan, A. (2012). Imagining a Feminist Actor-Network Theory. International Journal Of Actor-Network Theory And Technological Innovation, 4(2),