Teaching theory is a difficult task. The question one asks oneself is what knowledge do I want students to be exposed to in the course of the semester? Of course, individual faculty members can choose what they think is important to teach. They can choose texts that they like and ignore texts they do not deem relevant. Indeed, given the constraints of a semester, faculty have to make those kinds of choices even if they are trying to be even handed in terms of what they assign.

So, let me explain to you my choices. It is my opinion that students develop one of two relationships with theory. First, they decide to embrace some theorist and in doing so become a member of a cult, one that gives them an identity and a community. By declaring yourself a Marxist, a postcolonialist theorist, or a Bourdieusian, you join an identifiable group, a group that tells you who are and even better, who you are against. A lot of sociology is caught up in such identities and theorists and our Department has many people who see themselves in exactly these terms. The other strategy is to see theories as a kind of tool box, one that will help you study problems that you care about. Here, students are more empirically driven and less enamored by big theory. Instead, they want to make sense of some corner of the world and they find themselves in need of conceptual tools that will help structure their research practice. They also want to be able to join a conversation of scholars who are interested in similar kinds of problems. Theory here is theory with a small “t”. We have lots of folks around here who choose this tactic as well.

Before you make this choice, you need to understand it better. It is my goal to lay out for you as best I can the terrain of social theory as it has evolved since Marx, Weber, and Durkheim. But the problem in doing is that the field of sociology has fragmented theoretically in a number of ways. Mirroring the choice, I just described, there is a division between those who view theory as concerned with describing the general direction of the modern (or postmodern) condition and those who want to use theory to make sense of particular phenomena. This can be somewhat divided between European and American theorists. European theorists tend to write books and do not do empirical research (with the notable exceptions of Pierre Bourdieu and Bruno LaTour). American theorists tend to write articles which are directed at providing an underpinning for streams of related research. In the case of American scholars, if their work is successful, it spawns a set of research studies that use the concepts in useful ways. This difference is
captured in the paper written by Gabriel Abend’s paper entitled “The Meaning of Theory” which we will read for the first day of class.

This leaves me with three interrelated problems: how to teach theory, which theorists to teach, and how to manage the tension between grand theory and useful theory. One of the things I did was to try and figure out what other sociologists were teaching in “Modern Social Theory”. What I discovered was what I pretty much expected: theory classes were all over the place. Indeed, the two people in our Department who taught this course before me produced syllabi that were at least 70% different.

So, I decided to take a different tact to the problem. I consider myself a general sociologist, one who is interested in way too many things. But I also consider myself an empirically oriented sociologist who is fascinated by how things really are in all of their messy complexity. Above all else, I like to count things. So, I thought I would turn the problem of what to teach you into an empirical question. Rather than assert who is and who is not in the canon (or whether we need a canon or not) and decide how I would organize the field for you, I decided to pursue what sociologists actually do and what theorists and theoretical articles are the most useful by examining what is currently being cited and used in contemporary research practice.

At the end of this syllabus, I have included the results of my empirical project. The first table contains the names of the most cited theorists who are sociologists who write books. You will note that nine of the eleven are European, all are male, and more than half are dead (amongst those who are alive, the youngest is 70). In spite of 30 years of postmodernism declaring war on “dead white European males”, they continue to be the most significant social theorists. Almost 100 years after their deaths, Marx, Weber, and Durkheim continue to be amongst our leading theorists.

Given that most of these folks did most of their important work before 1990 (well before almost all of you were born) and in many cases before 1980, I was curious as to what theory has looked like subsequently. So, I decided to pursue two tactics. First, I looked at who had the most cited papers in our two leading journals of theory, Theory and Society, and Sociological Theory. I looked at the 10 most cited papers in each of those publications from 1980-2018 and for only papers published in the period 2000-2018. My goal was to ascertain what people who were doing theory were doing and to try and see what was happening in theory in the contemporary period (post 2000). I also decided to look at the ten most cited papers in each of those periods in the two main general journals in Sociology, the American Sociological Review and the American Journal of Sociology. I did this in order to see what work was currently affecting research practice in our leading journals.

So, what did I find? There is obviously a big disjuncture between the list of people prominent across the social sciences who write books and those who are affecting current sociological practice. While the division is not entirely complete, the dominance of European social theorists concerned with the trajectory of modernity is obvious on that
list. But that does not mean that American sociologists are not interested in theory. Indeed, of the ten most cited papers in the American Sociological Review, five of them are entirely theoretical (DiMaggio and Powell, Swidler, Hannan and Freeman, Snow, et. al., and Fligstein). Similarly, five of the papers on the list of most cited papers in the American Journal of Sociology are theoretical (Coleman, Granovetter, Williamson, Sewell, Portes and Sensenbrenner) and two more primarily theoretical (Meyer, et. al., and Burt).

The two journals explicitly dealing with theory take up topics similar to the papers in the two main journals but explore other topics as well. They include institutional theory, network analysis, social capital theory, economic sociology, gender, culture, and the problem of identity, agents and structures. One of the most interesting aspects of these lists is that they capture in many ways the most vibrant fields in American sociology in the past 30 years; cultural sociology, organizational sociology, economic sociology, network analysis, political sociology, social movement theory, and thinking about how identities are formed and how they mobilize action in the context of issues concerning gender, race, and ethnicity. The links between these papers and these fields is no accident. The papers offer large, broad, and extensive theoretical bases for research programs, programs that have been large and successful.

As a result of this investigation, I have decided to offer you a different kind of roadmap through theory. I have tried to balance off grand theorists and useful theorists. Along the way, I made another kind of discovery. The division between grand and useful theorist is not as deep as one might think. The theorists off of our most popular lists have in one way or another managed to speak to at least a subset of other theorists who came before them or are reacting to their contemporaries. Thus, the division between big think and empirical work is not as wide as one might guess. Hopefully, by the end of the semester, you will see this more as a tapestry or a conversation and less as a set of isolated works of “great” thinkers.

We will begin with a set of theorists who take us from Marx, Weber, and Durkheim to Mead and Elias, both of whom wrote their most important works before World War II. From the 1950s and 1960s we draw on Goffman and Berger and Luckman. Goffman represents symbolic interactionism which is the most important micro theory of action in contemporary sociology and it is the source of all contemporary theories of identity. Symbolic interactionism also informs Bourdieu’s theory of practice. Indeed, Goffman is one of the few sociologists Bourdieu actually cites. We move on to Berger and Luckman’s book, The Social Construction of Reality which contains the conceptual distinctions that underlay most of contemporary discussions of institutions and agency and their ideas are reflected in almost all of these theories since 1970. Where Goffman drew on the American philosophy of pragmatism and symbolic interactionism (ideas that were joined at the hip), Berger and Luckman drew on the European philosophic tradition of phenomenology.

We then turn to Bourdieu and Latour. These authors continue the European tradition of social theory where their larger concerns were the nature of society. Bourdieu
offers us a theory of structure and action that implicitly critiques Marxism and embeds the insights of Elias, Mead, Goffman, and Berger and Luckmann in relation to a theory of social structure, what he calls “field theory.” Latour who critiques much of the 1970s-1980s sociology as being way too macro. Writing in the 1990s and the 2000s, Latour offers a radical view of society he calls Actor-Network-Theory (ANT) based in phenomenology and ethnomethodology.

Then, we will examine some of the theoretical ideas that have pushed forward the most vibrant fields in sociology in the past 30 years. We will do this around theorists, but mostly around approaches to important theoretical problems in sociology. I include readings on institutional theory, network analysis and social capital, and the key works in the field of culture, cognition, and action. We then consider elaborations of the theory of fields and sociological perspectives on identity. We will end with a week that focuses on theories of race and ethnicity and a week on gender. Most of the readings in the last two weeks were not published in the four journals mentioned before. But all of them contain authors who draw on many on the different strands of postwar theory and all are works that are core to the constitution of their fields.

In spite of the differences between European and American scholars and the tendency to write more encompassing versus less encompassing social theories, you will hopefully see that there is certainly a core concern across all of the theorists with understanding the problem of actors and social structures. The attempt to recast classical theory to reconstruct notions of social structure, social order, social interaction, identity, culture, and agency are core to modern sociology’s concerns.

James Dusenberry, the economist, once famously remarked that economics is all about why people have choices while sociology is all about why people do not have choices. If this statement is examined closely, it actually turns out not to be true for sociology or economics. For neoclassical economics, once you know what an actor’s preferences are, you can predict what they are going to do in any situation because one can assume they will maximize their returns. This means that outside of having preferences (which economics agrees are a problem outside of their purview), people have no choice but to act rationally in line with those preferences.

Alternatively, the recent history of sociological theory (since the 1960s) can be read as an entirely interested in how people continuously make decisions about what they want and how they act. The basic issue is that mostly social life appears to reproduce the inequalities that already exist. But at the same time, there is a lot of social conflict and lots that people do to resist their lot in life and rise above it. Agency is everywhere but social order appears to usually win. Even more perplexing, sometimes the underdogs in life rise up and actually change the rules. How can we explain that? Sociologists of all kinds have been struggling with these issues for the past 50 years. Dusenberry was wrong: the problem of making choices under constraints is central to all modern social theory.
Books and Other Readings

We will read primary texts. The books are available at bookstores and there are probably used copies at many bookstores as well as copies in the library. I encourage you to buy these books even if we are only going to read part of them because they form the basis of any library in sociology. For the books, I have provided “required readings”. I can say that you will like the books better if you can manage to read all or most of them. But, since they all are long and hard to read, I have tried to select the most important parts. I will use B-courses for readings noted below.

How should you read these texts? I would like our classes to start by puzzling out what the texts mean. The most important thing to do is to arrive at what you think is a coherent interpretation of what the author is saying. Many students start out thinking they need to be critical towards a work in order to discover its flaws. But it is more important to give authors their due. By this I mean, you need to get inside the author’s head and try and think like they do. Who are they in debate with? What theoretical sources inform what they are doing? How do they differ from those sources? What are their theoretical claims about how to analyze society or social situations? How would you use their ideas to study something in the world?

Book Selections


Pierre Bourdieu
Outline of a Theory of Practice, p. 72-95; p. 159-97

An Invitation to Reflective Sociology, p. 94-140

"Rethinking the state" (B-courses)

“Social space and symbolic power” (B-courses)


Norbert Elias

The Civilizing Process

Erving Goffman
Presentation of Self in Everyday Life, p.17-51; p. 208-37
Stigma p.41-66; p.105-39

Frame Analysis, p. 21-39. (B-courses)

Bruno Latour


George Herbert Mead

Mind, Self, and Society

Schedule


January 28     G.H. Mead Mind, Self, and Society.


                 P. Bourdieu. An Invitation to a Reflexive Sociology, p. 94-110.


March 17       Institutional theory (Readings in B-courses)


March 24    Spring Break

March 31  Network analysis and social capital (Readings in B-courses)


April 7          The problem of culture and action (Readings in B-courses)


April 14  Fields, Agency, and Identity

First hour- The Theory of Fields and the Theory of Action (Readings in B-courses)


Second Hour- Identity (Reading in b-courses)


April 21  Race and Ethnicity

First hour: Race


Second hour: Ethnicity, race, and Nationalism


Exchange between Bonilla-Silva and Loveman:

April 28 Gender

First hour: Gender


Second hour: Intersectionality


QE Preparation and the Class Assignments

I would like to assign three short papers for the class and a final exam. The short papers (5-7 double spaced pages) are due in my mailbox in the main office by 4:00 PM.

Monday, February 17

Friday March 20

Monday April 20

I have in mind that you select some issue and discuss it in the context of at least two of the authors or schools of thought. As we get close to the first assignment, I will offer some suggestions of potential paper topics.

For your final paper, my plan is to offer you a set of 6 essay questions on April 28. I will ask that you write 5-7 pages double spaced on 3 of the questions. These will be due on Monday May 11 at 4 P.M. in my Barrows mailbox.

I intend these questions to be large and synthetic. So, for example, I might ask you something like “How do various sociological theorists (choose 2) think about what is distinctive about modernity? Compare and contrast their views.”
Most cited authors of books in the humanities and social sciences, 2018

Collected by the London Review of Books

Citations to Authors identified as Sociologists on the list

Michel Foucault (1926-1984) Sociology
Pierre Bourdieu (1930-2002) Sociology
Anthony Giddens (1938- ) Sociology
Erving Goffman (1922-1982) Sociology
Jurgen Habermas (1929- ) Sociology
Max Weber (1864-1920) Sociology
Bruno Latour (1947- ) Sociology
Ulrich Beck (1944-2015 ) Sociology
Emile Durkheim (1858-1917) Sociology
Karl Marx (1818-1883) Political theory, economics, sociology
Barney Glaser (1930-) Sociology
10 most cited papers American Journal of Sociology from 1980 to 2018

JS Coleman (1988) Social capital in the creation of human capital. American journal of sociology, journals.uchicago.edu, cited by 40077 (1381.97* per year)

M Granovetter (1985) Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. American journal of sociology, journals.uchicago.edu, cited by 35712 (1116.00* per year)


RS Burt (2004) Structural holes and good ideas. American journal of sociology, journals.uchicago.edu, cited by 4127 (317.46* per year)


P Bonacich (1987) Power and centrality: A family of measures. American journal of sociology, journals.uchicago.edu, cited by 3708 (123.60* per year)
10 most cited articles in the *American Journal of Sociology* from 2000 to 2018

RS Burt (2004) **Structural holes and good ideas.** *American journal of sociology*, journals.uchicago.edu, cited by 4127 (317.46* per year)


D Pager (2003) **The mark of a criminal record.** *American journal of sociology*, journals.uchicago.edu, cited by 1958 (139.86* per year)

O Sorenson, TE Stuart (2001) **Syndication networks and the spatial distribution of venture capital investments.** *American journal of sociology*, journals.uchicago.edu, cited by 1576 (98.50* per year)

B Uzzi, J Spiro (2005) **Collaboration and creativity: The small world problem.** *American journal of sociology*, journals.uchicago.edu, cited by 1437 (119.75* per year)

JM Podolny (2001) **Networks as the pipes and prisms of the market.** *American journal of sociology*, journals.uchicago.edu, cited by 1406 (87.88* per year)

D MacKenzie, Y Millo (2003) **Constructing a market, performing theory: The historical sociology of a financial derivatives exchange.** *American journal of sociology*, journals.uchicago.edu, cited by 1264 (90.29* per year)

H Rao, P Monin, R Durand (2003) **Institutional change in Toque Ville: Nouvelle cuisine as an identity movement in French gastronomy.** *American journal of sociology*, journals.uchicago.edu, cited by 1256 (89.71* per year)

SR Lucas (2001) **Effectively maintained inequality: Education transitions, track mobility, and social background effects.** *American journal of sociology*, journals.uchicago.edu, cited by 1210 (75.63* per year)

PC Giordano, SA Cernkovich, ... (2002) **Gender, crime, and desistance: Toward a theory of cognitive transformation.** *American journal of sociology*, journals.uchicago.edu, cited by 1217 (81.13* per year)
10 most cited papers in the *American Sociological Review* from 1980 to 2018


DA Snow, EB Rochford Jr, SK Worden, ... (1986) *Frame alignment processes, micromobilization, and movement participation*. *American sociological ...*, JSTOR, cited by 6484 (209.16* per year)


RJ Sampson, JD Morenoff, F Earls (1999) *Beyond social capital: Spatial dynamics of collective efficacy for children*. *American sociological review*, JSTOR, cited by 2107 (117.06* per year)

10 most cited papers in the *American Sociological Review* from 2000 to 2018


10 most cited papers in *Sociological Theory* from 1980 to 2018


P Bourdieu (1989) *Social space and symbolic power*. *Sociological theory*, JSTOR, cited by 3612 (129.00* per year)


N Fligstein (2001) *Social skill and the theory of fields*. *Sociological theory*, journals.sagepub.com, cited by 1427 (89.19* per year)

P Bourdieu, S Farage (1994) *Rethinking the state: Genesis and structure of the bureaucratic field*. *Sociological theory*, JSTOR, cited by 1276 (55.48* per year)


JK Olick (1999) *Collective memory: The two cultures*. *Sociological theory*, Wiley Online Library, cited by 895 (49.72* per year)

10 most cited papers in *Sociological Theory* from 2000 to 2018

N Fligstein (2001) *Social skill and the theory of fields. Sociological theory*, journals.sagepub.com, cited by 1427 (89.19* per year)


N Fligstein, D McAdam (2011) *Toward a general theory of strategic action fields. Sociological theory*, Wiley Online Library, cited by 696 (116.00* per year)

D Kellner (2002) *Theorizing globalization. Sociological theory*, journals.sagepub.com, cited by 582 (38.80* per year)

M Schneiberg, ES Clemens (2006) *The typical tools for the job: Research strategies in institutional analysis. Sociological Theory*, journals.sagepub.com, cited by 539 (49.00* per year)

A King (2000) *Thinking with Bourdieu against Bourdieu: A 'practical' critique of the habitus. Sociological theory*, journals.sagepub.com, cited by 496 (29.18* per year)


10 most cited papers in *Theory and Society* from 1980 to 2018


10 most cited papers in *Theory and Society* from 2000 to 2018


J Mahoney (2000) **Path dependence in historical sociology**. *Theory and society*, Springer, cited by 3470 (204.12* per year)

A Lareau, EB Weininger (2003) **Cultural capital in educational research: A critical assessment**. *Theory and society*, Springer, cited by 1019 (72.79* per year)


WR Scott (2008) **Approaching adulthood: the maturing of institutional theory**. *Theory and society*, Springer, cited by 657 (73.00* per year)


