

MSc Social Research Methods 2018

Philosophy of Science and Social Scientific Research Practice

Dr Alexander Aisher

Dept of Anthropology, Arts C231

A.Aisher@sussex.ac.uk

Autumn Term, Weeks 1-12

500X8 (30 credits)

Timetable:

Location: Bramber House 232 (1300 – 1600)

Start date: Monday 24 September 2018

Course Aims

The aim of this course is to introduce students to some of the standard methodological and philosophical problems posed by social inquiry. These mostly branch out from one central question: are the methods of the social sciences essentially the same or essentially different from those of the natural sciences? An additional aim of the course is to show how theoretical and philosophical traditions in social science influence the methodological approaches and theoretical models that guide social research practice.

Each week we take one or, in some cases, two examples of major philosophical or theoretical approaches. These will be outlined with an emphasis on the theoretical model of society that they advocate. Secondly, it will be demonstrated what methodological implications for social research follow from these philosophical and theoretical ideas. In this way it will be shown that broad theoretical frameworks and concepts, often based in philosophical traditions, lead to particular methodological approaches around theoretical models. Overall the objective of the course is to show how theory can be operationalized as a method of analysis for empirical research.

The topics that will be addressed include: developments in the philosophy of science from positivism to post-positivism and their relevance to social inquiry, explanation versus interpretation and the interpretive critique of social science; problems of validity and values; realism and constructivism; the advantages and disadvantages of taking a critical stance; and feminist, postcolonial and multipecies approaches to social science. Although the problems will be illustrated in specific texts, you are also encouraged to pursue parallel arguments in different sources.

Assessment: 4,000 word term paper.

Submission deadline: Please see your 'Assessment Deadlines and Exam Timetable' in Sussex Direct for the submission deadline and location. It is your responsibility to know when and where you should submit your work. Late submission will be penalised unless acceptable mitigating evidence is also submitted.

Practical Information

- Please avoid coming in late and have the relevant readings read and materials prepared, all of which are available on the Canvas site (usually confirmed the week before the relevant session.).
- It is **NOT** possible to join the module after week 1. Attendance of at least nine weeks is required in order to complete the module. An attendance list will be kept.
- There are a total of eleven weekly meetings, from 24th September.
- There is no seminar on week 6 which is a reading and consolidation week.

Course Summary

Topic 1 Introduction and summary

Topic 2 Neopositivism and Functionalism

Topic 3 Methodological Individualism and Critical Realism

Topic 4 Interpretative Social Science: Hermeneutics and Phenomenology

Topic 5 Histories of Science: Kuhn and Foucault

Topic 6 **Reading week**: Postmodernism and poststructuralism

Topic 7 Social Constructionism and Multispecies Theory

Topic 8 Critical Social Science: Critical Theory

Topic 9 Critical and Pragmatic Social Science

Topic 10 Feminist Epistemology

Topic 11 Postcolonial Social Science

Topic 12. Consolidation: Group Analysis and Discussion

Each topic corresponds approximately to a week. Note that Topic 6 is a reading week. Some of literature to be covered in this week will also be discussed the following week.

Readings and Preparations:

The reading list is designed to encourage the consultation of diverse sources in order to identify common concerns and problems.

There are no set texts, but this text will be a key resource will be this volume:

Philosophies of Social Science: The Classic and Contemporary Readings, edited by Gerard Delanty and Piet Strydom. Open University Press, 2003. The volume consists of 64 edited extracts with commentary from classic works in the philosophy of social science. Many of the key readings taken from this volume. A Pdf file of the book is available on Canvas and the readings can be directly downloaded from it.

There is 'core reading' of three or four articles or chapters per session in order to provide a focus to discussion which all students are expected to read. Most of these readings can be downloaded from Canvas. In the case of journal articles, they can be also be downloaded from the electronic library.

Readings addressing empirical social research are given under Discussion and Applications.

The 'further reading' offers an opportunity to locate the topic in a wider context or to pursue more specialised aspects for essays.

Some questions are given to guide both preparation and to provide a focus for the seminars.

Deep Reading: each week, from week 2 onwards, students will pair up to complete an in-depth reading of three texts from that week's reading list. Each pair will pick three texts (either listed under the topic, or from their own library search), and complete a single A4-page sheet for each text. This will outline the core argument of the author, signal questions the text raises, and offer two or three significant quotations. Prior to the seminar, each student pair will be email their Deep Readings to the tutor. The tutor will collate these, and send the collated document to the whole group. This document - a digest of core texts within the module - will help to guide discussions, and provide a valuable collective resource for researching the final assignments.

Background reading

Andrew Abbott *Methods of Discovery: Heuristics for the Social Sciences*. New York: Norton, 2005.

G. Delanty *Social Science: Philosophical and Methodological Foundations*. Second edition, 2005 Open University Press/Minneapolis

B. Fay *Contemporary Philosophy of Social Science: A Multicultural Approach* (Blackwell,1996)

Mark J. Smith *Social Science in Question* (Sage, 1998). Core text for the Open University course corresponding to this one; very clear and well presented and illustrated.

Patrick Baert, *Philosophy of the Social Sciences: Towards pragmatism* (Polity 2005). See also the special issue of the *European Journal of Social Theory* 7 (3) 2004 edited by B. Turner and P. Baert on pragmatism.

T. Benton and I. Craib *Philosophy of Social Science* (Palgrave, 2001) is also a useful guide to the literature.

N Blaikie *Approaches to Social Inquiry*. (Polity, 1993) is an excellent guide.
 Mantzavinos, C. (ed) 2010 *Philosophy of the Social Sciences: Philosophical Theory and Scientific Practice*. Cambridge University Press
Readings in the Philosophy of Social Science edited by Michael Martin and Lee C McIntyre (MIT Press, 1994) is a useful collection popular in the US, although one that emphasises neo-positivistic approaches.
 M. Root *Philosophy of Social Science* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993)
 G. Potter *The Philosophy of Social Science* (Prentice Hall, 2000)
 S. Turner (ed) *The Blackwell Guide to the Philosophy of Social Science* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003)
 W. Outhwaite and S. Turner (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Social Science Methodology*. (Sage, 2008)
 N. Cartwright and E. Montuschi *Philosophy of Social Science Reader* edited by F. Guala and D. Steel. Routledge 2010. Oxford University Press, 2015
The Sage Handbook of the Philosophy of the Social Sciences, edited by I. Jarvie and J. Zamora-Bonilla. Sage, 2011.

Philosophy of Social Science: For an overview of the postmodern, poststructuralist critique of social inquiry, see: D. R. Dickens and A. Fontana (eds) *Postmodernism and Social Enquiry* (UCL Press, 1994)

A very good overview of debates in the philosophy of science is:

A.F. Chalmers *What is This Thing Called Science?* (Open UP, 1982)

See also:

A.F. Chalmers *Science and its Fabrication* (Open UP, 1990)

R. Klee *Introduction to the Philosophy of Science: Cutting Nature at its Seams* (OUP, 1997).

General anthologies in the philosophy of science are:

Introductory Readings in the Philosophy of Science, edited by E. Klemke et al, (Prometheus Books, 1998)

Philosophy of Science edited by Boyd et al (Harvard University Press, 1997)

Scientific Inquiry: Readings in the Philosophy of Science edited by R. Kelle (Oxford University Press, 1999)

On the connection between philosophies of science, social science and specific methods of research, see:

P. Diesing *Patterns of Discovery in the Social Sciences* (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972). Esp, Part III.

M. Williams and T. May *Introduction to the Philosophy of Social Research* (UCL Press, 1996).

D. Marsh and G. Stoker *Theory and Method in Political Science* 2nd edition. (Palgrave) (this is more relevant to political science students)

A recent and rather basic textbook useful for students of political science Della Porta, D. and Keating, M. eds *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences* Cambridge University Press, 2008

On philosophical and methodological issues in anthropology, this is particularly useful: H. Moore (ed) *Anthropology in Theory*. Blackwell, 2007)

Topic 1: Introduction:

This session serves two functions. Firstly, it provides a broad overview of the course and the connections between the topics, in particular outlining the three main traditions within the philosophy of social science. Secondly, it considers the issues of disciplinary and interdisciplinary research and in particular the relation between philosophy and social science. In addition to these aims, the session will clarify some of the basic concepts in the philosophy of science more generally as well as discussing the nature of scientific knowledge. The problem of explanation will be one of the main topics to be addressed in this session.

Core Text

Gary Goertz and James Mahoney 'Concepts and Measurement: Ontology and Epistemology' *Social Science Information* 5 (2): 205-16

On Canvas

Topic 2: Neopositivism and Functionalism

The session deals with some of the most important neopositivist theories of scientific methodology, taking Popper and functionalist approaches as the key examples of a conception of social science that emphasizes explanation. Popper's theory of falsification as the defining characteristic of science has been the single most influential theory of science in the 20th century. Arising from the neo-positivist theory of science are various functionalist approaches which have tended to emphasize explanation based on the search for generalizable laws as the primary aim of social science. Carl Hempel has been one of the most prominent philosophers of social science in the functionalist neo-positivist tradition of a general theory of science. We look at a debate on whether or not the social sciences are based on the discovery of general laws. The seminar will include a brief look at functionalism as a methodological approach that follows from a positivistic approach.

Core texts

Karl Popper 'The Problem of Induction'

Karl Popper 'Science: Conjectures and Refutations'

Carl Hempel 'Concept and Theory in Social Science' and 'The Function of General Laws in History'

(the first three of these are in Delanty and Strydom eds, *Philosophies of Social Science: The Classic and Contemporary Readings*) and the second Hempel text is on SyD as a link to a journal article

Discussion and applications:

J. Roberts 'There are no Laws of the Social Sciences'
and

H. Kincaid 'There are Laws in the Social Sciences'

(Both are in *Contemporary Debates in the Philosophy of Science*, C. Hitchcock, ed., Blackwell, 2004).

K. Davis 'The myth of functional analysis as a special method in sociology and social anthropology' *American Sociological Review* 24, no 6 (Dec) 1959 (can be downloaded from the library and also on Canvas.)

Seminar Questions:

1. What is the defining feature of scientific knowledge in Popper's view?
2. What is the principle of falsification and how relevant is this to social science?
3. Is it possible to avoid functionalist explanations in social science?
4. Does social scientific investigation need to be grounded in a general theoretical framework?
5. Is social science based on the search for general laws?

Further reading:

A useful further volume on developments in the philosophy of science is:

A.F. Chalmers *What is This Thing Called Science?* (Open UP, 1982), especially Ch 3,4,5 (second edition) or Ch 4,5,6 (third edition)

See also:

Alexander Bird *Philosophy of Science* (London: Routledge, 1998).

P. Macmamer and M. Silberstein eds *The Blackwell Guide to the Philosophy of Science* (Blackwell 2002).

An excellent selection of core readings in the philosophy of science and social science is: S. Brown, J. Fauvel and R. Finnegan (eds) *Conceptions of Inquiry* (Methuen,1981).

On philosophical problems on explanation:

S. Psillos *Causation and Explanation* (Acumen, 2002)

Much of the debate is conducted as a debate over 'positivism'. Some idea of the difficulty with terminology is provided by Halfpenny's twelve definitions:

P. Halfpenny *Positivism and Sociology: Explaining Social Life* (Allen and Unwin, 1982)

Standard positivist interpretations of social science:

E. Nagel *The Structure of Science* (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1968) Chs 13, 14

C.G. Hempel *Aspects of Scientific Explanation* (Macmillan, 1970) esp Ch 9

Key extracts are in Delanty and Strydom.

A useful overview of logical positivist philosophy:

O. Hanfling *Logical Positivism* (Columbia University Press, 1981)

For general treatments of positivism in the social sciences, see:

P. Cohen *Modern Social Theory* (Heinemann, 1968) Ch 1

J.C. Alexander *Theoretical Logic in Sociology, Volume I: Positivism, Presuppositions and Current Controversies* (Routledge, 1982) Ch 1

T. Benton *Philosophical Foundations of the Three Sociologies* (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1977) Ch 2

R. Keat, J. Urry *Social Theory as Science* (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975) Chs 2, 5

P. Baert *Social Theory in the Twentieth Century* (Polity, 1998), Ch 8

The debate over positivism has had an important role in the development of 'critical' theory in Germany. See:

T.W. Adorno et al *The Positivist Dispute in German Sociology* (Heineman, 1976)

A recent attempt at outlining a neo-positivist social science is:

J.H. Turner 'Analytical theorising' in A. Giddens, J.H. Turner (eds) *Social Theory Today* (Polity, 1987).

J.H Turner 'Introduction: Can sociology be a cumulative science?' in J.H. Turner (ed) *Theory Building in Sociology: Assessing Theoretical Cumulation* (Sage, 1989).

On the idea of science see:

S. Fuller, Steve (1997) *Science* (University of Minnesota Press, 1997)

One debate which has had particular significance for theories of social science is the 'Popper-Kuhn' debate. See:

T.S. Kuhn *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (U of Chicago Press, 1962)

K. Popper *Conjectures and Refutations* (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963) Chs 3, 10

For a discussion of Popper's views on social inquiry, see:

A. O'Hear *Karl Popper* (Routledge, 1980) Ch 8

Perhaps, the most developed 'Popperian' statement is the elaboration of 'sophisticated falsificationism' by Lakatos:

I. Lakatos 'Falsification and the methodology of scientific research programmes' in *Collected Papers, Volume I* (Cambridge UP, 1978) and in I. Lakatos and A. Musgrave (eds) *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge* (Cambridge UP, 1970)

For a 'Lakatosian' treatment of social science, see;

D. Papineau *For Science in Social Science* (Macmillan, 1978) Ch 2

For more on science as 'problem-solving', see:

L. Laudan *Progress and its Problems: Towards a Theory of Scientific Growth* (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1977).

See Hempel's most famous paper:

Carl G. Hempel 'The Function of General Laws in History' *The Journal of Philosophy* Vol. 39, No. 2 (Jan. 15, 1942), pp. 35-4

Good general discussions of *functionalism* are:

M. Abrahamson *Functionalism* (Prentice Hall, 1978).

J.H. Turner *The Structure of Sociological Theory* (Dorsey, 1986) esp Part One

W.E. Moore 'Functionalism' in T. Bottomore, R. Nisbet (eds) *A History of Sociological Analysis* (Heinemann, 1979)

See also:

P. Baert *Social Theory in the Twentieth Century* (Polity, 1998), Ch 2

B. Barnes *The Elements of Social Theory* (UCL Press, 1995) Ch 2

A 'classic' statement of the necessity of functionalism is:

K. Davis 'The myth of functional analysis as a special method in sociology and social anthropology' *American Sociological Review* 24, 1959

Much of the philosophical literature on functionalism tends to affirm methodological individualism and criticise what is held to be an inappropriate form of teleology at odds with a proper causal understanding. For the most important statement, see:

C. G. Hempel 'The logic of functional analysis' in L. Gross (ed) *Symposium on Functional Analysis* (Row, Peterson and Co, 1959).

For a good formal defence, see:

W.J. Isajiw *Causation and Functionalism in Sociology* (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1968)

An equivalent defence of Marxist functionalism is:

G. A. Cohen *Karl Marx's Theory of History: A Defence* (Clarendon, 1978) Chs IX, X
[A short version of the argument is G. A. Cohen 'Forces and relations of production' in *History, Labour and Freedom: Themes from Marx* (Clarendon, 1988)]

Parsons's strongest statements of functionalism are associated with his later work.

See:

T. Parsons *The Social System* (Routledge, 1950) Chs 1 and 2

T. Parsons *Societies: Evolutionary and Comparative Perspectives* (Prentice-Hall, 1966)

For general discussions of Parsons, see:

J. Scott *Sociological Theory: Contemporary Debates* (Edward Elgar, 1995) Ch 2

I. Craib *Modern Social Theory: From Parsons to Habermas* (Harvester, 1984) Ch 3

On neo-functionalism as a new paradigm, avoiding the problems of earlier forms of functional analysis, see:

J. C. Alexander 'From functionalism to neofunctionalism: creating a position in the field of social theory' in *Neofunctionalism and After* (Blackwell, 1998)

N. Mouzelis *Sociological Theory. What Went Wrong?* (Routledge, 1995) Ch 7

For Alexander's version of the 'myth of neofunctionalism as a special method', see:

J.C. Alexander 'The new theoretical movement' in N.J. Smelser (ed) *Handbook of Sociology* (Sage, 1988) and reprinted in *Neofunctionalism and After* (Blackwell, 1998)

For a critique of Alexander (and others associated with the new theoretical movement), see:

J. Holmwood *Founding Sociology? Talcott Parsons and the Idea of General Theory* (Longman 1996) esp Ch 5

S. Turner 'The end of functionalism' *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 23(2) 1993

One important debate over functionalism has concerned the problem of accounting for contradiction and social change. The major statement, is:

D. Lockwood 'Some remarks on *The Social System*' *British Journal of Sociology* 7(), 1956

D. Lockwood 'System integration and social integration' in G. Zollschan and W. Hirsch (eds) *Explorations in Social Change* (Routledge, 1964). Reprinted as an appendix to D. Lockwood *Solidarity and Schism: 'The Problem of Disorder' in Durkheimian and Marxist Sociology* (Clarendon Press, 1992)

The distinction between system and social integration has been widely taken up (for example, by Habermas, Giddens, Mouzelis and Archer among many others). For discussion, see:

N. Mouzelis 'Social integration and system integration: Lockwood, Habermas, Giddens' *Sociology* 31(1) 1997

M. Archer 'Social integration and system integration: developing the distinction' *Sociology* 30(4), 1996

Topic 3: Methodological Individualism and Critical Realism

The session is concerned with post-positivistic explanatory oriented approaches. We take two quite different examples: rational choice or methodological individualism and a more recent naturalistic philosophy of science called critical realism. Both of these emerged out of post-positivistic philosophy of social science while adhering to the main assumptions of the modern scientific method, in particular the attempt to offer an explanatory account of social behaviour and institutional arrangement. They all share a concern with finding a unified methodological approach for the social sciences. Followers of Weber frequently argue that social scientific concepts referring to groups or collectivities can only be 'short-hand' conveniences and that they can, in principle, always be broken down into the constituent actions of individual actors. This is usually argued against proponents of 'holism', a position attributed to Marx and Durkheim among others. The doctrine of methodological individualism finds greatest support in psychology and economics, but is promoted by rational choice theorists as the means of unifying the social sciences. This session will examine the claims of methodological individualism in the context of rational choice theory and some of the major objections to it.

The other approach we discuss is critical realism. Realists argue that the central task of natural science is to locate the structures of the natural world, that is, the entities and causal powers which produce natural events. They argue that experiment is central to this search for structures, as it allows investigators to isolate a particular structure and examine its properties. Turning to social science, realists argue that there are structures in the social world that have properties similar (though not identical) to those in the natural world. However, they also note that the existence of human agency, and the limited possibilities for experiment in social science, make it difficult to locate and identify these structures. In this session we discuss realist arguments, and examine whether there are procedures for identifying social structures that can compensate for the difficulties of studying the social realm. We consider these issues in relation to a debate between Andrew Sayer and John Holmwood about the relationship between capitalist and bureaucratic structures, on the one hand, and gender structures, on the other.

Core texts:

Critical Realism

R. Bhaskar 'Transcendental Realism and the Problem of Naturalism'

(in Delanty and Strydom eds, *Philosophies of Social Science: The Classic and Contemporary Readings*).

Rational Choice

Jon Elster 'Rational Choice and the Explanation of Social Action'

(in Delanty and Strydom eds, *Philosophies of Social Science: The Classic and Contemporary Readings*).

Discussion and applications:

Critical realism:

A.C. Pratt 'Putting critical realism to work: the practical implications for geographical research' *Progress in Human Geography* 19(1) 1995

Yeung, H. 'Critical realism and realist research in human geography: a method or a philosophy in search of a method?' *Progress in Human Geography*, 1997, 21: 51-74

(these can all be downloaded from the library and are also on the Canvas.)

Additional text:

Malcolm William 'Situated Objectivity, Values and Realism' *European Journal of Social Theory* 2015, vol 18(1): 76-92

Seminar Questions:

1. Can all collective categories be reduced to categories relating to individual action? If not, why not?
2. Can rational choice theory explain collective action?
3. Are realists correct that experiments cannot be a key tool for social science? Are there alternatives to experiment that social science can employ?
4. What is objectivity in social science?

Further reading (On Rational Choice):

J.W.N. Watkins 'Ideal types and historical explanation' *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 3(1) 1952

B. Barnes *The Elements of Social Theory* (UCL Press, 1995) Ch 1

J. Scott 'Rational choice and social exchange' in *Sociological Theory: Contemporary Debates* (Edward Elgar, 1995)

Elaborations of Watkins's position are:

J.W.N. Watkins 'The principle of methodological individualism' *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 3(2), 1952.

J.W.N. Watkins 'Methodological individualism: a reply' *Philosophy of Science* 22(1), 1955 [Note, all Watkins's articles are collected in J. O'Neill (ed) *Modes of Individualism and Collectivism* (Heinemann, 1973)

For Popper's critique of 'holism', see:

K. Popper *The Poverty of Historicism* (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1957)

K. Popper 'What is dialectic' in *Conjectures and Refutations: The Growth of Scientific Knowledge* (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963)

See, also:

J. Agassi 'Methodological individualism' in J. O'Neill (ed) *Modes of Individualism and Collectivism* (Heinemann, 1973).

The 'classic' statements of action categories as the basic categories of social inquiry is: M. Weber *Economy and Society, Volume I* (Bedminster Press, 1968), Ch. 1

V. Pareto *Sociological Writings* (Pall Mall Press, 1966) Part II, Ch 1

The 'classic' statement of the non-reducibility of 'social facts' is:
E. Durkheim *The Rules of Sociological Method* (Free Press, 1964)

See also:

M. Mandelbaum 'Societal facts' in J. O'Neill (ed) *Modes of Individualism and Collectivism* (Heinemann, 1973).

S. Turner *The Search for a Methodology of Social Science: Durkheim, Weber and the Nineteenth Century Problem of Cause, Probability and Action* (Reidel, 1986)

P. Urbach 'Social propensities' *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 31(), 1980

S. Lukes 'Methodological individualism reconsidered' in D. Emmet, A. McIntyre (eds) *Sociological Theory and Philosophical Argument* (Macmillan, 1970)

M. Archer *Realist Social Theory: The Morphogenetic Approach* (CUP, 1995) Ch 1

On 'rational interpretation', see:

M. Hollis *Models of Man: Philosophical Thoughts on Social Action* (CUP, 1977), esp Ch 6

For a 'classic' critique of rational interpretation, see:

A. Schutz 'The problem of rationality in the social world' in D. Emmet, A. McIntyre (eds) *Sociological Theory and Philosophical Argument* (Macmillan, 1970) [note that Schutz's argument is revised by H. Garfinkel in his 'The rational properties of common-sense and scientific activities' in *Studies in Ethnomethodology* (Prentice Hall, 1967)]

For good, general discussions of rational choice theory, see:

D. King, K. Dowding 'Introduction' in D. King, K. Dowding (eds) *Preferences, Institutions and Rational Choice* (OUP, 1995)

J. Elster 'Introduction' in J. Elster (ed) *Rational Choice* (Blackwell, 1996)

J. Coleman 'Rational reconstruction of society' *American Sociological Review* 58(1), 1993

M. Hechter 'Rational choice foundations of social order' in J.H. Turner (ed) *Theory Building in Sociology: Assessing Theoretical Cumulation* (Sage, 1989)

D. Friedman, M. Hechter 'The comparative advantages of rational choice theory' in G. Ritzer(ed) *Frontiers of Social Theory: The New Syntheses* (Columbia UP, 1990)

A. Heath *Rational Choice and Social Exchange* (CUP, 1976)

Books and journal issues devoted to the critical assessment of rational choice approaches are:

J. Coleman and T.J. Fararo (eds) *Rational Choice Theory: Advocacy and Critique* (Sage, 1992)

Sociological Theory 9(2), 1991

D. Green, I. Shapiro *The Pathologies of Rational Choice Theory* (Yale UP, 1994)

See, also:

M. Zafirovski 'What is really rational choice? Beyond the utilitarian concept of rationality' *Current Sociology* 47(1), 1999

M. Zafirovski 'Unification of sociological theory by the rational choice model: conceiving the relationship between economics and sociology' *Sociology* 33(3), 1999
 B. Hindess *Choice, Rationality and Social Theory* (Unwin Hyman, 1988)
 N. Mouzelis *Sociological Theory. What Went Wrong?* (Routledge, 1995) Ch 2
 E. Sofianou 'Post-modernism and the notion of rationality in economics' *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 19(3), 1995

A recent development is the argument that Marxist social theory can be given a foundation in the categories of rational-choice. See:

J. Roemer "'Rational choice" Marxism: some issues of method and substance' in J. Roemer (ed) *Analytical Marxism* (CUP, 1986)
 J. Elster *Making Sense of Marx* (CUP, 1985) esp Ch 1
 A. Przeworski 'The material bases of consent' in *Capitalism and Social Democracy* (CUP, 1985)
 E.M. Wood 'Rational choice Marxism: is the game worth the candle?' *New Left Review* #177
 T. Carver, P. Thomas (eds) *Rational Choice Marxism* (Macmillan 1995)

The debate over categories of 'rational choice' has frequently concentrated on the narrowness of the conception of rational action and sought to extend it to include 'non-rational' (as distinct from irrational) elements. For 'classic' statements, see:
 M. Weber *Economy and Society, Volume I* (Bedminster Press, 1968), Ch 1
 V. Pareto *Sociological Writings* (Pall Mall Press, 1966), Part II, Ch 1

The major statement of the position, drawing on Weber and Pareto, is:
 T. Parsons *The Structure of Social Action* (Free Press, 1937)

Similar arguments are made by those who wish to 'rescue' Marx and Marxism from the reduction to utilitarian categories attempted by analytical Marxists (and frequently imputed to Marx by non-Marxists). See:

D. Lockwood *Solidarity and Schism: 'The Problem of Disorder' in Durkheim and Marxist Sociology* (Clarendon Press, 1992), esp Ch 10
 M. Gould 'Parsons versus Marx: "an earnest warning ..."' *Sociological Inquiry* 51(3/4), 1981.
 T. Benton *The Rise and Fall of Structuralist Marxism* (Macmillan, 1984)

A reply to such criticisms (and several articles in further discussion) is:

J. Elster 'Marxism, functionalism and game theory: the case for methodological individualism' *Theory and Society* 11(4), 1982

An earlier version of the 'same' underlying debate (where rational choice theory was referred to as 'exchange theory'), see:

H. Turk, R.L. Simpson (eds) *Institutions and Exchange: The Sociologies of Talcott Parsons and George Caspar Homans* (Bobbs-Merrill, 1971)
 J.C. Alexander *Twenty Lecture: Sociological Theory Since World War II* (Columbia UP, 1987), lectures 10 and 11

See also:

B. Barry *Sociologists, Economists and Democracy* (Collier-Macmillan, 1970)

Further reading (On Realism):

- R. Collins 'Sociological Realism'. In Delanty and Strydom
 J. Habermas 'Realism after the Linguistic-Pragmatic Turn'. In Delanty and Strydom
 A. Collier: 'Experiment and Depth Realism' in *Critical Realism: An Introduction to Roy Bhaskar's Philosophy* (Verso, 1994)
 A. Sayer: 'Theory and Method I: Abstraction, Structure and Cause' in *Method In Social Science: A Realist Approach* (Hutchison, 1984)
 S. Kemp, 'Critical Realism and the Limits of Philosophy', *European Journal of Social Theory* 2005, Vol 8, No. 2, pp. 171-191

Joseph, J. and Roberts, J. eds 2004 *Realism and Deconstruction*. London: Routledge
 Lopez, J. and Potter, G. eds 2001. *After Postmodernism: An Introduction to Critical Realism*. London: The Athlone Press.

On realism as an analysis of natural science, see:

- R. Bhaskar *A Realist Theory of Science*, 2nd Edition (Verso, 1997 [1975])
 R. Bhaskar *Scientific Realism and Human Emancipation* (Verso, 1986)
 A. Collier *Critical Realism: An Introduction to Roy Bhaskar's Philosophy* (Verso, 1994)
 J. Isaac 'Realism and reality: some realistic considerations' *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 20(1), 1990
 B. Fay 'Critical realism?' *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 20(1), 1990
 A. Chalmers 'Is Bhaskar's realism realistic?' *Radical Philosophy* 49 Summer, 1988
 M. Archer, R. Bhaskar, A. Collier, T. Lawson, A. Norrie (eds) *Critical Realism: Essential Readings* (Routledge, 1998)

On 'realism' and the social sciences, see:

- R. Harré, P.F. Secord *The Explanation of Social Behaviour* (Blackwell, 1972) esp Ch7
 R. Bhaskar *The Possibility of Naturalism* (Harvester, 1979)
 R. Bhaskar *Scientific Realism and Human Emancipation* (Verso, 1986)
 R. Harré, C.R. Varela 'Conflicting varieties of realism: causal powers and the problems of social structure' *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior* 26(3), 1996
 T. Benton *Philosophical Foundations of the Three Sociologies* (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1977) Ch 2
 R. Keat, J. Urry *Social Theory as Science* (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975) Chs 2, 5
 W. Outhwaite *New Philosophies of Social Science: Realism, Hermeneutics and Critical Theory* (Macmillan, 1987) Chs 2, 3
 A. Sayer *Method in Social Science: A Realist Approach* (Hutchinson, 1984)
 R. Trigg *Understanding Social Science: A Philosophical Introduction to the Social Sciences* (Blackwell, 1985)
 M. Archer, R. Bhaskar, A. Collier, T. Lawson, A. Norrie (eds) *Critical Realism: Essential Readings* (Routledge, 1998)
 A. Collier *Critical Realism: An Introduction to Roy Bhaskar's Philosophy* (Verso, 1994)
 M. Archer *Realist Social Theory: The Morphogenetic Approach* (CUP, 1995)
 P. Manicas *A Realist Philosophy of Social Science* (Cambridge University Press 2006).
 Danermark, B. et al *Explaining Society: Critical Realism in the Social Sciences* (Routledge 2002).

For criticisms of 'Critical Realism' in social science see:

- A. King 'The Impossibility of Naturalism: The Antinomies of Bhaskar's Realism' *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 29 (3) 1999
 D. Layder *The Realist Image in Social Science* (Macmillan, 1990)
 R. Albury, G. Payne, W. Suchting 'Naturalism and the Human Sciences' *Economy and Society* 10(3) 1981

'Critical realism' has had considerable impact in economics. See, for example:

- T. Lawson *Economics and Reality* (Routledge, 1997)

And in geography. See:

- A. Sayer 'Realism and geography' in R.J. Johnston (ed) *The Future of Geography* (Methuen, 1985)
 A.C. Pratt 'Putting critical realism to work: the practical implications for geographical research' *Progress in Human Geography* 19(1) 1995

For many (though not all) realists Marxism (and especially its Althusserian variant) provides exemplars of 'explanatory mechanisms' of social structures. See:

- L. Althusser 'Contradiction and overdetermination' in *For Marx* (Allen Lane, 1969)
 L. Althusser 'From *Capital* to Marx's philosophy' in L. Althusser, E. Balibar *Reading Capital* (New Left Books, 1970)
 T. Benton *The Rise and Fall of Structuralism Marxism* (Macmillan, 1984)
 T. Benton *Philosophical Foundations of the Three Sociologies* (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1977) Ch 8, 9
 R. Keat, J. Urry *Social Theory as Science* (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975) Ch 6

On issues of 'realism' in literary interpretation and literary method, see the essays in: G.E. Levine (ed) *Realism and Representation: Essays on the Problem of Realism in Relation to Science, Literature, and Culture* (U of Wisconsin Press, 1993)

G. Potter *The Bet: Truth in Science, Literature and Everyday Knowledges* (Aldgate, 1999).

Habermas and realism see

- J. Habermas 'Realism after the linguistic-pragmatic turn' in Delanty and Strydom

A debate that reflects a Critical Realist perspective

A. Sayer: 'System, Lifeworld and Gender: Associational versus Counterfactual Thinking', *Sociology*, 2000, Vol 34, No 4, pp. 705-725

J. Holmwood: 'Gender and Critical Realism: A Critique of Sayer', *Sociology*, 2001, Vol 35, No 4, pp. 947-965 (and see also Sayer's Reply in *Sociology*, 2001, 35 (4).

Topic 4: Interpretative Social Science: Hermeneutics and Phenomenology

In this session we discuss interpretive accounts of social science, which attempt to clearly distinguish it from natural science. Defenders of an interpretive approach argue that the key difference is that whereas natural science studies a domain of objects which has no intrinsic meaning, social science studies a domain of objects in which the meanings and understandings of actors play a central part. The major attempt is that found in Max Weber's methodological writings and in the work of Alfred Schutz who took up and developed Weber's approach. This session will offer a detailed examination of Weber's and Schutz's conception of value relevance, of the distinction between value-judgements and validity in sociological accounts, and of the 'ideal typical' nature of theory construction. For Peter Winch, an important interpretive thinker, this means that social inquiry must focus on grasping the understandings of actors, rather than explaining their behaviour in a causal, scientific fashion. This session discusses both Winch's views, and the views of critics who argues that it is possible to incorporate a concern with actors' meanings while still allowing that there are causes operating in the social world. Some of the issues raised are illustrated with reference to Lupton and Tulloch's argument for an interpretive approach to theorizing fear of crime.

Core texts:

Max Weber ' "Objectivity in Social Science and Social Policy" '

Alfred Schutz 'Concept and theory Formation in the Social Sciences'.

Peter Winch *The Idea of a Social Science and its Relation to Philosophy*, 2nd Edition (Routledge, 1990) Ch 2, 3. See link to book

Anthony Giddens 'Social Science as a Double Hermeneutic'

(These are in Delanty and Strydom eds, *Philosophies of Social Science: The Classic and Contemporary Readings*. In the case of Winch see the extract 'Philosophy and Science').

Discussion and application:

D. Lupton & J. Tulloch: 'Theorizing fear of crime: beyond the rational/irrational opposition', *British Journal of Sociology*, 1999, Vol 50, No 3

B. Flyvbjerg 'The Power of Example' in *Making Social Science Matter* (Cambridge University Press, 2001)

Michael Gibbons 'Hermeneutics, Political Inquiry and Practical Reason' American Political Science review

Lukes on rationality

B. Flyvbjerg 'Phronetic Planning Research *Planning Theory and Practice* 5 (3), 2004

All available on Canvas.

Seminar Questions:

1. Why does Schutz disagree with the neopositivists Hempel and Nagel?
2. Are ideal types a useful research tool?
3. What is Winch's position on the relation of social scientists' understandings to the understandings of actors? Is this a defensible view?
4. Are cases studies scientific?

Further reading:

Other relevant methodological essays by Weber are:

M. Weber 'The meaning of "ethical neutrality" in sociology and economics' in M. Weber *The Methodology of the Social Sciences* (Free Press, 1949)

M. Weber *Roscher and Knies: the Logical Problems of Historical Economics* (Free Press, 1975)

On the 'politics' of social inquiry, see:

M. Weber 'Science as a vocation' in H.H. Gerth and C.W. Mills (eds) *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1948)

M. Weber 'Politics as a vocation' in H.H. Gerth and C.W. Mills (eds) *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1948)

[an important and very influential essay on Weber's stance is: A. Gouldner 'Anti-Minotaur: the myth of a value-free sociology' in *For Sociology* (Allen Lane, 1973)]

Two excellent detailed treatment of Weber's methodological arguments are:

H.H. Bruun *Science, Values and Politics in Max Weber's Methodology* (Munksgaard, 1972)

S. Kalberg *Max Weber's Comparative-Historical Sociology* (Polity Press, 1994)

A 'classic' and still important critique of ideal types is:

T. Parsons *The Structure of Social Action* (Free Press, 1937) Ch XVI

More straightforward secondary accounts are:

F. Parkin *Max Weber* (Tavistock, 1982) Ch.1

J. Torrance 'Max Weber: methods and the man' *Archives Europeennes de Sociologie* 15(1) 1974

A. Sharlin 'Max Weber and the origin of value-free sociology' *Archives Europeennes de Sociologie* 15(2), 1974

G. Roth 'Sociological typology and historical explanation' in R. Bendix, G. Roth *Scholarship and Partisanship* (Univ. of California Press, 1971)

W. Mommsen 'Ideal type and pure type: two variants of Max Weber's ideal-typical method' in *The Political and Social Theory of Max Weber* (Polity, 1989)

M. Albrow *Max Weber's Construction of Social Theory* (Macmillan, 1990)

Weber's approach is frequently contrasted with that of Durkheim's 'positivist', or 'structuralist' accounts (usually - not always, see Turner - to the latter's disadvantage):

R. Bendix 'Two sociological traditions' in R. Bendix, G. Roth *Scholarship and Partisanship* (Univ. of California Press, 1971)

S. Turner *The Search for a Methodology of Social Science: Durkheim, Weber and the Nineteenth Century Problem of Cause, Probability and Action* (Reidel, 1986)

See also

D. Papineau 'Ideal types and empirical theories' *British Journal of the Philosophy of Science* 27(2), 1976

B. Fay *Social Theory and Political Practice* (Allen and Unwin, 1972), Ch 4

For a strong, revisionist and 'hermeneutic' defence of Weber against any attempt to reconcile science and social inquiry, see:

W. Hennis "A Science of Man": Max Weber and the political economy of the German

Historical School' in *Max Weber: Essays in Reconstruction* (Allen & Unwin, 1988)

L. Scaff 'Weber before Weberian Sociology' in K. Tribe (ed) *Reading Weber* (Routledge, 1989)

On the problem of 'decisionism' in Weber's separation of scientific judgements from judgements of value, see:

J. Habermas 'Technology and science as "ideology"' *Toward a Rational Society* (Heinemann, 1971)

K-O. Apel 'The common presuppositions of hermeneutics and ethics: types of rationality beyond science and technology' *Research into Phenomenology* IX(1), 1979

For a feminist appropriation of Weber's methodology of ideal types, see:

S.J. Hekman 'Truth and method: feminist standpoint theory revisited' *Signs* 22(2), 1997

A few good collections of readings covering the diversity of approaches under the general heading are:

F. Dallmayr and T McCarthy (eds) *Understanding and Inquiry* (University of Notre Dame, 1977)

A. Giddens (ed) *Positivism and Sociology* (Heinemann, 1975)

T. Luckmann (ed) *Phenomenology and Sociology* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1978).

S. C. Brown *Philosophical Disputes in the Social Science* (Brighton: Harvester Press, 1979)

P. Rabinow and Sullivan (eds) *Interpretative Social Science* (Berkeley: University of California, 1979).

Good general treatments of 'hermeneutics' or 'interpretative' social inquiry are:

W. Outhwaite *Understanding Social Life: the Method Called Verstehen* (Allen and Unwin, 1975) Chs 2,5, 6

W. Outhwaite *New Philosophies of Social Science: Realism, Hermeneutics and Critical Theory* (Macmillan, 1987) Chs 4, 5

R. J. Bernstein *The Restructuring of Social and Political Theory* (Blackwell, 1976) Part II

See also:

R. Keat, J. Urry *Social Theory as Science* (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975) Chs 7,8,9

T. Benton *The Philosophical Foundations of the Three Sociologies* (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1977) Chs 6,7

A. Giddens *New Rules of Sociological Method* (Hutchinson, 1976) Ch 1

H. Ferguson *Phenomenological Sociology: Experience and Insight in Modern Society* (Sage 2006).

Winch's Wittgensteinian critique of social science is in:

P. Winch *The Idea of a Social Science* (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1976)

On the convergence between hermeneutics and Wittgensteinian approaches, written by a proponent of critical hermeneutics, see:

K-O Apel *The Analytical Philosophy of Language and the Gesiteswissenschaften* (Reidel, 1967)

K-O. Apel *Towards a Transformation of Philosophy* (Routledge, Kegan and Paul, 1980)

On the conservatism of interpretation, see:

J. Habermas 'On systematically distorted communication' *Inquiry* 13(3), 1970 [see, also:

J. Habermas 'Towards a theory of communicative competence' *Inquiry* 13(4), 1970]

For a reply, see:

H-G Gadamer 'On the scope and function of reflection' in *Philosophical Hermeneutics* (U of California Press, 1976)

B. Fay *Critical Social Science* (Polity, 1987) Chs 7, 8.

The standard 'positivist' critique of interpretation is:

T. Abel 'The operation called *verstehen*' *American Journal of Sociology* 54, 1948.

Topic 5: Histories of Science: Kuhn and Foucault

The session deals with conceptions of science that arose out of new histories of science. We take two examples that have been particularly influential in shaping post-positivistic social science: Kuhn and Foucault who both in quite different ways saw scientific inquiry as organized into discourses or, to use Kuhn's term, paradigms and counter paradigms. Kuhn's *The Structure of Scientific Revolution* opened up new ways of thinking about science that led to the recognition of social factors entering into science, which he saw as organized into paradigms. Paradigms determine what counts as evidence and what is relevant. Foucault in a different but related way demonstrated the historically embedded nature of science showing how scientific knowledge is embedded in discourses that shift accordingly as major epistemic ruptures occur. The most influential methodological approach that has emerged from Foucault is that of genealogy and a social theory of governmentality. Some applications of these will be discussed.

Core text:

Thomas Kuhn 'Introduction: A Role for History'

Michel Foucault 'The Order of Things'

Michel Foucault 'Power/Knowledge'

(these are in Delanty and Strydom eds, *Philosophies of Social Science: The Classic and Contemporary Readings*).

Michel Foucault 'Nietzsche, Genealogy and Critique' on Canvas as a link to a journal article

Discussion and application:

N. Polsby (1998) 'Social Science and Scientific Change: A Note on T. Kuhn's Contribution' *Annual Review of Political Science* 1: 199-210

S. Jacobs and B. Mooney 'Sociology as a Source of Anomaly in Thomas Kuhn's System of Science'

Nicholas Rose (with Paul Rabinow) '*Biopower today: Vital Politics: Health, Medicine and Bioeconomics into the Twenty First Century*, London School of Economics, 5-7 September 2003. Available on the internet

Wendy Bastalich 'Reading Foucault'

On Canvas.

Seminar Questions:

1. Compare the notions of paradigm and discourse as used by Kuhn and Foucault
2. How relevant is the notion of paradigm for the social sciences?
3. What is the meaning of 'genealogy' as used by Foucault? What does Foucault mean by 'subjugated knowledges'?

Further Reading:

On Kuhn:

T.S. Kuhn *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (U of Chicago Press, 1962)

T.S. Kuhn 'The natural and the human sciences' in D.R. Hiley (et al) *The Interpretive Turn: Philosophy, Science, Culture* (Cornell UP, 1991)

B. Barnes *T.S. Kuhn and Social Science* (Macmillan, 1982)

Bird, A. 2009. *Thomas Kuhn*. London: Acumen.

S. Fuller *Thomas Kuhn – A Philosophical History for Our Times* (Chicago University Press, 2000)

W. Sharrock, and R. Read *Kuhn – Philosopher of Scientific Revolution* (Polity Press, 2002).

T. Nickles (ed) *Thomas Kuhn* (Cambridge University Press 2003).

On Foucault:

H. Dreyfus and R. Rabinow (eds) *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics* (University of Chicago Press, 1982).

D. Hoy (ed) *Foucault: A Critical Reader* (Blackwell, 1986)

G. Gutting (ed) *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault* (Cambridge University Press, 1994)

On Foucault and Habermas, see:

M. Kelly (ed) *Critique and Power: Recasting the Foucault/Habermas Debate*. (MIT Press, 1994).

Foucault, M. (1979) 'Governmentality' *Ideology & Consciousness*, 6, pp. 5-21.

Dean, M (1994) *Critical and Effective Histories: Foucault's Methods and Historical*

Sociology London: Routledge

Dean, M. 1999 *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. London: Sage

Kendall, G. And Wicham, G. 1999 *Using Foucault's Methods*. London: Sage.

Rose, N. 1999 *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge University Press.

Press.

Scheurich, J.1997 *Research Method in the Postmodern* London: Falmer Press

Michel-Foucault.com website: <http://www.michel-foucault.com>

Topic 6: Postmodernism, Poststructuralism and Social Science

This topic will be covered through a reading week. There are two objectives. The first is to cover general conceptions of poststructuralism and, related to it, postmodernism. This will in part have been introduced in the previous week in relation to Foucault. The most important poststructuralist thinkers - aside from Foucault - are Baudrillard, Derrida, Lacan, Lyotard and Deleuze. The second objective is to focus on their works and some applications. Of these, Deleuze is the most important in terms of applications in social science. The notion of assemblage derives from his work. However, Lacan also has a significant following in social science and Lyotard's 1979 book, *The Postmodern Condition* has a major impact on social science.

Core Text

J-F. Lyotard *The Postmodern Condition*

There is a link to the book, which is available on the internet

Further Reading:

On postmodernism in social science

D. Harvey *The Condition of Postmodernity* (Blackwell, 1989)

F. Jameson, *Postmodernism or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*.
(Duke University Press, 1991)

For some general surveys of postmodernism in social science see:

G. Delanty *Modernity and Postmodernity* (Sage, 2000)

B. Smart *Modern Conditions, Postmodern Controversies* (Routledge, 1992)

B. Turner (ed) *Modernity and Postmodernity* (Sage, 1990)

D. R. Dickens and A. Fontana (eds) *Postmodernism and Social Enquiry* (UCL Press, 1994)

S. Madan, *An Introductory Guide to Post-structuralism and Postmodernism*. Harlow : Harvester, 1993

D. R. Dickens and A. Fontana (eds) *Postmodernism and Social Enquiry* (UCL Press, 1994)

On Deleuze and social science, see R. Colemand and J. Ringmore *Deleuze and Research Methodologies*. Edinburgh University Press, 2013.

J. Protevi *Life, War and Earth: Deleuze and the Sciences*. Minnesota 2013.

There are a few useful commentaries in G. Delanty and S. Turner (eds) *Routledge International Handbook of Social and Political Theory*, 2011. See in particular

Thomas Docherty 'Accidental Conditions: The Social Consequences of Poststructuralist Philosophy'

Yannis Stavrakakis 'Lacanian Theory: Ideology, Enjoyment, and the Spirit of Capitalism.'

On the concept of assemblages see,

A. Ong and S. Collier (eds) *Global Assemblages: Technology, Politics and Ethics as Anthropolitical Problems*. Blackwell, 2005.

Latour, Bruno. 2005. *Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor network theory*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

For recent multispecies applications of the assemblage concept see,

Ogden, Laura, Billy Hall, and Kimiko Tanita. 2013. Animals, plants, people, and things: A review of multispecies ethnography. *Environment and Society: Advances in Research* 4.1: 5–24.

Sagan, Dorion. 2011. The human is more than human: Interspecies communities and the new “facts of life.” In *Cultural Anthropology*.

von Uexküll, Jakob. 1992. A stroll through the worlds of animals and men: A picture book of invisible worlds. *Semiotica* 89.4: 319–391.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. 1987. *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. London: Athlone.

Latour, Bruno. 2004. *Politics of nature: How to bring the sciences into democracy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.

Bennett, Jane. 2010. *Vibrant matter: A political ecology of things*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press.

Cassidy, Rebecca. 2012. Lives with others: Climate change and humananimal relations. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 41:21–36.

Bear, Christopher. 2013. Assembling the sea: Materiality, movement and regulatory practices in the Cardigan Bay scallop fishery. *Cultural Geographies* 20.1: 21–41.

Barua, Maan. 2014. Circulating elephants: Unpacking the geographies of a cosmopolitan animal. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 39.4: 559–573.

This book reflects a general postmodern perspective on method in social science,

John Law *After Method: Mess in Social Science*. Routledge 2004

Topic 7 Social Constructionism and Multispecies Thinking

This topic concerns an approach that has diverse origins but can be principally related to developments with interpretative social science. We look at Berger and Luckman's book *The Social Construction of Reality*, which arose out of the phenomenological tradition, and stronger versions of constructionism such as Actor Network Theory, as in the work of Bruno Latour. Our main focus will be the multispecies approaches that have emerged out of social constructionism and have become an important methodological approach in social research today.

Core texts:

Ian Hacking 'What is Social Constructionism?'

(Hacking is in Delanty and Strydom eds, *Philosophies of Social Science: The Classic and Contemporary Readings*).

S. Strum and B. Latour 'Redefining the Social Link' 1987 *Social Science Information* 26 (4)

On Canvas as a link to a journal article.

Discussion and applications:

Ogden, Laura, Billy Hall, and Kimiko Tanita. 2013. Animals, plants, people, and things: A review of multispecies ethnography. *Environment and Society: Advances in Research* 4.1: 5–24.

Murdoch, Jonathon. 1997. Inhuman/nonhuman/human: Actor-network theory and the prospects for a non-dualistic and symmetrical perspective on nature and society. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 15.6: 731–756.

Sayes, Edwin. 2014. Actor network theory and methodology: Just what does it mean to say that nonhumans have agency? *Social Studies of Science* 44.1: 134–149.

T. Osborne and N. Rose (1999) 'Do the Social Sciences Create Phenomena?' *British Journal of Sociology* 50 (3): 367-96.

(Osborne and Rose 1999 are available on Canvas.

Further Reading:

For multispecies thinking, building on social constructivism and posthumanism: Aisher, A. and V. Damodaran, eds. 2016. Introduction: Human-nature Interactions through a Multispecies Lens. *Conservation and Society* 14(4): 293-304.

Barad, Karen. 1996. Meeting the universe halfway: Realism and social constructivism without contradiction. In *Feminism, Science, and the Philosophy of Science*. Edited by L. H. Nelson and J. Nelson, 161–194. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.

Bennett, Jane. 2010. *Vibrant matter: A political ecology of things*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press.

- Castree, Noel, Catherine Nash, Neil Badmington, Bruce Braun, Jonathon Murdoch, and Sarah Whatmore. 2004. Mapping posthumanism: An exchange. *Environment and Planning A* 36.8: 1341–1363.
- Corbey, Raymond, and Annette Lanjouw, eds. 2013. *The politics of species: Reshaping our relationships with other animals*. Cambridge, UK: *Cambridge Univ. Press*.
- Despret, Vinciane. 2013. Responding bodies and partial affinities in human-animal worlds. *Theory, Culture & Society* 30.7–8: 5–76.
- Dransart, Penelope, ed. 2013. *Living beings: Perspectives on interspecies engagements*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Feinberg, Rebecca, Patrick Nason, and Hamsini Sridharan. 2013. Introduction: Human-animal relations. *Environment and Society: Advances in Research* 4.1: 1–4.
- Fuentes, Agustín, and Eduardo Kohn. 2012. Two proposals. *Cambridge Anthropology* 30.2: 136–146.
- Goldman, Mara J., Paul Nadasdy, and Matthew D. Turner, eds. 2011. *Knowing nature: Conversations at the intersection of political ecology and science studies*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Hackmann, H. and S.C. Moser. 2013. Social sciences in a changing global environment: general introduction. In: *World Social Science Report 2013* (eds. Hackmann, H. and S.C. Moser). Pp. 33–45. Paris: UNESCO, ISSC.
- Kirksey, S. Eben, and Stefan Helmreich. 2010. The emergence of multispecies ethnography. *Cultural Anthropology* 25.4: 545–576.
- Latimer, Joanna, and Mara Miele. 2013. Naturecultures? Science, affect and the non-human. *Theory, Culture & Society* 30.7: 5–31.
- Lorimer, Jamie. 2010. Moving image methodologies for more-than-human geographies. *Cultural Geographies* 17.2: 237–258.
- Panelli, Ruth. 2010. More-than-human social geographies: Posthuman and other possibilities. *Progress in Human Geography* 34.1: 79–87.
- Sagan, Dorion. 2011. The human is more than human: Interspecies communities and the new “facts of life.” In *Cultural Anthropology*.
- Sodikoff, Genese Marie, ed. 2011. *The anthropology of extinction: Essays on culture and species death*. Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press.
- Tsing, A.L. 2013. More-than-human sociality: a call for critical description. In: *Anthropology and nature* (ed. Hastrup, K.). Pp. 27–43. London: Routledge.
- von Uexküll, Jakob. 1992. A stroll through the worlds of animals and men: A picture book of invisible worlds. *Semiotica* 89.4: 319–391.
- Wolfe, Cary. 2010. *What is posthumanism?* Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press.

For more general philosophical treatments of constructivism and applications:

- Eder, K. (1996) *The Social Construction of Nature*. London Sage
- Fuller, S. (1994) ‘The Reflexive politics of constructionism’ *History of the Human Sciences* 7(1): 87-93
- Gamson, W. (1992) *Talking Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gergin, K. (2001) *Social Construction in Context*. London: Sage
- Gergin, K. (1994) *Realities and Relationships: Soundings in Social Construction*. Cambridge: Cambridge, MIT/
- Gergin, M. and Gergin, K. (eds) (2003) *Social Construction: A Reader*. London: Sage
- Goffman, E. (1986) *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Boston: Northeastern University.

- Hacking, I. (1999) *The Social Construction of What?* Cambridge: Harvard University Press
- Hannigan, D. (1995) *Environmental Sociology: A Social Constructionist Perspective*. London : Routledge.
- Kukla, A. (2000) *Social Constructionism and the Philosophy of Science*. London: Routledge.
- Sismondo, S. (1993) 'Some social constructions' *Social Studies of Science*, 23: 515-53.
- Strydom, P. (2002) *Risk, Environment and Society*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Williams, R. and Velody, I. (eds) (1998) *The Politics of Constructionism*. London: Sage.

On discourse analysis:

- Van Dijk, T. (1985) *Handbook of Discourse Analysis* New York: Academic Press.
- Wodak, R. & Chilton, P. A. (Eds.) (2005) *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Benford, R. and Snow, D. (2000) 'Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment' *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26: 611-37.
- Gamson, W. and Stuart, D. (1992) 'Media Discourse as a Symbolic Contest: The Bomb in Political Cartoons', *Sociological Forum* 7 (1): 55-86
- M. Haijer 'Discourse Analysis' in *The Politics of Environmental Discourse* (Oxford University Press. 1995)
- Max Miller (1992) 'Discourse and Morality', *European Journal of Sociology* 33(1): 3-38

Topic 8: Critical Social Science: Critical Theory

This session will discuss the idea that social scientific investigation should adopt a critical perspective. Social science as critique and emancipatory practice is the focus, with reference to Marx and Western Marxism and the critical theory tradition. Fay and Harvey argue that the purpose of critical social science is to develop knowledge that can be used to challenge and overthrow existing forms of social organisation. Their arguments are contrasted with those of Hammersley (and other neo-positivists), who argues that partisan social research is problematic, and that researchers should aim to be value-free in their studies. We will explore whether a critical orientation should be a presupposition of inquiry, or whether it should only arise once inquiry has concluded that there are good reasons to be critical of present social arrangements. The main focus of this week's topic is the conception of critical social science in the Frankfurt School tradition of critical social theory. This includes the classic formulations by Adorno and Horkheimer, the revisions undertaken by Habermas and Honneth's more recent recognition theory.

Core texts:

Horkheimer 'Critical and Traditional Theory'

Adorno 'Sociology and Empirical Knowledge'

Jürgen Habermas 'Knowledge and Human Interests' link to postscript of book

Jürgen Habermas 'The Tasks of a Critical Theory'

(all in Delanty and Strydom eds, *Philosophies of Social Science: The Classic and Contemporary Readings*).

Axel Honneth Chapter 8 of *The Struggle for Recognition*.

On Canvas.

Discussion and application:

Jürgen Habermas (2006) 'Political Communication in Media Society: Does Democracy Still Enjoy an Epistemic Dimension? The Impact of Normative Theory on Empirical Research', *Communication Theory* 16: 411-26.

And

Axel Honneth (2004) 'Organized Self-Realization: Some Paradoxes of Individualization', *European Journal of Social Theory* 7(4): 463-78.

On Canvas.

B. Fay *Critical Social Science* (Polity, 1987) Ch 2

L. Harvey *Critical Social Research* (Unwin Hyman, 1990) Ch 1

M. Hammersley *Taking Sides in Social Research: Essays on Partisanship and Bias* (Routledge, 2000) Ch 1

Seminar Questions:

1. What are some characteristics of critical thinking?
2. In what ways, according to Habermas, is knowledge based on 'human interests'?
3. How convincing are the arguments of Harvey and Fay for a critical orientation to social research?
4. Is it possible for social scientific research to be value-free?
5. Do Hammersley's arguments undermine the positions of Harvey and Fay? How might they respond?
6. Which features of social life might a critical account misconstrue?

Further Reading:

On the background to contemporary critical theory, see:

James Bohman 'Critical Theory as practical Knowledge: Participants, Observers and Critics' in S. Turner and P. Roth *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* (Blackwell, 2003).

M. Jay *The Dialectical Imagination* (Heinemann, 1973)

D. Held *Introduction to Critical Theory: Horkheimer to Habermas* (Hutchinson, 1980)

P. Connerton (ed) *Critical Sociology* (Penguin, 1976) is a useful anthology of some of the older texts

D. Couzens Hoy and T. McCarthy *Critical Theory* (Blackwell, 1997)

A classic empirical application of critical theory:

Adorno, T. et al (1982) *The Authoritarian Personality* (New York: Norton).

There is an extensive literature on Habermas. See, especially, the following:

T. McCarthy *The Critical Theory of Jürgen Habermas* (Hutchison, 1978)

R. Geuss *The Idea of a Critical Theory: Habermas and the Frankfurt School* (C.U.P. 1981)

R. Keat *The Politics of Social Theory: Habermas, Freud and the Critique of Positivism* (Blackwell, 1984)

W. Outhwaite *Habermas: A Critical Introduction* (Polity, 1994)

G. Finlayson *Habermas: A Very Short Introduction* (OUP 2005)

G. Delanty *Social Theory in a Changing World* (Polity, 1999).

The most extensive statement of Habermas's position in relation to Marxist accounts of capitalism is:

J. Habermas *Legitimation Crisis* (Heinemann, 1976)

For a discussion, see:

D. Held 'Crisis tendencies, legitimation and the state' in D. Held and J. Thompson (eds) *Habermas: Critical Debates* (Macmillan, 1982)

Habermas makes extensive use of the sociological distinction between 'system integration' and 'social integration', developed by Lockwood. See:

D. Lockwood 'System integration and social integration' reprinted as an appendix to *Solidarity and Schism: The Problem of Disorder in Durkheimian and Marxist Sociology* (Clarendon Press, 1992)

For Gadamer's critique of critical theory, see:

H-G Gadamer 'Rhetoric, hermeneutics and the critique of ideology' in K. Mueller-Vollmer (ed) *The Hermeneutics Reader* (Blackwell, 1986)

For a feminist critique of Habermas, see:

N. Fraser 'What's critical about critical theory? The case of Habermas and gender' in S. Benhabib, D. Cornell (eds) *Feminism as Critique* (Polity, 1987) Also in N. Fraser *Unruly Practices B* (U of Minnesota Press, 1989)

For feminist discussions of Marxist 'exemplars' for critical theory, see:

N. Hartsock 'The feminist standpoint: developing the ground for a specifically feminist historical materialism' in S. Harding (ed.) *Feminism and Methodology* (Open Univ. Press, 1987)

M. O'Brien 'Reproducing Marxist man' in L. Clark, L. Lange (ed.) *The Sexism of Social and Political Theory: Women and Reproduction from Plato to Nietzsche* (Univ. of Toronto Press, 1979)

H. Hartmann 'The unhappy marriage of Marxism and Feminism' in L. Sargent (ed) *The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism* (Pluto, 1981)

On objectivity see:

Graham, K (2002) 'The ideal of objectivity in political dialogue: liberal and feminist approaches' *Social Epistemology*. 16 3 295-309.

Hammersley, M(2011) 'Objectivity: a reconceptualisation' in Williams, M and Vogt, W P (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Innovation in Social Research* Harding, S. (1986) *The Science Question in Feminism*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Harding, S. (1991) *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge?*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Harding, S. (1993) 'What is 'Strong Objectivity''? In L. Alcoff and E. Potter (eds), *Feminist Epistemologies* (New York: Routledge).

Janack, M (2002) 'Dilemmas of Objectivity' *Social Epistemology* 16 3 267-281. *Methods*. London: Sage 25- 43.

Longino, H (1990) *Science as Social Knowledge: Values and Objectivity in Scientific Inquiry* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Longino, H (1996) 'Subjects, Power and Knowledge: Prescription and Description in Feminist Philosophies of Science' in Fox Keller, E and Longino, H (eds) *Feminism and Science*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Topic 9: Critical and Pragmatic Social Science

The focus of this session is on developments in critical social science that have emerged out of the work of Pierre Bourdieu. We begin with a look at some of Bourdieu's main methodological ideas – in particular the notions of practice and reflexivity - and then contrast his approach with the more recent developments around pragmatic sociology as in the work of Boltanski and Thevenot.

Core Texts:

Pierre Bourdieu 'Radical Doubt' (in Delanty and Strydom eds, *Philosophies of Social Science: The Classic and Contemporary Readings*).

L. Boltanski and L. Thevenot (1999) 'The Sociology of Critical Capacity' *European Journal of Social Theory* 2 (359-77)

Links to articles on SyD

Discussion and Applications

M. Lamont and Thevenot, L. (2000) *Rethinking Comparative Sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Introduction.

Seminar questions:

1. What is the aim of a reflexive sociology, according to Bourdieu?
2. How useful is the notion of practice as a methodological tool?
3. What is critical capacity?

Further Reading:

Some of Bourdieu's methodological ideas can be found in:

P. Bourdieu *The Logic of Practice* (Polity Press, 1990)

P. Bourdieu *Sociology in Question* (Sage, 1995)

P. Bourdieu 'Toward a Reflexive Sociology'. In Turner, S. (ed.) *Social Theory and Sociology: The Classics and Beyond*. (Blackwell, 1996).

A good methodological introduction to his work is

P. Bourdieu and L. Wacquant *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992)

On Boltanski and Thevenot

Boltanski, L. and Thevenot, L (2006) *On Justification: Economies of Worth*. Princeton University Press.

Chiapelo, E. and Thevenot, L. (2005) *The New Spirit of Capitalism* London: Verso.

See P. Wagner (1999) 'After Justification: Repertoires of Evaluation and the Sociology of Modernity' *European Journal of Social Theory* 2: 341-57

T. Benatouil (1999) 'A Tale of Two Sociologies: The Critical and Pragmatic Stances' *European Journal of Social Theory* 2: 379-91.

E. Chiapelo (2003) 'Reconciling the two Principal Meaning of the Notion of Ideology: The Example of the "Spirit of Capitalism"' *European Journal of Social Theory* 6: 155-171.

F. Silber (2003) 'Pragmatic Sociology as Cultural Sociology: Beyond Repertoire Theory', *European Journal of Social Theory* 6 (4): 427-449.

Thevenot, L. (2001) 'Organized Complexity: Conventions of Coordination and the Composition of Economic Arrangements' *European Journal of Social Theory* 4 (4): 405-25

Thevenot, L. (2007) 'A Science of Life Together in the World' *European Journal of Social Theory* 10 (2): 233-44

Topic 10: Feminism: Social inquiry reconstructed or de-constructed?

In this session, we will use debates in feminist epistemology to re-assess some of the different arguments addressed in the course. On the one hand, feminism has been a major stimulus to the reconstruction of social science and the questioning of mainstream social science as 'male-stream'. On the other hand, feminists have also expressed their suspicion at the deconstruction of 'reason' as male. The session will be organised in terms of debates over 'feminist empiricism', 'standpoint theory', 'postmodern feminism' and black/majority world feminism. We will look at the question, of who has the right to speak: are only women able to interpret the social condition of other women, as some standpoint theorists argue, or is there no such thing as authentic experience as postmodern feminists such as Joan Scott claim? In what way too have black and majority world feminists criticised the universalising tendency of western feminisms to speak about women as united and homogeneous?

The session is also concerned with the ways epistemological issues and problems can be overcome through the introduction of reflexive and autobiographical research methodologies? Is there such a thing as a 'feminist' research method? If so, to what extent can it embrace and progress feminist knowledge claims, interests and ethics? To what extent has the attempt by different groups to develop their own methodological approaches been successful? Are methodological approaches designed to collect and analyse quantitative data 'masculine' and so antithetical to true feminist enquiry? Are approaches that adopt a participatory, qualitative approach automatically more likely to result in research findings that take due cognisance of women's experiences and lives? Are they less likely to make participants feel objectified by the research process? Can we collect viable or significant data from groups we don't belong to or identify with? Is politicised method more or less likely to produce 'reliable' or relevant evidence for social scientific enquiry?

Core Reading:

MsCall, L. 'The Complexity of Intersectionality'

Walby, S. et al 'Intersectionality: Multiple Inequalities in Social Theory'

Other core readings:

S. Harding *The Science Question in Feminism* (Open Univ. Press, 1986) - Ch.6

E. Grosz 'What is feminist theory?' in C. Pateman, E. Gross (eds.) *Feminist Challenges* (Allen and Unwin, 1986)

M. Hawkesworth (1989) 'Knower, knowing, known: feminist theory and claims of truth' *Signs* 14(3): 533-57.

J.W. Scott (1992) 'Experience', in J. Butler and J. Scott (eds.), *Feminists Theorize the Political*. New York and London: Routledge.

C.T. Mohanty (2002) "'Under Western Eyes" Revisited: Feminist solidarity through anticapitalist struggles', *Signs* 28 (2): 499-533.

L. Stanley (1993) 'The Knowing Because Experiencing Subject: Narratives, lives, autobiographies', *Women's Studies International Forum* 16(3): 205-215.

Seminar Questions:

1. Which of the accounts of feminist knowledge do you find most convincing: feminist empiricism, feminist standpoint, or postmodern feminism? Why?
2. To what extent can social scientific research be independent of political values and influences?
3. Does Smith's research project gain anything from her adoption of a feminist standpoint perspective? Does it lose anything?

Further Reading:

On the feminist critique of the 'universalistic' discourse of science, see:

S. Harding *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge?* Ch 5

E.F. Keller (1982) 'Feminism and science' *Signs* 11(3)

S. Bordo (1986) 'The Cartesian masculinization of thought' *Signs* 11(3),. [the last two articles are available in, S. Harding, J. O'Barr (eds) *Sex and Scientific Inquiry* (U. of Chicago Press, 1987)

K.P. Addelson 'The man of professional wisdom' in S. Harding, M.B. Hintikka (eds.) *Discovering Reality: Feminist Perspectives on Epistemology, Metaphysics, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science* (Reidel, 1983)

See also:

A. Phillips 'Universal pretensions in political thought' in M. Barrett, A. Philips (eds.) *Destabilising Theory: Contemporary Feminist Debates* (Polity, 1992)

C. MacKinnon *Toward a Feminist Theory of the State* (Harvard UP, 1989) esp, Ch 6.

On feminist standpoint theory, see:

A. Jaggar *Feminist Politics and Human Nature* (Rowman and Littlefield, 1988) Ch 11

N. Hartsock 'The feminist standpoint: developing the ground for a specifically feminist historical materialism' in S. Harding (ed.) *Feminism and Methodology* OUP, 1987)

D. Smith *The Everyday World as Problematic* (Open UP, 1988) Chs 1, 2.

For a critique using Weberian methodology of ideal types, see:

S.J. Hekman (1997) 'Truth and method: feminist standpoint theory revisited' *Signs* 22(2), (and comments by Harding, Smith, Hartsock in the same issue)

On the 'generalisation' of 'marginal' identities in the opposition to 'white, male, middle-class' theory, see:

S. Harding (1992) 'Subjectivity, experience and knowledge: an epistemology from/for rainbow coalition politics' in J.N. Peterse (ed) *Emancipations, Modern and Postmodern* (Sage)

C. Lemert (1994) 'Dark thoughts about the self' in C. Calhoun (ed) *Social Theory and the Politics of Identity* (Blackwell)

L. Nicholson 'On the postmodern barricades: feminism, politics and theory' in S.A. Seidman, D.G. Wagner (eds.) *Postmodernism and Social Theory* (Blackwell, 1992)

D. Haraway (1990) 'A manifesto for cyborgs: science, technology, and socialist feminism in the 1980s' in L. Nicholson (ed.) *Feminism/Postmodernism* (Routledge)

For a critique of epistemological privilege to any group, see:

B-A. Bar On (1993) 'Marginality and epistemic privilege' in L. Alcoff, E. Potter (eds) *Feminist Epistemologies* (Routledge)

On postmodern feminism, see:

S. Hekman (1990) *Gender and Knowledge* Ch 5

A. Yeatman (1995) 'Postmodern epistemological politics and social science' in K. Lennon, M. Whitford (eds.) *Knowing the Difference: Feminist Perspectives in Epistemology* (Routledge, 1995)

L. J. Nicholson (1990) (ed.) *Feminism/ Postmodernism* (Routledge). Esp., essays in Part I

For an argument that the 'crisis in reason' should be exacerbated, see:

E. Grosz (1993) 'Bodies and knowledges: feminism and the crisis of reason' in L. Alcoff, E. Potter (eds). *Feminist Epistemologies* (Routledge)

For criticisms of postmodern feminism, see:

I. Barwell (1995) 'Towards a defence of objectivity' in K. Lennon, M. Whitford (eds.) *Knowing the Difference: Feminist Perspectives in Epistemology* (Routledge, 1995)

S. Strickland (1995) 'Feminism, postmodernism and difference' K. Lennon, M. Whitford (eds.) *Knowing the Difference: Feminist Perspectives in Epistemology* (Routledge)

G. McLennan 'Feminism, epistemology and postmodernism' *Sociology* 29(3) 1995

For a defence of 'feminist empiricism', see:

L. H. Nelson 'Feminist epistemological communities' in L. Alcoff, E. Potter (eds) *Feminist Epistemologies* (Routledge, 1993)

J. Holmwood (1995) 'Feminism and epistemology: what kind of successor science?' *Sociology* 29(3).

A. Oakley (X) 'Interviewing women: a contradiction in terms' in Y.S. Lincoln, K. N. Denzin (eds.) *Turning Points in Qualitative Research: Tying Knots in a Handkerchief* (Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press).

A. Oakley (2000) *Experiments in Knowing: Gender and Method in the Social Sciences* (Polity)

S. Hacker (1990) *Doing it the Hard Way: Investigations of Gender and Technology* (Boston: Unwin Hyman).

N. Westmarland (2001) 'The Quantitative/Qualitative Debate and Feminist Research: A Subjective View of Objectivity' *Forum for Qualitative Social Research* Volume 2, No. 1, Art. 13: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/974/2124>.

C. Ramazanoglu with J. Holland (2003) *Feminist Methodology: Challenges and Choices* (Sage Publications: London)

C. Ramazanoglu (1992). 'On feminist methodology: male reason versus female empowerment'. *Sociology*, 26(2): 207-212.

P. Lather (1986) 'Issues of Validity in Openly Ideological Research: Between a Rock and a Soft Place' *Interchange*, Vol. 17, No. 4 (Winter 1986): 63-84.

A. Oakley (X) 'Interviewing women: a contradiction in terms' in Y.S. Lincoln, K. N. Denzin (eds.) *Turning Points in Qualitative Research: Tying Knots in a Handkerchief* (Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press).

A. Oakley (2000) *Experiments in Knowing: Gender and Method in the Social Sciences* (Polity)

S. Hacker (1990) *Doing it the Hard Way: Investigations of Gender and Technology* (Boston: Unwin Hyman).

N. Westmarland (2001) 'The Quantitative/Qualitative Debate and Feminist Research: A Subjective View of Objectivity' *Forum for Qualitative Social Research* Volume 2, No. 1, Art. 13: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/974/2124>.

C. Ramazanoglu with J. Holland (2003) *Feminist Methodology: Challenges and Choices* (Sage Publications: London)

C. Ramazanoglu (1992). 'On feminist methodology: male reason versus female empowerment'. *Sociology*, 26(2): 207-212.

P. Lather (1986) 'Issues of Validity in Openly Ideological Research: Between a Rock and a Soft Place' *Interchange*, Vol. 17, No. 4 (Winter 1986): 63-84.

Further reading on:

Race research:

L. Back and J. Solomos (2001) 'Doing Research, Writing Politics: The dilemmas of political intervention in research on racism', in H. Goulbourne, *Race and Ethnicity: Critical concepts in sociology Volume III*. London: Routledge.

More on the feminist research process:

L. Stanley & S. Wise (1983). 'Back into the personal or: our attempt to construct feminist research'. In G. Bowles & R. Duelli Klein (Eds.), *Theories of women's studies* (pp.20-60). (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).

L. Stanley & S. Wise (1990). 'Method, methodology and epistemology in feminist research processes'. In L. Stanley (Ed.), *Feminist praxis* (pp.20-60). (London: Routledge)

A. McRobbie (1982). The politics of feminist research: between talk, text and action. *Feminist Review*, 12, 46-57.

More on quantitative research and its relationship to feminism:

A. Hunt (1986). 'Use of quantitative methods in researching issues which affect women' *Methodological Issues in Gender Research*, 10: 12-19.

Topic 11: Postcolonial Theory and Critiques of Western Social Science

The final topic concerns critiques of the epistemological assumptions of western social science. This is mostly focussed on postcolonial theory. We look at some of the classic positions within post colonial theory and take a few recent debates that seek to highlight the experiences of the non-northern hemisphere.

Core Reading:

Connell, Raewyn. 2006. "Northern Theory: the Political Geography of General Social Theory." *Theory and Society* 35(2):237-64.

Go, J. (2013) 'For a Post-Colonial Sociology' *Theory and Society* 42 (1): 22-55

Sitas, Ari. 2006. "The African Renaissance Challenge and Sociological Reclamations in the South." *Current sociology* 54(3):357-80

Additional text, R. Connell 'Why is Classical Theory Classical?'

These are available on Canvas as links to articles

See also

The Post Colonial Studies Reader, eds Ashcroft, B. et al Routledge 1995

(pdf can be down-loaded from internet)

Further Reading

Some classic texts that reflect a postcolonial perspective:

Aimé Césaire *Discourse on Colonialism* (1955)

Syed Hussein Alatas (essays on 'the captive mind')

Robert Young *White Mythologies* (1990)

Paul Gilroy *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (1993)

Anthony Appiah *In My Father's House: Africa in the Philosophy of Culture* (1992)

Homi Bhabha *Nation and Narration* (1990)

Homi Bhabha (editor) *The Location of Culture* (1994)

Dipesh Chakrabarty *Provincializing Europe* (2000)

Edward Said *Orientalism* (1979)

Some work on indigenous knowledge:

Descola, P. 2014. Modes of being and forms of predication. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 4(1): 271–280.

Ellen, R., P. Parkes, and A. Bicker (eds.). 2000. Indigenous environmental knowledge and its transformations: critical anthropological perspectives. *studies in Environmental Anthropology* 5. Amsterdam: Harwood.

Escobar, A. 2012. Notes on the ontology of design. In: Indigenous cosmopolitics: dialogues about the reconstitution of worlds. Organised by de La Cadena, M. and M. Blaser. Davis. California: University of California. October 30, 2012.

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. 2009. State of the world's indigenous peoples. New York: UNESA. http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/SOWIP_web.pdf. Accessed on July 15, 2014.

E. Viveiros de Castro, 2004. Exchanging Perspectives: The Transformation of Objects into Subjects in Amerindian Ontologies, in *Common Knowledge* 10.3: 463–84.

Topic 12. Consolidation: Group Analysis and Discussion

The final week will be devoted to group round-the-table discussion and analysis of the philosophical foundations of a new social science method developed by Dr Alexander Aisher. Following a demonstration and introduction to the method by the tutor, students will be invited to analyse the method through the lens of the philosophical concepts and frameworks explored across the module. The objective is to put into practice the topics discussed in the module.

Relevant materials will be supplied prior to the session.

Appendix 1

General Transdisciplinary Theoretical Frameworks in the Philosophy of Social Science

	Naturalistic	Interpretative	Critical
Epistemological foundations and philosophical traditions	Positivism Neopositivism Deduction Nomological-deductive Induction/observation based Probabilistic Predictive Principle of falsification Explanation	Hermeneutics Phenomenology Symbolic interactionism Social constructionism Induction Interpretation Understanding of beliefs, intentions, symbols, meaning	Marxism Feminism Postcolonialism Pragmatism Mediation Dialectics Abduction Diagnostic Reconstructive World-disclosure Theory and practice linked
Major representatives	Popper, Hempel, Nagel	Weber, Schutz, Mead Rational choice, Taylor, Geertz	Marx, Freud, Adorno, Foucault, Bourdieu Habermas, critical realism
Ontological Assumptions	Social reality as objective given	Reality as inter-subjective, linguistic	Structured, power relations, Emergent,
Theory of Society	Macro (large-scale social processes)	Micro (small group situations)	Meso (social conflict, movements, change)
Methodological approaches	Functionalism Middle range theory Measurement, measurable facts Search for regularities/social laws	Ideal types, Constructionism Discourse theory Narrative theory Frame analysis Performative theory Thick description	Ideology critique Social, cultural critique Deconstruction Anti-oppressive practice, critical practice

Research methods	Quantitative Fact finding Surveys Questionnaires Comparative	Qualitative Case study, interviews Participant observation Focus groups Content/media analysis, Documentary Ethnography	Quantitative Qualitative Action theory
Normative (political ethical) approaches	Neutral, universalistic Policy relevant	Neutral, relativist	Emancipation, enlightenment, anti- systemic

Appendix 2 Assessment

Write an essay on one of the following topics:

1. Select two or more major philosophies of social science and discuss how they lead to different methods of analysis
2. In what ways is social research influenced by ontological and epistemological assumptions?
3. Is there a difference between truth and objectivity in social science?
4. Does social science offer explanations or interpretations of social phenomena?
5. You can propose a topic that is directly relevant to the module aims and scope. The title must be approved by the module convenor.

Length: The essay should be about 4,000 words in length (this does not include additional material: the bibliography/References, notes etc). As a guide, the overall paper should not exceed 5000 words.

It should take the format of:

Title (one of the above)

Abstract (optional)

Text (ideally with a structure of Introduction, 3-4 titled subsections, conclusion, References)

Use the Harvard referencing system (author/date in text and full list of cited references under References).

Submission deadline

Please see your 'Assessment Deadlines and Exam Timetable' in Sussex Direct for the submission deadline and location. It is your responsibility to know when and where you should submit your work. Late submission will be penalised unless acceptable mitigating evidence is also submitted.

Essay Plans

You can send me by email a plan for the essay (that is rough outline, up to 1000 words) and I will provide some comments. You cannot send a draft of the essay. There is no particular deadline but please do so no later than 16th December.

It is recommended not to write the essay until after the module, or close to the end.

Please note the following paragraph from the Assessment and Examinations handbook for students, pertaining to word length. As a department we do not want to deduct marks for work just over the limit, but there may be times when even less than 10% over the stated limit does give an advantage and we may invoke this rule. We therefore strongly suggest that you keep within the word limit set. Your references in the bibliography do not count towards your overall word count.

1. Failure to observe limits of length

The maximum length for each assessment is publicised to students. The limits as stated include quotations in the text, but do not include the bibliography, footnotes/endnotes, appendices, abstracts, maps, illustrations, transcriptions of linguistic data, or tabulations of numerical or linguistic data and their captions. Any excess in length should not confer an advantage over other students who have adhered to the guidance. Students are requested to state the word count on submission. Where a student has marginally (within 10%) exceeded the word length the Marker should penalise the work where the student would gain an unfair advantage by exceeding the word limit. In excessive cases (>10%) the Marker need only consider work up to the designated word count, and discount any excessive word length beyond that to ensure equity across the cohort. Where an assessment is submitted and falls significantly short (>10%) of the word length, the Marker must consider in assigning a mark, if the argument has been sufficiently developed and is sufficiently supported and not assign the full marks allocation where this is not the case.

Advice on Choosing your own Topic

You may write your term papers on any topic you want that is related to the subject matter of the module.

If you formulate your own question, you should do so in consultation with the tutor who taught the topic which is related to your question. It is difficult to formulate a question well, so do bear the following in mind.

It is a good idea to start with a question as a working title, but by the time you finish you should choose a title, which reflects the central claim of the essay, and this will generally not be a question.

1. Be clear what the question is. Formulate or reformulate it as a question.
2. Formulate it clearly and concisely.
3. Make it an open question not a closed one. A closed question is one which is satisfactorily answered with a Yes or No.
4. It helps if the question arises in the context of an existing debate, for which there is an existing literature.
5. It helps to ask a question on which you have a definite opinion. Although you may not know what your answer is going to be in advance, you should at least know how to make a start.
6. It is good if it is a question which allows you to take sides. You don't want to end up with a lame, fence sitting conclusion.
7. Make sure the question calls for critical evaluation, not just exposition and analysis.