

Sociology 5111 FA: Problems and Issues in Sociology

Instructor: Dr. Antony Puddephatt
Class Location: RB 3027
Class Time: Fridays 8:30-11:30am

Office: RB 2034
Office Hours: Monday 8:30-10:30am
email: apuddeph@lakeheadu.ca
Office phone: 343-8091

Introduction to the Course:

Broadly, this course explores ontological, epistemological, and practical considerations to do with the production of knowledge, and how this relates to our own field of Sociology. To accomplish this, we spend the first half of the term exploring some of the foundational readings in the philosophy and sociology of science. We will read the competing visions of science from Karl Popper and Thomas Kuhn, look at the pioneering work of Robert Merton, and then consider the rise of the social constructionist approach to scientific knowledge as a response to these ideas. We then consider critical responses to social constructionist accounts from Bruno Latour's non-modernism, authors of feminist standpoint theories, and Pierre Bourdieu's approach that conceives science as a practice that operates in a competitive field of struggle. We then turn our attention to a reflexive examination of Sociology, its culture and hierarchy, and the ways in which it represents a set of craft practices. We conclude the course by reading contemporary debates in the discipline, including the call for a more public sociology, and the institutional place and vision for Canadian sociology in the wider global context.

Mark Breakdown:

- | | |
|-------------------------|-----|
| 1. Short Essays (2) | 60% |
| 2. Leading Seminars (2) | 20% |
| 3. Participation | 20% |

Explanation of Assignments

1. Short Essay Papers

I will ask you to write two short (maximum 10 pages, double-spaced, 2 point times new roman + references) papers to respond to a question or set of questions I raise about the readings over a series of weeks. These papers should be well written, well structured, and demonstrate your knowledge of the readings as well as your ability to evaluate the ideas and compare and contrast them in critical ways. Deadlines will be October 31 and December 10, 2014. The question(s) I ask you to respond to will be provided as the term progresses.

2. Seminar Presentations

For two weeks of your choosing, you are responsible for leading discussion on the course readings. Your job is to ensure that the class participates in discussion, and answers questions, about the key ideas of the work for that week. Handouts, audio-visual aids, etc are optional. The main thing you will be graded on is the coverage of the major ideas, and your ability to "make the class work" in encouraging active participation in this regard.

3. Participation

Because this is a seminar class, participation is very important. This grade evaluates your preparedness for class, and your ability to demonstrate knowledge of the key ideas of the readings, and to provide insightful comments/analysis/critique in this regard. The quality of your participation is more important than the quantity (i.e. irrelevant or tangential contributions are not worth in comparison to those that are more directly “on point”).

Course Schedule:

September 12: Welcome and introduction to the Course

September 19: Searching for the Soul of Science: Kuhn and Popper

1. Popper, Karl. 1999. “Selections from the Logic of Scientific Discovery,” pp 99-119 in Boyd, Gasper and Trout (eds.) *The Philosophy of Science*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
2. Kuhn, Thomas. 1999. “Scientific Revolutions,” pp 139-157 in Boyd, Gasper and Trout (eds.) *The Philosophy of Science*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
3. Fuller, Steve. 2004. “Kuhn and Popper: A Case of Mistaken Identities,” pp 12-19 in *Kuhn vs. Popper: The Struggle for the Soul of Science*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

September 26: Robert Merton: Pioneer in the Sociology of Science

Merton, Robert. 1973. *The Sociology of Science: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

1. “The Puritan Spur to Science,” pp 228-253,
2. “The Normative Structure of Science,” pp 267-280, and
3. “The Mathew Effect in Science” pp 439-459

October 3: Ambivalence, Ideology, and Boundaries in Science

1. Mitroff, Ian. 1974. “Norms and Counter-Norms in a Select Group of the Apollo Moon Scientists: A Case Study of the Ambivalence of Scientists,” *American Sociological Review*, 39: 579-595.
2. Gieryn, Thomas. 1983. “Boundary Work and the Demarcation of Science from Nonscience: Strains and Interests in the Professional Ideologies of Scientists,” *American Sociological Review*, 48(6): 781-795.
3. David Bloor. 1976. “The Strong Programme in the Sociology of Scientific Knowledge,” pp 1-23 in *Knowledge and Social Imagery*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

October 10: From Social Constructionism to Non-modernism: Latour’s Actor-Networks

1. Latour, Bruno. 1993. *We Have Never Been Modern*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.

October 17: Feminist Critiques of Science and Standpoint Epistemology

1. Harding, Sandra. 2001. "Feminist Standpoint Epistemology," pp 145-168 in Muriel Lederman and Ingrid Bartsch (eds.) *The Gender and Science Reader*. New York, NY: Routledge.
2. Haraway, Donna. 2001. "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective," pp 169-188 in Muriel Lederman and Ingrid Bartsch (eds.) *The Gender and Science Reader*. New York, NY: Routledge.
3. Fox, Mary Frank. 2010. "Women and Men Faculty in Academic Science and Engineering: Social-Organizational Indicators and Implications," *American Behavioral Scientist*, 53(7): 997-1012.

October 24: Critical and Reflexive Accounts of Science

1. Bourdieu, Pierre. 2004. *Science of Science and Reflexivity*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

October 31: Graduate Cultures, Networks, and Hierarchies in Sociology

1. Ferrales, Gabrielle and Gary Alan Fine. 2005. "Sociology as Vocation: Reputations and Group Cultures in Graduate School," *The American Sociologist*, 36(2): 57-75.
2. Puddephatt, Antony, Benjamin Kelly, and Michael Adorjan. 2006. "Cultivating Authenticity in Graduate Sociology," *The American Sociologist*, 37(3): 84-98.
3. Burris, Val. 2004. "The Academic Caste System: Prestige Hierarchies in PhD Exchange Networks," *American Sociological Review*, 69(2): 239-264.

ESSAY 1 DUE!!!

November 7: From Sociology as Science to Sociology as Craft

1. Mills, C Wright. 1959. "Appendix: On Intellectual Craftsmanship," pp 195-226 in C.W. Mills' *The Sociological Imagination*. Oxford University Press.
2. Alford, Robert. 1998. Selection (p 11-53) from *The Craft of Inquiry: Theories, Methods, Evidence*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

November 14: Canadian Sociology in Crisis?

1. McLaughlin, Neil. 2005. "Canada's Impossible Science: Historical and Institutional Origins of the Coming Crisis in Anglo-Canadian Sociology," *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 30(1): 1-40.
2. Baer, Douglas. 2005. "On the Crisis in Canadian Sociology: Comment on McLaughlin," *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 30(4): 491-502.
3. Johnston, Josee. 2005. "The Second Shift of Canadian Sociology: Setting Sociological Standards in a Global Era: A Response to McLaughlin's Impossible Science," *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 30(4): 513-527.
4. Warren, Jean-Philippe. 2006. "Sociologizing Alone? Is Anglo-Canadian Sociology Really Facing a Crisis?" *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 31(1): 91-105.

November 21: Should Sociology go Public?

1. Burawoy, Michael. 2005. "For Public Sociology," *American Sociological Review*, 70(1): 4-28.
2. Van den Berg, Axel. 2014. "Public Sociology, Professional Sociology, and Democracy," pp 53-73 in A. Hanemaayer and C.J. Schneider (eds.) *The Public Sociology Debate: Ethics and Engagement*. UBC Press.
3. Vannini, Philip and Laura Milne. 2014. "Public Ethnography as Public Engagement: Multimodal Pedagogies for Innovative Learning," pp 225-245 in A. Hanemaayer and C.J. Schneider (eds.) *The Public Sociology Debate: Ethics and Engagement*. UBC Press.

November 28: New Institutional Visions for Canadian Sociology

1. Mathews, Ralph. 2014. "Committing Canadian Sociology: Developing a Canadian Sociology and a Sociology of Canada," *Canadian Review of Sociology*, 51(2): 107-127.
2. Carroll, William. 2013. "Discipline, Field, Nexus: Revisioning Sociology," *Canadian Review of Sociology*, 50(1): 1-26.
3. Puddephatt, Antony and Neil McLaughlin. "Critical Nexus or Pluralist Discipline?" revise and resubmit, *Canadian Review of Sociology*.

ESSAY 2 DUE DECEMBER 10!!!

Thanks for the participating in the class, enjoy the winter break

Lakehead University Regulations:

IX Academic Dishonesty

The University takes a most serious view of offences against academic honesty such as plagiarism, cheating and impersonation. Penalties for dealing with such offences will be strictly enforced.

A copy of the "Code of Student Behaviour and Disciplinary Procedures" including sections on plagiarism and other forms of misconduct may be obtained from the Office of the Registrar.

The following rules shall govern the treatment of candidates who have been found guilty of attempting to obtain academic credit dishonestly.

- (a) The minimum penalty for a candidate found guilty of plagiarism, or of cheating on any part of a course will be a zero for the work concerned.
- (b) A candidate found guilty of cheating on a formal examination or a test, or of serious or repeated plagiarism, or of unofficially obtaining a copy of an examination paper before the examination is scheduled to be written, will receive zero for the course and may be expelled from the University.

Students disciplined under the Code of Student Behaviour and Disciplinary Procedures may appeal their case through the Judicial Panel.

Note: "Plagiarism" shall be deemed to include:

1. Plagiarism of ideas as where an idea of an author or speaker is incorporated into the body of an assignment as though it were the writer's idea, i.e. no credit is given the person through referencing or footnoting or endnoting.
2. Plagiarism of words occurs when phrases, sentences, tables or illustrations of an author or speaker are incorporated into the body of a writer's own, i.e. no quotations or indentations (depending on the format followed) are present but referencing or footnoting or endnoting is given.
3. Plagiarism of ideas and words as where words and an idea(s) of an author or speaker are incorporated into the body of a written assignment as though they were the writer's own words and ideas, i.e. no quotations or indentations (depending on format followed) are present and no referencing or footnoting or endnoting is given.