

Sociology 5111 FA: Problems and Issues in Sociology

Instructor: Dr. Antony Puddephatt
Class Location: RB 3027
Class Time: Wednesday 11:30am-2:30pm

Office: RB 2034
Office Hours: Wed 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, feminist standpoint theories, and Pierre Bourdieu's field theory. 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 changing nature of publishing, the role of disciplines in the organization of knowledge, 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 Seminar | 20% |
| 3. Participation | 20% |

Explanation of Assignments

1. Short Essay Papers

I will ask you to write two short (maximum 10 pages, double-spaced, 12 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 February 24 and then April 10. The questions I ask you to respond to will be provided as the term progresses.

2. Seminar Presentations

For one week of your choosing, you are responsible for leading discussion on the course readings for the week. 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.

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 much in comparison to those that are more directly “on point”).

Course Schedule:

January 6: Welcome and introduction to the Course

PART 1: The Sociology of Science/Scientific Knowledge

January 13: Searching for the Soul of Science: Kuhn and Popper (photocopies)

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.

January 20: Robert Merton: Pioneer in the Sociology of Science

1. Merton, Robert. 1973. *The Sociology of Science: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
“The Puritan Spur to Science,” pp 228-253 (D2L)
“The Normative Structure of Science,” pp 267-280 (D2L)
“The Mathew Effect in Science” pp 439-459 (D2L)

January 27: Rise of the “New” Sociology of 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. Michael Lynch. 1993. “Chapter 3: The Rise of the New Sociology of Scientific Knowledge,” pp 71-116 in M. Lynch’s *Scientific Practice and Ordinary Action*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. (D2L)
3. Knorr-Cetina, Karin. 1995. “Laboratory Studies: The Cultural Approach to the Study of Science,” pp 140-166 in S. Jasanoff et al. (eds.) *Handbook of Science and Technology Studies*. Sage Publishing. (D2L)

February 3: From Social Constructionism to Non-modernism: Latour’s Actor-Networks

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

February 10: Critical and Reflexive Accounts of Science

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

February 17: Reading week!

PART 2: The Sociology of Sociology

February 24: From Sociology as Science to Sociology as Cultural Craft

1. Mills, C Wright. 1959. "Appendix: On Intellectual Craftsmanship," pp 195-226 in C.W. Mills' *The Sociological Imagination*. Oxford University Press. (D2L)
2. Alford, Robert. 1998. Selection (p 11-53) from *The Craft of Inquiry: Theories, Methods, Evidence*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. (D2L)
3. Puddephatt, Antony, Benjamin Kelly, and Michael Adorjan. 2006. "Cultivating Authenticity in Graduate Sociology," *The American Sociologist*, 37(3): 84-98.

ESSAY 1 DUE!

March 2: Publishing Sociology in the Digital Age

1. Willinsky, John. 2006. "Opening" and "Access," pp 1-37 in J. Willinsky's *The Access Principle: The Case for Open-Access to Research and Scholarship*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. (D2L)
2. Xia, Jingfeng et. al. 2014. "Who Publishes in 'Predatory' Journals?" *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*. DOI: 10.1002/asi.23265.
3. Puddephatt, Antony and Taylor Price. "Symbolic Interaction, Public Sociology, and the Potential of Open-Access Publishing," (article submitted to *Symbolic Interaction*) (D2L)

March 9: Do we still need Disciplines?

1. Jacobs, Jerry. 2013. *In Defense of Disciplines: Interdisciplinarity and Specialization in the Research University*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. (bookstore) (read chapters 2-7 & 10).

March 16: Should Sociology go Public?

1. Burawoy, Michael. 2005. "For Public Sociology," *American Sociological Review*, 70(1): 4-28.
2. Creese, Gillian, A.T. McLaren, and J. Pulkingman. 2009. "Re-thinking Burawoy: Reflections from Canadian Feminist Sociology," *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 34(3): 601-622.
3. 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. (D2L)

March 23: 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.

March 30: 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? Institutional Ambivalence and the Future of Canadian Sociology," *Canadian Review of Sociology*, 52(3): 310-332.

ESSAY 2 DUE April 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.