

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-54046-9 - The Cambridge Dictionary of Sociology
Edited by Bryan S. Turner
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

The Cambridge Dictionary of Sociology

Providing an authoritative and comprehensive overview of the classical and the contemporary, this volume is an indispensable guide to the vibrant and expanding field of sociology. Featuring over 600 entries, from concise definitions to discursive essays, written by leading international academics, the *Dictionary* offers a truly global perspective, examining both American and European traditions and approaches. Entries cover schools, theories, theorists, and debates, with substantial articles on all key topics in the field. While recognizing the richness of historical sociological traditions, the *Dictionary* also looks forward to new and evolving influences such as cultural change, genetics, globalization, information technologies, new wars, and terrorism. Most entries incorporate references for further reading, and a cross-referencing system enables easy access to related areas. This *Dictionary* is an invaluable reference work for students and academics alike and will help to define the field of sociology in years to come.

BRYAN S. TURNER is Professor of Sociology in the Asia Research Institute at the National University of Singapore, where he leads the research team for the Religion and Globalisation cluster. Prior to this, he was Professor of Sociology in the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences at the University of Cambridge. Professor Turner is the author of *The New Medical Sociology* (2004) and *Society and Culture: Principles of Scarcity and Solidarity* (with Chris Rojek, 2001), and is the founding editor of the *Journal of Classical Sociology* (with John O'Neill), *Body & Society* (with Mike Featherstone), and *Citizenship Studies*. He is currently writing a three-volume study on the sociology of religion for Cambridge University Press.

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-54046-9 - The Cambridge Dictionary of Sociology
Edited by Bryan S. Turner
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

BOARD OF EDITORIAL ADVISORS

Ira Cohen, *Rutgers University*

Jeff Manza, *Northwestern University*

Gianfranco Poggi, *Universita di Trento*

Beth Schneider, *University of California, Santa Barbara*

Susan Silbey, *Massachusetts Institute of Technology*

Carol Smart, *University of Leeds*

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-54046-9 - The Cambridge Dictionary of Sociology
Edited by Bryan S. Turner
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

The
Cambridge Dictionary of
SOCIOLOGY

General Editor
BRYAN S. TURNER



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-54046-9 - The Cambridge Dictionary of Sociology
Edited by Bryan S. Turner
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo

Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521540469

© Cambridge University Press 2006

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2006

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN-13 978-0-521-83290-8 hardback
ISBN-10 0-521-83290-X hardback
ISBN-13 978-0-521-54046-9 paperback
ISBN-10 0-521-54046-1 paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for
the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or
third-party internet websites referred to in this book,
and does not guarantee that any content on such
websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-54046-9 - The Cambridge Dictionary of Sociology
Edited by Bryan S. Turner
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

To the memory of my parents Sophia Turner (née Brookes) and
Stanley W. Turner

Contents

<i>List of contributors</i>	<i>page viii</i>
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	x
<i>Introduction</i>	xi
<i>How to use this Dictionary</i>	xix

THE DICTIONARY

List of contributors

- Gabriel Abend, *Northwestern University*
 Gary L. Albrecht, *University of Illinois, Chicago*
 Jeffrey Alexander, *Yale University*
 Tomas Almaguer, *San Francisco State University*
 Patrick Baert, *University of Cambridge*
 Jack Barbalet, *University of Leicester*
 James Beckford, *University of Warwick*
 Stephen Benard, *Cornell University*
 Michael Billig, *Loughborough University*
 Mildred Blaxter, *University of Bristol*
 Mick Bloor, *University of Glasgow*
 William A. Brown, *University of Cambridge*
 Brendan J. Burchell, *University of Cambridge*
 Stewart Clegg, *University of Technology, Sydney*
 Elizabeth F. Cohen, *Syracuse University*
 Ira Cohen, *Rutgers University*
 Oonagh Corrigan, *University of Plymouth*
 Rosemary Crompton, *City University, London*
 Sean Cubitt, *The University of Waikato, New Zealand*
 Tom Cushman, *Wellesley College*
 Tia DeNora, *University of Exeter*
 Peter Dickens, *University of Cambridge*
 Michele Dillon, *University of New Hampshire*
 S. N. Eisenstadt, *The Jerusalem Van Leer Institute*
 Tony Elger, *University of Warwick*
 Anthony Elliott, *Flinders University of South Australia*
 Amitai Etzioni, *The Communitarian Network, Washington*
 Mary Evans, *University of Kent*
 Ron Eyerman, *Yale University*
 James D. Faubion, *Rice University*
 Janie Filoteo, *Texas A & M University*
 Gary Alan Fine, *Northwestern University*
 David Frisby, *London School of Economics*
 Loraine Gelsthorpe, *University of Cambridge*
 Julian Go, *Boston University*
 David Good, *University of Cambridge*
 Philip Goodman, *University of California, Irvine*
 Susan Hansen, *Murdoch University*
 Bernadette Hayes, *University of Aberdeen*
 Chris Haywood, *University of Newcastle upon Tyne*
 John Heritage, *University of California, Los Angeles*
 John Hoffman, *University of Leicester*
 John Holmwood, *University of Sussex*
 Robert Holton, *Trinity College, Dublin*
 Darnell Hunt, *University of California, Los Angeles*
 Geoffrey Ingham, *University of Cambridge*
 Engin Isin, *York University, Canada*
 Andrew Jamison, *Aalborg University*
 Valerie Jenness, *University of California, Irvine*
 Bob Jessop, *Lancaster University*
 James E. Katz, *Rutgers University*
 Douglas Kellner, *University of California, Los Angeles*
 Krishan Kumar, *University of Virginia*
 John Law, *Lancaster University*
 Charles Lemert, *Wesleyan University*
 Donald N. Levine, *University of Chicago*
 Ruth Lister, *Loughborough University*
 Steven Loyal, *University College, Dublin*
 Mairtin Mac-an-Ghaill, *University of Birmingham*
 Michael Macy, *Cornell University*
 Jeff Manza, *Northwestern University*
 Robert Miller, *Queen's University, Belfast*
 Jan Pakulski, *University of Tasmania*
 Edward Park, *Loyola Marymount University*
 Frank Pearce, *Queen's University, Canada*
 Emile Perreau-Saussine, *University of Cambridge*
 Chris Phillipson, *Keele University*
 Gianfranco Poggi, *Università di Trento, Italy*
 Dudley L. Poston,* *Texas A & M University*
 Stephen Quilley, *University College, Dublin*
 Mark Rapley, *Edith Cowan University*
 Larry Ray, *University of Kent at Canterbury*
 Isaac Reed, *Yale University*
 Thomas Reifer, *University of San Diego*
 Derek Robbins, *University of East London*
 Chris Rojek, *Nottingham Trent University*
 Mercedes Rubio, *American Sociological Association*

*Dudley Poston wishes to thank the following graduate students for their assistance: Mary Ann Davis, Chris Lewinski, Hua Luo, Heather Terrell and Li Zhang.

List of contributors

- | | |
|--|---|
| Rogelio Saenz, <i>Texas A & M University</i> | Piotr Sztompka, <i>Jagiellonian University, Poland</i> |
| Kent Sandstrom, <i>University of Northern Iowa</i> | Edward Tiryakian, <i>Duke University</i> |
| Cornel Sandvoss, <i>University of Surrey</i> | Kenneth H. Tucker, Jr., <i>Mount Holyoke College, MA</i> |
| Jacqueline Schneider, <i>University of Leicester</i> | Bryan S. Turner, <i>National University of Singapore</i> |
| Jackie Scott, <i>University of Cambridge</i> | Jonathan Turner, <i>University of California, Riverside</i> |
| Martin Shaw, <i>University of Sussex</i> | Stephen P. Turner, <i>University of South Florida</i> |
| Mark Sherry, <i>The University of Toledo</i> | Arnout van de Rijt, <i>Cornell University</i> |
| Birte Siim, <i>Aalborg University, Denmark</i> | Ann Vogel, <i>University of Exeter</i> |
| Susan Silbey, <i>Massachusetts Institute of Technology</i> | Frederic Volpi, <i>University of St. Andrews</i> |
| Carol Smart, <i>University of Manchester</i> | Alan Warde, <i>University of Manchester</i> |
| Vicki Smith, <i>University of California, Davis</i> | Darin Weinberg, <i>University of Cambridge</i> |
| Nick Stevenson, <i>University of Nottingham</i> | Andrew Wernick, <i>Trent University, Canada</i> |
| Rob Stones, <i>University of Essex</i> | Kevin White, <i>The Australian National University</i> |
| Richard Swedberg, <i>Cornell University</i> | Fiona Wood, <i>Cardiff University</i> |

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Sarah Caro, formerly Senior Commissioning Editor in Social Sciences at Cambridge University Press, for her tireless and cheerful commitment to this *Dictionary*, and her enthusiasm for the project of sociology as a whole. Her quiet determination to get the job done provided me with an enduring role model. More recently, John Haslam has effectively seen this project to a conclusion. Juliet Davis-Berry of the Press worked unstintingly to get lists, entries, and authors organized. Carrie Cheek has provided generous and careful secretarial and editorial support in collecting entries, corresponding with authors, overseeing corrections, and dealing with my mistakes. Without her ongoing support, the *Dictionary* would not have been completed. Leigh Mueller worked with extraordinary vigilance to correct the proofs of the *Dictionary* and to impose some standard of excellence on often wayward English.

The editorial board members – Ira Cohen, Jeff Manza, Gianfranco Poggi, Beth Schneider, Susan Silbey, and Carol Smart – contributed to the development of the list of entries, read and re-read draft entries, and made substantial contributions of their own. Ira Cohen, in particular, wrote major entries, advised authors, and recruited his daughter as a contributor. The authors kindly responded to criticism and correction of their draft submissions with considerable tolerance. Many authors struggled with major illness, family breakdown, and the sheer cussedness of everyday life to complete entries on time. The following authors wrote many additional and extensive essays, often at the last minute to fill in gaps caused by entries that were missing for a variety of reasons, and I am especially grateful to them: Stewart Clegg, Tony Elgar, Mary Evans, Susan Hansen, John Hoffman, John Holmwood, Charles Lemert, Steven Loyal, Stephen Quilley, Mark Rapley, Larry Ray, Darin Weinberg, and Kevin White. The *Dictionary* is, in short, a genuinely collective effort. However, any remaining errors and omissions are my responsibility.

Introduction

At one level, sociology is easy to define. It is the study of social institutions – the family, religion, sport, community, and so on. We can study institutions at the micro-level by looking at interactions between family members, for example, or we can examine macro-relations such as the family and kinship system of a society as a whole. Below this level of minimal agreement, there is considerable dispute as to what sociology really is, and during the twentieth century and into this century many critics of sociology have periodically pronounced it to be in crisis or to be moribund. It is said to be prone to jargon, or it is claimed by its critics to be merely common sense. A natural scientist at my former Cambridge college, on hearing that I was editing a dictionary of sociology, inquired in all seriousness whether there would be enough concepts and terms for a whole dictionary. My problem as editor has by contrast been the question of what to leave out. In this context of lay skepticism, a dictionary of sociology is in part a defense of the discipline from its detractors, and in part a statement of its achievements and prospects. It aims to give a precise, informative, and objective account of the discipline, including both its successes and failures, and in this sense dictionaries are inherently conservative. A dictionary seeks to give an informed guide to a particular field such that both the expert and the student can benefit intellectually.

In many respects, part of the problem for sociology as an academic discipline lies in its very success. An outsider to the academy at the end of the nineteenth century, sociology is now influential in archaeology, the arts, the history and philosophy of science, science and technology studies, religious studies, organizational theory, and in the teaching of general practice and community medicine in medical faculties, where the social dimension of everyday reality is now taken for granted. The study of contemporary epidemics in public health, especially the AIDS/HIV epidemic, has employed sociological insights into networks and risk taking. The management of any future pandemic will draw upon sociological research on social networks, compliance behavior, and the impact of such factors as social class, gender, and age on prevalence rates. Other areas such as art history and aesthetics often draw implicitly on sociological notions of audiences, art careers, art markets, and cultural capital. Science and technology studies more explicitly depend on the sociology of knowledge. Dance studies frequently adopt insights and perspectives from the sociology of the body. It is often difficult to distinguish between historical sociology, social history and world-systems theory. Cultural studies, women's studies, and disability studies have drawn extensively on debates of social construction in sociology. Activists

Introduction

in social movements in support of disability groups have directly adopted sociological ideas about how disability as a social construct involves the curtailment of social rights. Ethnomethodology – the study of the methods or practices that are important in accomplishing tasks in the everyday world – has contributed to research on how people use complex machinery in workplace settings. Conversational analysis has been important in understanding how conversations take place, for example between doctor and patient. The emerging area of terrorism studies will no doubt have a substantial input from sociologists on recruitment patterns, beliefs, and social background. In short, there has been a great dispersion and proliferation of the sociological paradigm into adjacent fields and disciplines. Much of this intellectual dispersion or seepage has practical consequences.

The danger is, however, that the sociological perspective will, as a result of this intellectual leakage, simply dissolve into cultural studies, film studies, media studies, and so forth. Sociological insights and approaches have been successfully dispersed through the humanities and science curricula, but the intellectual connections with sociology are not always recognized or indeed understood. The contemporary enthusiasm for multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary often obscures the need to preserve basic disciplines. Although this dispersal of sociology into various areas within the humanities and social science curricula is satisfying in some respects, it is important to defend a sociological core, if sociology is to survive as a coherent and valid discipline. The idea of defending a “canon” has become somewhat unfashionable. In literary studies, the problem of the canonical authority of the received great texts has been a crucial issue in English literature since the publication of, for example, F. R. Leavis’s *The Great Tradition* in 1948. The idea of a sociological canon has been attacked by feminism and postmodernism for being too exclusive and narrow, but a canonical tradition does not have to be unduly narrow or parochial, and students need to understand how sociology developed, who contributed to its growth, and where contemporary concepts emerged historically. I would contend further that classical sociology, when generously defined, remains relevant to understanding the contemporary world. The study of “the social” remains the basis of the discipline, where the social is constituted by institutions. Where the intellectual roots of the discipline are ignored, the strong program of sociology as an autonomous discipline is eroded. A dictionary of sociology is an attempt to (re)state the principal theories and findings of the discipline, and thereby inevitably contributes to the definition of a canon. Sociology remains, however, a critical discipline, which constantly questions its origins and its evolution.

Of course, in many respects, sociology is not a homogeneous or seamless discipline. It has always been somewhat fragmented by different traditions, epistemologies, values, and methodologies. Sociological theories and ideas are perhaps more open to contestation and dispute, precisely because their social and political implications are radical. A dictionary of sociology has to articulate the coherence of the subject, and at the same time fully to recognize its

diversity. For example, one major division in sociology has been between the American and the European traditions. The basic difference is that sociology in America became thoroughly professionalized with a strong association (the American Sociological Association), a variety of professional journals, a clear apprenticeship process prior to tenure, and a reward system of prizes and honors. In Europe, professional associations have not been able to establish an agreed core of theory, methods, and substantive topics. While European sociology defines its roots in the classical tradition of Marx, Durkheim, Weber, and Simmel, American sociology more often sees its origins in the applied sociology of the Chicago School, in pragmatism, and in symbolic interactionism. American sociology has favored empiricism, pragmatism, and social psychology over European sociology, which has its foundations in the Enlightenment, the humanism of Auguste Comte, the political economy of Marx, and the critical theory of Adorno and Horkheimer. We should not overstate this division. There have been important figures in sociology, who, to some extent, have bridged the gap between the two traditions – C. Wright Mills, Talcott Parsons, Peter Berger, Neil Smelser, and more recently Jeffrey Alexander and Anthony Giddens. W. E. B. Du Bois was trained in both American and European traditions. Nevertheless the divisions are real and these historical differences have been, if anything, reinforced in recent years by the fact that European sociology has been more exposed to postmodernism, deconstruction, and poststructuralism than has the American tradition. In negative terms, European sociology has been more subject to rapid changes in fashions in social theory. Pragmatism, social reform, and applied sociology in America have been seen as an alternative to the excessive theoretical nature of European thought. While Adorno and Horkheimer saw American empiricism as the worst form of traditional theory, the Marxist revival in the 1960s and 1970s in Europe had little lasting impact in America. Talcott Parsons's sociology in fact never gained dominance in American sociology, partly because *The Structure of Social Action* was too European. More recently the pragmatist revival in America – for example in the social philosophy of Richard Rorty – has attempted to show once more that American social theory does not need any European inspiration. Recent European debates have not had much impact on mainstream American sociology. Two illustrations are important. The development of cultural studies that has been influential in British sociology, around the work of Richard Hoggart, Raymond Williams, Stuart Hall, and the Birmingham School, has had relatively little consequence in mainstream American sociology. The debate around Ulrich Beck's notion of risk society and the theory of individualization has not extended much beyond Europe.

In this new *Cambridge Dictionary of Sociology*, I have attempted to cover both American and European traditions by ensuring that the editorial board and the authors reflect these different approaches, and that the entries have afforded ample recognition of the richness of these different perspectives. Entries therefore attempt to provide a more global coverage of sociology by attending to these differences rather than obscuring or denying them. The

Introduction

Dictionary examines key intellectual figures in both European and American sociology, and also reflects different substantive, theoretical, and methodological perspectives. Although there are important differences that are the product of separate historical developments, the *Dictionary* also looks forward to new influences that are the common concerns of sociologists everywhere.

What are these new developments in sociology that the *Cambridge Dictionary* attempts to address? First, there is the debate about globalization itself. Sociologists have been concerned with two significant aspects of this process, namely the globalization of trade and finance following the collapse of the Bretton Woods agreements and the rise of the Washington consensus, and the development of technology and software that made possible global communication in an expanding economy. Sociologists have examined a variety of substantial changes relating to globalization, such as diasporic communities, global migration, fundamentalism, and the rise of the global city. Various theoretical responses to these changes are also fairly obvious. The analysis of risk society itself can be seen as a sociological response to the uncertain social consequences of economic globalization. Another development is the use of social capital theory to look at the social impact of global disorganization and economic inequality on individual health and illness. While the original foundations of globalization theory were explored in economics and politics (for example the global governance debate), sociologists have become to some extent more interested in cultural globalization in terms of mass media and cultural imperialism. As a result of globalization, sociologists have been exercised by the possibility of new forms of cosmopolitanism, and whether a cosmopolitan ethic can transform the character of sociology. These debates and concepts are fully represented in this *Dictionary*.

One important aspect of globalization has been a revival of the sociological study of religion. In the 1960s the sociology of religion was especially dominant, partly through the influence of sociologists such as Peter Berger, Thomas Luckmann, Bryan Wilson, and David Martin. However, as the secularization thesis became dominant, the intellectual fortunes of the sociology of religion declined. In American sociology, the study of cults and new religious movements was important, but the sociology of religion was no longer influential in sociology as a whole, and it was not at the cutting edge of sociological theory. The globalization process has given rise to a revival of the sociology of religion, especially in the study of fundamentalism. In this respect, the work of Roland Robertson on (cultural and religious) globalization has been particularly influential. Here again, however, there are important differences between America and Europe, because American sociology has been much more influenced by the applications of rational choice theory to religious behavior, giving rise to the notion of a “spiritual marketplace.” Whereas European societies have experienced a history of religious decline in terms of church attendance and membership, religion in America has remained an influential aspect of public life. The “new paradigm” in American sociology of religion has taken notice of

the “supply side” of religion, where competition in the religious market has expanded religious choice and fostered a buoyant spiritual marketplace.

It is obvious that 9/11, and the subsequent “war on terrorism,” have had and will continue to have a large impact on sociology. This political and military crisis demonstrated that the largely positive views of global society that were characteristic of the early stages of the study of globalization, for example on world democracy and governance, were somewhat one-sided, premature, and indeed utopian. The brave new world order had come to a sudden end. Global uncertainty was reinforced by the Afghan war, the war in Iraq, and the more general war on Al-Qaeda; and these world events have opened a new chapter in the history of sociological thought – the sociology of global terrorism. The bombings in Bali, Madrid, and London demonstrated the global nature of modern terrorism. We might argue that the sociology of globalization has, as it were, taken a dark turn. There is growing awareness of the need to study the global sex industry, including pornography, child sex abuse, sexual tourism, and the wider issues of slavery and the trade in women. The war on terrorism has made the sociology of the media even more prominent, but it has also demonstrated that sociology has until recently ignored such prominent social phenomena as war, terrorism and violence, money and exchange, and religion, human rights and law. There is also greater awareness of the need for a new type of medical sociology that will examine the globalization of epidemics of which HIV/AIDS, SARS and avian flu are dramatic examples. Critics have argued that the “cultural turn” in sociology that gave rise to a new interest in cultural phenomena in everyday life and to new interpretative methods, from discourse analysis to deconstruction as a method of textual analysis, has resulted in the neglect of traditional but important social phenomena – social class, poverty, inequality, power, and racial conflict. One further consequence of 9/11 and 7/7 (the bombings in London) has been a growing disillusionment with multiculturalism, and many social scientists have proclaimed “the end of multiculturalism” and have identified the rise of the “new xenophobia” in western societies. Future research on race, ethnicity, and identity will be colored by the despairing, bleak mood of the first decade of the new millennium.

While sociologists have been interested in the social causes of fundamentalism in general, research on political Islam has been especially prominent in current sociological research. These recent developments have resulted in various re-evaluations of Max Weber’s comparative sociology of religion. The debate about the relevance of the Protestant Ethic Thesis to Islam continues to interest sociologists, and there has also been much interest in the revival of Confucianism in Asia. There is, however, also recognition of the fact that we need new ways of thinking about modernization, secularization, and fundamentalism. The work of S. N. Eisenstadt in developing ideas about “multiple modernities” offers innovative theoretical strategies for sociological research. Globalization is therefore stimulating a rich arena of research in modern sociology, such as George Ritzer’s work on McDonaldization, Manuel

Introduction

Castells on the media, Martin Shaw on global military conflict, Thomas Cushman on global human rights, and David Martin on global Pentecostalism. This *Dictionary* provides substantial coverage of these issues, theories, and authors.

One major dimension of globalization is of course the expansion and transformation of media technology and information. Marshall McLuhan in the 1960s invented a variety of expressions to describe the arrival of a new age – in particular the idea of a global village. Every aspect of modern society has been revolutionized by these developments in communication and information – from “cybersex” and “telesurgery” to smart bombs. To understand the social changes that made possible the information society, there has been a revival of interest in technology. What had been rejected by Marxist sociology as “technological determinism” has become increasingly central to the sociological understanding of how the world is changing. Research on the impact of technology on spatial relationships, speed, and social networks can be seen in the growing interest in the idea of mobilities, social flows, and networks in the work of John Urry. The concern to understand technology has forced sociologists to think more creatively about how we interact with objects and networks between objects. The development of actor network theory has brought together spatial, technological, and science studies to understand the interactional relations between human beings and the world of objects. Many sociologists believe that these changes are so profound that a new type of sociology is required to analyze speed, mobility, and the compression of space. The “cultural turn” (a new emphasis on culture in modern society) was followed by the “spatial turn” (a new preoccupation with space, the global city, and urban design). In order to encompass these developments, the *Dictionary* has included many entries on information, communications, and mass media.

Technological change in modern society often involves a combination of information, genetics, computerization, and biomedicine. These developments in society have transformed the old debate about nature and nurture, and raised new issues about surveillance, individual freedoms, eugenics, and governmentality. The relationship between the human body, technology, and society has become increasingly complex, and the emergence of the sociology of the body can be regarded as one response to these intellectual, social, and legal developments. The ownership of the human body has become a major issue in legal conflicts over patients, patents, and profits. The early stages in the evolution of the sociology of the body were closely associated with feminism, the anthropology of Mary Douglas, and the work of Maurice Merleau-Ponty and Michel Foucault, but developments in micro-biology and information sciences are beginning to change these concerns with the body “as organism” to the body as “genetic map.” These new challenges arising from the implications of genetics for human aging and reproduction have given rise to the possibility of what Francis Fukuyama has called “our posthuman future.” This new intellectual confrontation between biology, informatics, and sociology has also produced a considerable re-assessment of the legacy of Charles Darwin, social Darwinism, and evolutionary thought. The social

problems associated with the application of genetics have stimulated a renewed interest in the changing nature of reproduction, gender, and the family. Stem-cell research, therapeutic cloning, and regenerative medicine are changing the intellectual horizons of medical sociology, and are raising new questions (for example, can we live forever?) – for which we have no satisfactory answers.

A reassessment of the relationships between sociology and biology is recasting the old debate between education and endowment, and in turn forcing us to rethink sex, sexuality, and gender. In the 1960s and 1970s mainstream sociology often neglected feminist theory and gender. The debate about how to measure social class, for example, often failed to take into account the class position of women by concentrating exclusively on the class position of men in the formal labor market. In the 1970s and 1980s, feminist analysis flourished and the work of Juliet Mitchell, Kate Millett, Germaine Greer, Ann Oakley, and Shulamith Firestone had a comprehensive impact on sociological research. Although feminist thought was often fragmented into materialist, socialist, and postmodern versions, feminism gave rise to a rich legacy of social theory and empirical work. Sociology has also been influenced by sexual politics, debates about identity, and queer theory. These debates over gender, sex, and sexuality were heavily influenced by the debate around social construction, perhaps first clearly enunciated by Simone de Beauvoir's claim that women are created by society rather than by biology. Medical technology has transformed the conditions under which people reproduce and has produced new methods of reproduction that do not require sexual intercourse between men and women. These new reproductive technologies are forcing sociologists to re-think the social relations of biological reproduction.

The emergence of gender studies, women's studies, and gay and lesbian studies has often meant that traditional areas such as sociology of the family and marriage have been overshadowed by new questions and new foci of research. While contemporary sociologists explore gay and lesbian cultures, an older, perhaps more socially conservative, tradition, represented by the work of Peter Laslett, Peter Willmott, Michael Young, and Elizabeth Bott in Britain and by W. J. Goode in America, went into decline. This relative decline of the family as a key topic of research is ironic – given the alleged ideological dominance of heterosexuality (“heteronormativity”) in mainstream society and in conventional sociology. We can imagine, however, that current sociological views of what constitutes gender and sexuality will have to change radically with changes in how humans reproduce through new reproductive technologies, surrogacy, same-sex marriages, “designer babies,” and cloning. These developments constitute a considerable component of this *Dictionary*.

Alongside the sociology of the body, there has been an important development of the sociology of the emotions, where the work of Jack Barbalet has been particularly innovative. By drawing on the legacy of William James, Barbalet pushed the debate about emotions away from social psychology towards seeing emotions as the link between social structure and the social

Introduction

actor. His work reminds us of the connection between contemporary theories of emotion and the work of classical economists such as Adam Smith in *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* of 1759. The contemporary analysis of emotions needs to be understood as part of a legacy of classical sociology and the Enlightenment.

Another way of approaching these critical debates is through the influence of postmodernism. Because conventional sociology has been associated with the Enlightenment tradition and modernity, postmodern theory was seen as an attack on classical sociology. Thinkers such as Durkheim and Weber were held up to be the epitome of modern as opposed to postmodern social theory. There are at least two problems associated with these critical evaluations of classical sociology. They often fail to distinguish between postmodernity as a state of society (for example, as illustrated by flexibility in employment, the dominance of service industries, the growth of information technologies, the rise of consumerism, and the general decline of a post-Fordist economy) and postmodernism as a type of theory (which employs textual analysis, irony, bathos, essay form, and aphorism). We can therefore understand postmodernity without difficulty via sociological concepts (that are related to the theory of postindustrial society) without having to accept postmodern theory. Postmodern theory in Europe is still influential in the sociological analysis of culture and identity, and it was influential in the expansion of new methodologies that questioned the legacies of positivism and behaviorism. In the postwar period there was initially a dominant focus on survey data and quantitative analysis, but there has been a growing interest in qualitative methodologies, ethnographies, biographical research, oral history, and discourse analysis. There is also an emerging interest in the use of electronic communication as a method of conducting research. These movements in social theory – constructionism, postmodernism, poststructuralism, and queer theory – have been somewhat eclipsed by the growing interest in globalization theory and awareness of the negative aspects of globalization such as new wars, terrorism, slavery, and crime. With the impact of globalization, new debates will emerge in sociology around the question of cosmopolitanism and global sociology.

The Cambridge Dictionary of Sociology attempts therefore to cover these new, important and controversial developments in sociology, but it is also concerned not to become disconnected from the sociological tradition. In developing this modern *Dictionary*, I have been at pains to retain a lively and committed relationship to the diverse traditions and legacies of classical sociology, which have shaped the sociological imagination in the last century. Maintaining the core of sociology preserves a basis for further innovation and creativity. The *Dictionary* has been developed to recognize the continuities between classical sociology and the work of such sociologists as Ulrich Beck, Raymond Boudon, Pierre Bourdieu, James Coleman, Anthony Giddens, and Neil Smelser. The *Dictionary* attempts to be relevant to modern social theory and changes in contemporary society, while describing these developments in the context of the legacy of classical sociology.

How to use this *Dictionary*

Sociology is a critical discipline, and its concepts are typically contested. There is no consensus over the meaning of globalization, risk, information, culture, and society. The aim of this *Dictionary* has therefore been discursive. Its entries are designed to illustrate and debate concepts, showing their diverse origins and contested meanings. Some entries – on culture, family, gender, genetics, globalization, health, information, mass media and communications, power, race and ethnicity, religion, science and technology studies, social movements, and work and employment – are very long (around 5,000 words). These major entries allow authors to explore these critical issues in depth. The variable length of entries is intended to reflect the complexity and importance of different topics and fields in sociology. These large entries on key aspects of society are intended to be, as it were, the intellectual backbone of the *Dictionary*.

The *Dictionary* also contains a large number of entries on sociologists, both classical and contemporary. While the selection of these entries will always be somewhat arbitrary, they are intended to illustrate current debates as reflected in the work of living sociologists. This selection of contemporary sociologists will cause some degree of annoyance to those living sociologists who are not included. I hope they will accept my apologies for their absence, but these choices are unavoidably eccentric to some degree. I have if anything been overly inclusive rather than exclusive.

There is no list of bibliographical references at the end of the entries. Because references are included in the text, the reader can get an immediate grasp of the key bibliographical sources. The entries also contain many cross references in bold print that allow the reader to make immediate connections to other related entries. With foreign works, the first date in round brackets refers to its original publication, while dates in square brackets refer to publication dates of titles in English translation. Where possible I have referred to the English titles of translated works rather than to the original language of the publication. There are no footnotes or endnotes. The aim throughout has been to achieve simplicity rather than clutter entries with scholarly conventions that are not necessarily helpful to the reader.

Finally, the authors have been drawn from many countries in a bid to reflect the contemporary richness and cosmopolitanism of sociology. The entries are written in a simple, discursive, and accessible language that strives to avoid jargon or excessive dependence on a technical and arid

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-54046-9 - The Cambridge Dictionary of Sociology
Edited by Bryan S. Turner
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

How to use this Dictionary

vocabulary. I have encouraged authors to write in business-like, clear English. There are relatively few diagrams, charts, or figures. It is intended that the *Dictionary* will offer a lively defense of sociology as a vibrant and expanding field of study. The more complex and difficult modern society becomes, the more we need a relevant, critical, and energetic sociological understanding of society. This *Dictionary* is intended to assist that understanding.

Bryan S. Turner
National University of Singapore