



Department of Sociology

Sociology 476: Contemporary sociological theory

Credits: 3

Undergraduate & Graduate course. General education.

Instructor: Ivan Ermakoff
Professor
8116a Social Science Building
email: ermakoff@ssc.wisc.edu

Instructional Mode: all face-to-face

Credit hours: This course meets as a group 150 minutes per week (two 75-minute sessions) and carries the expectation that you will spend an average of 3 hours outside of class for each class period. In other words, in addition to class time, plan to allot an average of 6 hours per week for reading, writing, preparing for discussions, and/or working on the term paper.

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Where do our tastes and preferences come from? Can we systematically understand how individuals make decisions? Which factors shape patterns of social interactions in both mundane and exceptional circumstances? These questions address fundamental aspects of group behavior and call for systematic knowledge. Sociological theory provides the basis for this knowledge. Since “there is nothing more practical than a good theory” (Kurt Lewin), this small, reading and discussion-intensive course confronts sociological theories of preferences, choice-making and interactional processes with empirical studies of art consumption, statutory distinction, ideological commitments, educational choices, self-delusion, group solidarity, political cleavages and group behaviors in critical situations, among others.

PREREQUISITES

Students need to have had an introductory course in sociological theory (for instance Soc 475).

REQUISITES FOR UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

Each student may earn up to 100 points based on:

1. Attendance and quality of participation in class discussion: 20 points possible.

The class format is centered on lectures and on in-class discussions. Regular attendance and participation are required. You must complete the reading(s) listed for each session before the class in which we discuss them. You should not expect to do well in the course without regular attendance and thoughtful participation in class discussion.

This course meets as a group 150 minutes per week (two 75-minute sessions) and carries the expectation that you will spend an average of 3 hours outside of class for each class period. In other words, in addition to class time, plan to allot an average of 6 hours per week for reading, writing, preparing for discussions, and/or studying for quizzes and exams for this class.

Attendance is worth up to 8 points and thoughtful participation up to 12 points. You can earn up to 8 points if you do not miss classes and up to 12 points if in each session you demonstrate a thoughtful reading of the texts by answering the questions I raise in class or by posting relevant questions and comments on the discussion board created for each session.

Each unexcused absence will take 4 points off your attendance and participation grade. I will grade the quality of your participation on the remaining points.

Please communicate with me before class if you become ill or if emergencies arise so that I am aware of your circumstances and I can excuse your absence. If many emergencies arise in the course of the semester, I will ask you to document them.

Discussion is intended to help you get a handle on the readings. Some weeks you will divide into small discussion groups for part of a class.

Except for students with special needs, no laptop or electronic device will be allowed in class. In case of remote courses, I urge you to take handwritten notes.

Several studies underscore that students who took notes on laptops performed worse on conceptual questions than students who took notes longhand.

See for instance: Mueller, Pam A. and Daniel M. Oppenheimer. "The Pen Is Mightier Than the Keyboard: Advantages of Longhand Over Laptop Note Taking." *Psychological Science* 25 (6), 2014: 1159-1168.

2. Four response papers (three-page long): 20 points possible.

Each paper is to be focused on one (and only one) required reading as listed in the syllabus. For instance, a response paper on Tackett's analysis of preference shift should cover the Introduction and chapters 1, 4 & 5, not the introduction only or chapter 4 & 5 only.

As indicated below (see "Directions for the response papers"), the structure of each response paper will have three sections.

Each response paper is due at the beginning of the class in which we will discuss the reading. I will not accept papers handed in at the end of class.

All the papers should be numbered (from one to four) next to the paper title.

You may not submit more than one paper on the same day. If you submit two papers on the same day, you will lose half of the points earned for the second paper, which means that you should not wait until the last weeks of the semester to hand in your short papers.

NOTE: I advise you to submit at least two papers before the mid-term exam.

Important requirement

In addition to the hard copy handed in at beginning of the class in which we will be discussing the reading, you will have to submit an electronic copy of your paper to the Turnitin web site: www.turnitin.com before class. Turnitin is the anti-plagiarism software used by the Sociology Department.

I will not grade papers that will not have been submitted to Turnitin.

Instructions for submitting the electronic copy

- (1) Go the Turnitin web site: www.turnitin.com.
- (2) Click on the New Users at the top of the homepage. The new user wizard will open and walk you through the profile creation process.
- (3) To create a profile, you must know the **class ID number** and the **enrollment key**. Once you finish creating your profile, you will be logged in to Turnitin. The name **Contemporary Sociological Theory** will show up on your homepage.
- (4) Click this name to open your portfolio for this class.
- (5) To submit a paper, click the *submit* button. The paper submission page will open.
- (6) The submission title should be the title of the reading.
- (7) Then click the *browse* button and locate your paper on your computer.
- (8) After having selected your paper, click submit to upload your paper.

For further information, please follow this link for the student quickstart:

https://guides.turnitin.com/01_Manuals_and_Guides/Student_Guides/01_QuickStart_Guide

This quickstart will help you get started with Turnitin and will walk you through the steps for submitting your first paper.

Directions for the response papers

These papers should not exceed 3 double-spaced typewritten pages and should have three sections:

Section 1:

The first section identifies the key claims, spells out the main concepts, and describes the validation strategy if any. This section should be short and synthetic. One page should be enough.

It is crucial that section 1 of the response paper identify and clearly define key concepts. It is also crucial that it state the main points *in your own words*. The purpose of this exercise is to assess whether you clearly understood the concepts and the arguments under review. That is why simply quoting the reading will not be appropriate.

Furthermore, section 1 needs to be *precise and accurate*. If it states: “According to Adams, family ties matter for state construction,” and does not specify in which respects and how these ties matter, section 1 remains wanting. The same remark applies if the response paper makes basic interpretive mistakes. A sound rendering of the reading is a prerequisite for a good grade since sections 2 & 3 of the paper will be expected to comment on the reading.

Sound knowledge is always precise.

Section 2:

The second section of the response paper relates the reading to other required readings discussed in class.

How does the author(s)’s argument differ from, expand, challenge, or refine other required readings? To what extent does this argument contribute to the theoretical and empirical understanding of the issue under consideration given the other required readings discussed in class?

Section 3:

The third section provides a critical evaluation of the reading. This evaluation can be positive, negative or mixed.

What are the strengths and the weaknesses of the argument? What is left ambiguous, underdeveloped or unaddressed in the present reading? Which type of investigation could overcome these limitations?

Again, these critical remarks should be precise and elaborated. Comments pitched at a high level of generality and stock sentences will not do. Related to this last point: drawing on generative AI to produce response papers will prove counterproductive and self-defeating given the mode of production of the “comments” generated by AI. Furthermore, the work on these papers should help you hone your analytical skills and enhance your preparation for the midterm and the final exams. Ideas emerge through the process of writing.

Both your analysis of the contribution of the reading and your critique of its strengths and weaknesses are your comments proper. Your comments will be graded in light of their relevance and the extent to which they are precise and well-informed. If section 3 states: “this reading is important” or “Bourdieu is wrong” but does not elaborate these two assertions in light of specific points or examples, the comment does not fulfill its goal.

The paper should indicate page references whenever it refers to claims and concepts advanced in the required reading under consideration and the required readings already discussed in class.

Each paper will be worth up to 5 points: 2 points for the first section, 2 points for your comments (presentation of the reading's contribution and critique), and 1 point for clarity.

3. One classroom presentation (10 points possible)

During the semester, you will be required to give one classroom presentation on one required reading.

This presentation will be on one of the required readings assigned for the session. It should *not* be on a reading which you are discussing in a response paper.

In your presentation, you should assume that everyone has carefully read the material. The main purpose of the presentation is *not* to offer a detailed summary of the reading, but to provide an evaluation of the reading, and to launch the discussion.

Structure of the presentation

The presentation should not exceed *10 minutes* and should be organized as follows.

First, summarize in a few introductory sentences the main argument or the main points of the reading. This introduction should not exceed 3 minutes.

Second, outline the claims you are going to make to provide a critique of the reading. This critique can be positive and/or negative.

Third, elaborate one at a time the claims that you have outlined and, as you proceed forward in the course of your presentation, indicate which claim you are elaborating. Do not hesitate to quote the reading to back up the points you are elaborating.

Questions for your consideration

To organize your thoughts, you may want to consider the following questions:

What are the strengths and the weaknesses of the argument?

How does the author(s)'s argument expand, challenge, or refine previous readings or previous theories?

To what extent does this argument contribute to the theoretical and empirical understanding of the issue under consideration?

What is left ambiguous, underdeveloped or unaddressed in the reading?

Which type of investigation could overcome these limitations?

After your presentation, I will invite your fellow students to ask questions and make comments. I will also ask specific questions. You will then have the opportunity to respond.

Breakdown of the grade

The presentation will be graded as follows:

2 points for the organization of the presentation. Are the main points discussed in the presentation clearly outlined at the outset? Is the presentation clearly organized and easy to follow?

6 points for your critical assessment of the reading: are the claims made in the presentation regarding the reading, clear, relevant, well-grounded and documented?

2 points for the few sentences summarizing the content of the reading: are they precise and accurate?

The sign-up sheet for the presentations is available on Canvas: see the “Pages” tab. Once you have signed up for a presentation, I will assume that your commitment stands firm.

4. A mid-term examination (in-class, closed-book): 20 points possible.

This mid-term examination will be closed-book and in the form of a short answer and essay examination.

5. A final examination (in-class, closed-book): 30 points possible

The actual content of the final exam will be announced in class.

The format of the final exam will be similar to the format of the mid-term exam.

GRADING: UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

The grade will be based on the following breakdown:

Participation in class discussions = 20 points

Four response papers = 20 points

One classroom presentation on one required readings = 10 points

Midterm examination = 20 points

Final examination = 30 points

The final grade will be based on total number of points accumulated during the semester: 100-91 points is an A, 90-86 an AB, 85-81 a B, 80-76 a BC, 75-66 a C, 65-56 a D, below 55 a F.

REQUISITES FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS

1. Class participation (20 points)

The class format is lectures and in-class discussions. All graduate students are expected to attend weekly class meetings and to participate actively in discussion throughout the semester.

2. One classroom presentation (10 points)

During the semester, you will be required to give two classroom presentations on two required readings.

Each presentation will be on one of the required readings assigned for the session. You should assume that everyone has carefully read the material. The main purpose of the presentation is *not* to offer a detailed summary of the reading, but to offer a critical evaluation of the reading, and to launch the discussion by evaluating the main issues and arguments under examination. Therefore, the “summary part” of your presentation should be concise and very clear.

Your presentation should not last more than *ten* minutes. Please calibrate your time accordingly.

I will expect you to use these presentations as opportunities to develop and hone your skills as a lecturer. Your presentation should elicit the interest of an undergraduate audience and should motivate students to be active participants in the Q&A session.

I recommend that you announce very clearly the main points you will be elaborating in your introductory remarks.

I will grade each presentation as follows: 2 points for the summary: is it precise and accurate? 6 points for your critical assessment of the reading: are the claims that you are making regarding the reading, clear, relevant, well grounded and documented? 2 points for the organization of the presentation: do you clearly lay out the points that you are going to make? Is the presentation clearly organized and easy to follow?

3. Four short comments (each on one required reading) (20 points)

In addition to your two presentations, you will need to prepare two short comments (no more than 200 words each) on two required readings. Each comment should highlight a point that seems to you relevant and important about the reading whether this point relates to a problem, a limitation, a flaw, a contribution, an insight, an innovation or a strength of the reading.

These comments should be on readings different from those that you will present.

You will send me your comment as a Word attachment by email with the subject heading “Comment # - name of the author commented” at the latest by noon on the Sunday preceding the session devoted to the reading.

In addition, you will post your comment on the discussion board of Canvas at the latest by noon on the Sunday preceding the session devoted to the reading.

4. Term paper (50 points)

You will be expected to write a term paper on any topic connected to the themes of the course. This can be a research proposal or a paper addressing a clearly defined substantive problem. The length should be in the 15-page range.

To help you think about, and write, your term paper without having to rush in the last two weeks of the semester, I will ask you to submit a one-page prospectus to me by the end of the fourth week. This

prospectus will outline the subject matter of your paper, the research question you will address as well as the sources and the references on which you plan to draw.

The term paper will be due on the last day of class).

Please include page numbers in the body of the text and in citations.

Breakdown of the grade for the term paper

Clarity of research question and statements	10
Consistency of claims and arguments	10
Paper organization and structure	10
Originality and insightfulness	10
Relevance of the references	10

GRADING: GRADUATE STUDENTS

The grade will be based on the following breakdown:

Participation in class discussions = 20 points

Oral classroom presentation on a required readings = 10 points

Four short comments = 20 points

Term paper = 50 points

The final grade will be based on total number of points accumulated during the semester: 100-91 points is an A, 90-86 an AB, 85-81 a B, 80-76 a BC, 75-66 a C, 65-56 a D, below 55 a F.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

As with all courses at the University of Wisconsin, you are expected to follow the University's rules and regulations pertaining to academic honesty and integrity.

According to UWS 14, academic misconduct is defined as:

1. seeks to claim credit for the work or efforts of another without authorization or citation;
2. uses unauthorized materials or fabricated data in any academic exercise;
3. forges or falsifies academic documents or records;
4. intentionally impedes or damages the academic work of others;
5. engages in conduct aimed at making false representation of a student's academic performance;
6. assists other students in any of these acts.

By enrolling in this course, each student assumes the responsibilities of an active participant in UW-Madison's community of scholars in which everyone's academic work and behavior are held to the highest academic integrity standards. Academic misconduct compromises the integrity of the university.

Cheating, fabrication, plagiarism, unauthorized collaboration, and helping others commit these acts are examples of academic misconduct, which can result in disciplinary action. This includes but is not limited to failure on the assignment/course, disciplinary probation, or suspension. Substantial or repeated cases of misconduct will be forwarded to the Office of Student Conduct & Community Standards for additional review.

For more information, refer to: <http://www.studentconduct.wiscweb.wisc.edu/academic-integrity/>

ACCOMMODATIONS FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

The University of Wisconsin-Madison supports the right of all enrolled students to a full and equal educational opportunity. The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), Wisconsin State Statute (36.12), and UW-Madison policy (Faculty Document 1071) require that students with disabilities be reasonably accommodated in instruction and campus life.

Providing reasonable accommodation for students with disabilities is a shared faculty and student responsibility. Please inform me of your need for instructional accommodations by the end of the third week of the semester, or as soon as possible after a disability has been incurred or recognized. I will work either directly with you or in coordination with the McBurney Center to identify and provide reasonable instructional accommodations.

Disability information, including instructional accommodations as part of a student's educational record, is confidential and protected under FERPA." <http://mcburney.wisc.edu/facstaff/other/faculty/syllabus.php>

If you wish to request a scheduling accommodation for religious observances, send an email by the end of the third week of the course stating the specific date(s) for which you request accommodation; campus policy requires that religious observances be accommodated if you make a timely request early in the term.

See the university's web page for details: <https://kb.wisc.edu/page.php?id=21698>

DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION

Diversity is a source of strength, creativity, and innovation for UW-Madison. We value the contributions of each person and respect the profound ways their identity, culture, background, experience, status, abilities, and opinion enrich the university community. We commit ourselves to the pursuit of excellence in teaching, research, outreach, and diversity as inextricably linked goals.

The University of Wisconsin-Madison fulfills its public mission by creating a welcoming and inclusive community for people from every background – people who as students, faculty, and staff serve Wisconsin and the world." <https://diversity.wisc.edu/>

CLASS LEARNING OUTCOMES

Beyond the specific substantive and methodological content I will cover in this course, the requirements I have just listed as well as my lectures have been designed to achieve the following instructional objectives:

Critically analyze contemporary works of sociologists demonstrating an understanding of their core theoretical contributions.

Compare and contrast sociological theories on issues such as power, social stratification, cultural tastes, ideology, norms, social change, choice making and collective behavior.

Apply theoretical frameworks to empirical studies, demonstrating the explanatory power and limitations of these theories.

Evaluate the historical and intellectual contexts in which sociological theories emerged since the end of World War II.

Synthesize key concepts across the works of different theorists to construct coherent theoretical arguments.

Engage in scholarly debate by articulating well-supported positions on theoretical disputes and their implications for sociological research.

READING MATERIAL

The readings in each section are grouped under two categories: required and recommended. All participants should be prepared at class time to comment and critique the required readings. Additional readings are recommended for delving deeper into a topic and preparing for preliminary examinations.

The books indicated below have been ordered at the **University Book Store**. You are not expected to buy all of them, but may wish to add some to your personal library.

These books are also on reserve at the College Library.

Anderson, Elisabeth. 2021. *Agents of Reform: Child Labor and the Origins of the Welfare State*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Anspach, Renée R. 1993. *Deciding Who Lives: Fateful Choices in the Intensive-Care Nursery*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Coleman, James. 1990. *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Elster, Jon. 1983. *Sour Grapes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ermakoff, Ivan. 2008. *Ruling Oneself Out. A Theory of Collective Abdications*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Fligstein, Neil and Doug McAdam. 2012. *A Theory of Fields*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Habermas, Jürgen. 1984. *The Theory of Communicative Action. Reason and the Rationalization of Society*. Boston: Beacon Press. **Volume I**.

Gerson, Kathleen. 1986. *Hard Choices: How Women Decide about Work, Career and Motherhood*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

All the other required readings are available on Canvas.

Introduction

Ermakoff, Ivan. 2017. "Shadow Plays: On Theory's Perennial Challenges," *Sociological Theory*, 35(2): 128-137.

Part I. Preferences

Ideology

Sartori, Giovanni. 1969. "Politics, Ideology, and Belief Systems," *American Political Science Review*, 63:398-411.

Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Culture*. Basic Books. **Chapter 8 ("Ideology as a cultural System"), pp. 87-101 in chapter 4**.

Recommended readings:

Elster, Jon. 1983. *Sour Grapes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Chapter IV).

Habitus

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984 [1979] *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. **Pp. 175-225** (starting with “The Homology between the Spaces”).

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984 [1979] *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. **Preface to the English-Language edition, Introduction (pp. 1-7), pp. 99-125, pp. 169-175.**

Accominotti, Fabien Shamus R. Khan, and Adam Storer. 2018. "How Cultural Capital Emerged in Gilded Age America: Musical Purification and Cross-Class Inclusion at the New York Philharmonic," *American Journal of Sociology*, 123(6): 1743-1783.

Recommended readings:

Peterson, Richard A. and Roger M. Kern. 1996. “Changing Highbrow Taste: From Snob to Omnivore,” *American Sociological Review* 61(5): 900-907.

DiMaggio, Paul. 1987. “Classification in Art,” *American Sociological Review* 52: 440-455.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1990. *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford: Stanford University Press. Chapter 3.

DiMaggio, Paul and Michael Useem. 1978. “Social Class and Arts Consumption: The Origins and Consequences of Class Differences in Exposure to the Arts in America,” *Theory and Society*, 5: 141-161.

Self-interest

Direction for the short paper: write on either Brustein or Hechter. Hamilton’s chapter provides you with the historical background and should be the focus of a response paper.

Hamilton, Richard. F. 1982. *Who Voted for Hitler?* Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press. Appendix A (“The Reichstag elections 1919-1933”).

Brustein, William. 1996. *The Logic of Evil. The Social Origins of the Nazi Party, 1925-1933*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press. **Chapters 1 & 5, Conclusion.**

Hechter, Michael. 1987. *Principles of Group Solidarity*. Berkeley: University of California Press. **Chapter 2 & 3.**

Recommended readings:

Becker, Gary. 1976. *The Economic Approach to Human Behavior*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. Chapter 1.

Coleman, James. 1990. *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Chapter XIX (“The Self”).

Norms

Coleman, James. 1990. *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. **Chapters X & XI.**

Bicchieri, Cristina. 2006. *The Grammar of Society: The Nature and Dynamics of Social Norms*. New York: Cambridge University Press. **Chapter 1.**

Recommended readings:

Bicchieri, Cristina and Yoshitaka Fukui. 1999. "The Great Illusion: Ignorance, Informational Cascades, and the Persistence of unpopular Norms." *Business Ethics Quarterly* 9: 127-155.

Bicchieri, Cristina. 2017. *Norms in the wild: how to diagnose, measure, and change social norms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Centola, Damon, Robb Willer, and Michael Macy. 2005. "The Emperor's Dilemma: A Computational Model of Self-Enforcing Norms." *American Journal of Sociology*, 110(4): 1009–40.

Preference Shift

Elster, Jon. 1983. *Sour Grapes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. **Chapter III ("Sour Grapes")**.

Kuran, Timur. 1996. "Social Mechanisms of dissonance reduction," pp. 147-171 in *Social Mechanisms. An Analytical Approach to Social Theory*, edited by Peter Hedstrom and Richard Swedberg. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tackett, Timothy. 1996. *Becoming a Revolutionary. The Deputies of the French National Assembly and the Emergence of a Revolutionary Culture (1789-1790)*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. **Introduction (pp. 3-15), chapters 1, 4 & 5.**

Recommended readings:

Ermakoff, Ivan. 2010. "Theory of Practice, Rational Choice and Historical Change," *Theory and Society*, 39: 527-553.

Ermakoff, Ivan. 1997. "Prelates and Princes: Aristocratic Marriages, Canon Law Prohibitions and Shifts in Norms and Patterns of Domination in the Central Middle Ages." *American Sociological Review*. 62:405-422.

Part II. Choice-making and decisions

Rational Choice

Gambetta, Diego. 1987. *Were they pushed or did they jump? Individual decision mechanisms in education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. **Chapter 1**.

Elster, Jon. 1983. *Sour Grapes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. **(pp. 1-26 in Chapter I)**.

Tsebelis, George. 1990. *Nested Games. Rational Choice in Comparative Politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press. **Chapter 2**.

Recommended readings:

Harsanyi, John C. 1986 [1977]. "Advances in Understanding Rational Behavior," Pp. 82-107 in *Rational Choice*, edited by Jon Elster, Oxford Basil Blackwell.

Sen, Amartya. 1977. "Rational fools: A critique of the behavioral foundations of economic theory," *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 6:317-344.

Framing effects, expectations

Tversky, Amos and Daniel Kahneman. 1986. "Rational Choice and the Framing of Decisions," *Journal of Business*, 59(4): S251-S278.

Beckert, Jens. 2016. *Imagined Futures: Fictional Expectations and Capitalist Dynamics*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. **Introduction, chapter 4**.

Mische, Ann. 2009. "Projects and Possibilities: Researching Futures in Action." *Sociological Forum* 24 (3): 694–704.

Recommended readings:

Ermakoff, Ivan. 2017. "On the Frontiers of Rational Choice," pp. 162-200 in *Social Theory Now*, edited by Claudio Benzecry, Monika Krause, and Isaac Ariail Reed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Kahneman, Daniel, Paul Slovic and Amos Tversky (eds.). 1983. *Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapter I.

Bounded Rationality

Simon, Herbert A. 1985. "Human Nature in Politics: The Dialogue of Psychology with Political Science," *American Political Science Review*, 79 (2): 293-304.

March, James G. 1986 [1978]. "Bounded Rationality, Ambiguity, and the Engineering of Choice," **Pp. 142-158** in *Rational Choice*, edited by Jon Elster, Oxford Basil Blackwell. [originally published in the *Bell Journal of Economics*]

Habermas, Jürgen. 1984. *The Theory of Communicative Action. Reason and the Rationalization of Society*. Boston: Beacon Press. **Volume I, pp. 1-26.**

Recommended readings:

Ainslie, George. 1992. *Picoeconomics. The Strategic Interaction of Successive Motivational States within the Person*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Preface and Chapter 1.

Simon, Herbert A. 1986. "Rationality in Psychology and Economics," *Journal of Business*, 59(4): S209-S234.

Fateful Choices

Anspach, Renée R. 1993. *Deciding Who Lives: Fateful Choices in the Intensive-Care Nursery*. Berkeley: University of California Press. **Chapters 2 & 3.**

Ermakoff, Ivan. 2008. *Ruling Oneself Out. A Theory of Collective Abdications*. Durham: Duke University Press. **Preface, chapter 1.**

Gerson, Kathleen. 1986. *Hard Choices: How Women Decide about Work, Career and Motherhood*. Berkeley: University of California Press. **Chapters 6 & 7.**

Recommended readings:

Zussman, Robert. 1992. *Intensive Care: Medical Ethics and the Medical Profession*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Vaughan, Diane. 1996. *The Challenger Launch Decision: Risky Technology, Culture, and Deviance at NASA*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Part III. Interactions

Coordinating

Schelling, Thomas. 1980 [1963]. *The Strategy of Conflict*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. **Chapter 3 + pp. 89-118.**

Tavory, Iddo and Nina Eliasoph. 2013. "Coordinating Futures: Toward a Theory of Anticipation," *American Journal of Sociology* 118(4): 908-94.

Symbolic Interactions and Communicative Action

Blumer, Herbert. 1986 [1969]. *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. **Chapter III (pp. 78-89), pp. 1-20 and 47-60 in chapter I.**

Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Anchor. **Pp. 1-57.**

Habermas, Jürgen. 1984. *The Theory of Communicative Action. Reason and the Rationalization of Society*. Boston: Beacon Press. **Pp. 85-141.**

Collective alignments

Granovetter, Mark. 1978. "Threshold Models of Collective Behavior." *American Journal of Sociology* 83(6): 1420-1443.

Ermakoff, Ivan. 2008. *Ruling Oneself Out. A Theory of Collective Abdications*. Durham: Duke University Press. **Chapters 5 & 6.**

Recommended readings:

Katz, Elihu and Paul F. Lazarsfeld. 1955. *Personal Influence*. Glencoe: The Free Press. **Chapters 4 & 5.**

Kiesler, Charles A. and Sara B. Kiesler. 1969. *Conformity*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Ermakoff, Ivan. 2015. "The Structure of Contingency," *American Journal of Sociology*, 121(1): 64-125.

Fields

Fligstein, Neil and Doug McAdam. 2012. *A Theory of Fields*. Oxford: Oxford University Press **Chapters 1, 4 and 5**.

Anderson, Elisabeth. 2021. *Agents of Reform: Child Labor and the Origins of the Welfare State*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press. **Chapters 1 & 2**.

Review for the final exam

Last day to turn in the term paper