

Winter 2015

Co-chairs

Patrick Baert

Cambridge University, United Kingdom

pjnb100@cam.ac.uk

Agnes Ku

Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong

soagnes@ust.hk

Secretary / Treasurer

Bradley West

University of South Australia, Australia

brad.west@unisa.edu.au

Newsletter Editors

Erik Schneiderhan

University of Toronto, Canada

e.schneiderhan@utoronto.ca

Daniel Silver

University of Toronto, Canada

dsilver@utsc.utoronto.ca

Board

Jeffrey Alexander, Yale University, USA

Craig Browne, Sydney University, Australia

Fuyuki Kurasawa, York University, Canada

Martina Loew, Free University, Berlin, Germany

Hans Peter Mueller, Humbolt University, Berlin, Germany

Philip Smith, Yale University, USA

Lynette Spillman, University of Notre Dame, USA

Frederic Vandenberghe, Universidade Estadual de Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

Gilles Verpraet, École de Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, France

Ronald Jacobs, ex officio

Giuseppe Sciortino, ex officio

Table of Contents

- 2** **Editors' Introduction**
Erik Schneiderhan and Daniel Silver
- 3** **Georg Simmel's readers in Medellín:
How reading Simmel has enriched our
sociological life**
A. Botia, E. Mosquera Acevedo and J. Pabón
- 6** **How I Teach Sociological Theory**
Abdulkerim Sönmez
- 10** **Announcements**

Editors' Introduction

The hectic holiday season and the demands of end of term have resulted in a shorter than usual edition of *Theory*. But we are very excited about the two pieces we are featuring this edition. First, we have “Georg Simmel’s Readers in Medellín,” by Botia, Acevedo and Pabón, which looks at how Simmel matters for thinking about theorizing and theory in Latin America. Second, we have “How I Teach Theory,” by Abdulkerim Sönmez, which presents the approach of one of our members to teaching classical sociological theory. We would draw the reader’s attention to the end of the newsletter and the announcement of our upcoming June, 2016 conference in Cambridge, England. In particular, please notice that the deadline for abstracts has been extended until January 15, 2016. We wish you the best as the year draws to a close and look forward to seeing many of you next year in England.

Erik Schneiderhan and Daniel Silver

University of Toronto

Georg Simmel's readers in Medellín:

How reading Simmel has enriched our sociological life

A. Botia, E. Mosquera Acevedo and J. Pabón, Universidad de Antioquia, Medellín, Colombia

This brief note attempts to bring out our relation with Georg Simmel's work. Two goals are to be emphasized here. The first is to enunciate how some of its several dimensions have impacted both our sociological perspective and our approaches to teaching sociological theory. The second is to show how taking on Simmel has allowed us to engage in an international network that regards him a relevant author who sheds light on questions concerning the Latin American context.

Our first encounter with Simmel was in 2008 as undergraduate students by means of some short references to his insights in courses on modernity, sociological theory and urban sociology at the Sociology Department of Universidad de Antioquia. "Metropolis and Mental life," "The Problem of Sociology," its complementary note, and David Frisby's works on Simmel were the set of readings used for grasping the aims of the courses.

Being still students, Simmel himself became for us a *content*. Despite the fact of undertaking courses in which he was neither the central figure, nor a reference whatsoever, and as a result of our ongoing interest in reading and discussing other texts -e.g. his *Sociology* and his essays on culture- we were able to consolidate some sociological concerns specifically on sociological theory and sociology of culture. We consider this a significant step, not only because these fields are not emphasized within our undergraduate sociology programme, but also allowed us to have a (new) theoretical alternative to the dominant one which is mainly political. This first influence can be traced in our undergraduate dissertations owing to the use of Simmelian points of view for analyzing phenomena such as carnivals in Medellín, Colombian films and also as a theoretical approach for the problem of time in sociology.

The first scenario we attended for sharing our ideas on Simmel was the seminar called *Simmel y la modernidad* ("Simmel and modernity") which took place in Bogotá in 2008. Participating in this event allowed us to get in contact with recognized scholars from Latin America interested in Simmel's oeuvre and also motivated us to start promoting a Simmelian line of inquiry in our sociology department. In 2010, as a result of such motivation, we were part of the organizing staff of a short course called *Georg Simmel's social theory*, which was conducted by the Argentinian professor Esteban Vernik, editor of *Lebensanschauung* and other Spanish

translations of Simmel's texts. This three day course emphasized on some of Simmel's interests such as sociology, philosophy of history, music, sociology of life, among others.

Professor Vernik's visit was the foundation for delineating multiple Simmelian analytical lines to be discussed and incorporated into sociological theory courses in our department, a debate we helped to prompt and took part in, while continuing the contact with other international scholars. A year later, already as graduate sociologists, we were part of both the organizing and academic staff of the third in a series of international symposia on Georg Simmel held in Latin America since 2002, which took place at Universidad de Antioquia.¹

For this event² we were pleased to have the German professor Otthein Ramstedt and his wife Angela Ramstedt, both of them editors of Simmel's *Gesamtausgabe*, as keynote speakers. Argentinean, Colombian and Mexican scholars who had been part of the previous symposia were also our guests. This academic exchange allowed us to be in the middle of a vibrant Simmelian discussion that provided us with the opportunity to interact with those we only knew by books or bibliographical references, and also to widen our perspective. Ever since, Simmel's sway has been over us. Many of our written papers as well as every teaching proposal are to be understood as Simmel-influenced efforts.

As it was mentioned before, one of us has found that Simmel's insights on modern style of life are based on a specific conception of time and, therefore, has integrated the Simmelian concept of life into his way to understand and teach issues in the field of time studies. Another one has focused on Simmel's notion of hermeneutics; this particular interest has mainly driven two aims. On the one hand to present Simmel's idea of historic life as a philosophical foundation for his comprehensive sociology; on the other hand, to propose analytical lines within his sociological theory courses in which the Simmelian perspective may be used as a guideline for dealing with questions about the concept of society and the idea of contemporary sociological theory. While the last one has been tracking the notion of individuality and privacy in Simmel's work seeking for ways to analyze current forms of interactions of individuals, especially those present in films and social media.

A growing interest in networking has been the core of our shared work in the past two years. All of those who were part of the third international symposium claimed for the creation of a Simmel network in Latin America as a frame for holding different initiatives such as research proposals using Simmel as theoretical ground, the organization of forthcoming symposia, shared edition or translation projects, among others. The three of us, along with other

¹ The fourth international symposium was held in Buenos Aires, Argentina, on November 2015.

² III Jornadas Internacionales sobre Georg Simmel. Investigaciones: desarrollos teóricos y aplicaciones prácticas. (Third International Symposium on Georg Simmel. Inquiries: Theoretical developments and research applicability. It was hold in Medellín, Colombia, on november 2011.

colleagues and as a contribution for the network, have set the website RedSimmel.org to be the frame of this enterprise.

The main purpose of the website is to post, besides relevant news related to Simmel -namely upcoming events, recent publications, translations or reviews- notes on the different applications of Simmel's theory, specifically those proposed in Latin America. Concerning this, we have found that Simmel's categories have been used for understanding a particular form of modernity, which enables us to raise new questions on the Latin American debate about national and regional identities. We have also noticed a remarkable interest in reviewing the conditions for the production and reproduction of his oeuvre in order to evaluate the repercussions of this process in Latin American sociology.

Posting articles and information about events on RedSimmel.org is not the only task to keep the Simmelian network alive. The ongoing academic exchange with our Argentinean and Mexican colleagues has reached a consensus on the need of a shared project which formulates lines of inquiries over the reception of Simmel in Latin America. Our contribution to this initiative is, of course, the Colombian case³.

A preliminary description of our proposal for the Colombian reception can be described in the following lines: Tracing the instrumentalization of Simmel's ideas about the realm of Sociology and their relevance in the curriculum design of the early Sociology undergraduate programmes in our country and how he is currently used for designing theoretical courses; determining the use of Simmel's insights in the field of the studies of the process of modernity in Colombia; and searching for the influence of Simmelian ideas in the Colombian intellectual history. We believe these topics are useful for the academic field in our country since they examine the path followed by the ideas that, through teaching and the work of intellectuals, have helped to forge Colombian sociological communities.

After all of this, we could say going over part of Simmel's work, reading his interpreters and our ongoing group activities, has allowed us to grasp Sociology in our very own way. Simmelian sensibility, his sophisticated approach on political compromise, his perseverant struggle for a position in the German academy, and for redefining how and who was given to make sociological theory and research -here it is inevitable to quote his idea of feminine culture- and a large set of others features, have given us plenty of elements we wish to incorporate in our professional activities and, also, our life.

³ Professor Vernik has written about the Argentinian case. Professor Olga Sabido has already proposed the lines for the Mexican case.

How I Teach Sociological Theory

Abdulkerim Sönmez, Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey

I teach classical sociological theory to undergraduates. The course is in fact divided into three parts (or semesters) and I teach the first two parts in a consecutive order. Many of my students are second year sociology undergraduates for whom the course is a “must” or is “required” as part of their studies, some are from departments of psychology, history, political science, social work and economics who are taking one or all of the parts as electives and some are students from the same range of disciplines who are doing a double major or doing their minor in sociology. When added together, the total number of students registered for the course usually exceeds 100 and it is 150 for this term.

After having spent at least one year in the university, the second year students come to the classroom with a fairly good idea about what the courses are like, how the professors teach their courses and if they have spared some time to read the information package about the curriculum they will also know what a particular course is about. In fact their contact with more senior students seems to be their main source of information about how difficult or easy a particular course is and how a certain professor teaches or behaves towards the students. As far as classical sociological theory is concerned, they are also familiar with the names and some of the basic ideas of the founding fathers of sociology through their introductory courses. If, however, one asks and encourages them to unpack what else they have in their mental luggage, one would see for instance that they are deeply concerned with their future as sociology graduates and questioning what difference studying or understanding society can make in their lives; they are concerned that studying sociology may not be able to help them develop the kind of assets that will give them a competitive edge in the labour market. The second year in the university thus seems to assume a pivotal significance for many of the sociology undergraduates in their efforts to convince themselves and their families it is worth continuing with—or changing—the subject of their studies. Furthermore, if asked they would also report having discussions with their friends or acquaintances about how a particular issue can be explained or interpreted and feeling frustrated, even ashamed, that they are not wholly able to provide “a sociological and convincing answer”. These are some of the issues that stand as constants and in my first meeting with the students in this class and I have always felt

obliged to address such concerns and questions before introducing what I will be teaching. Though I am not sure if I have ever been able to provide satisfactory answers I have always hoped that this would help to lessen their emotional burden and motivate them to concentrate on their studies, a motivation that is also very crucial for developing a fruitful cooperation in a course that seems to be regarded as particularly difficult to understand.

The next task I try to perform in the very first week of my teaching is to introduce the content, structure, objectives and expected outcomes of my teaching (which are all stated in the information package) and the rationale behind why we need to study classical sociological theory and why I have decided to teach the course with this particular structure and content. Though the content and structure have to change from one theory course to the next, objectives and expected outcomes remain nearly the same: to help them to understand how sociological theory is constructed, how it relates to the aspects of social life that it aims at explaining and thus help them develop an awareness that the existence of differences between sociological theories is not simply a matter of how things appear from different perspectives but that social life is complicated enough to be understood and explained only from the perspective of this or that particular theory. These discussions, however, are not usually sufficient to convince the students why we teach a particular set of theory or the theoretical heritage of some dead scholars who are now called classics. When addressing students' inquiries of this nature I draw heavily on what J. Alexander once wrote about "the centrality of the classics". Unavoidably, not everything that has been said or written by the classics is or can be included in the course content. I choose, rather, to include those parts of the theoretical heritage the classical scholars left behind that still seem to influence our theoretical thinking and empirical research in matters related to the following issues: the method of sociological inquiry, the development of a social division of labour, the issue of social solidarity, the social origins of power and state, economy, social stratification and religion.

I think of my role in my teaching as comparable to that of a mediator and interpreter. The elements that I seem to be mediating between are the students, the scholars, their followers and opponents both past and present, the identity and social, cultural or historical boundaries of facts they talk about and of course myself. And what I seem to be interpreting is not only what each party seems to be saying but also if the meaning of what they have said is successfully translated and transmitted from one language to another, and from one society to another. I myself and my students speak Turkish (but not always as their first language), and English is only my second language. I find all statements starting with "all" and "only" easy to translate but very often equally difficult to identify and position in a given locality. Many of the Turkish translations of the main works are translations from English and very often one can find a big discrepancy between translations from English and, let's say, from French or German. Secondary literature on the other hand is a selection and interpretation of ideas, concepts and

their referents from the start and this further complicates matters. These are perhaps matters relating to self-awareness, but they heavily influence how I actually progress in my teaching.

Teaching to a large group of students in a classroom dictates the fact that classes assume the form of lecturing rather than, for instance, a group discussion supported by student assignments. When I am lecturing I take an author-based approach and progress in three dimension. These are (i) the internal structure of the argument and its referents that can be identified in the actual life, with particular attention paid to cases, events, or facts that the students can easily identify from their own environment or life experiences (that is, what is said and how it is said and where can be found in the actual life), (ii) what kind of theoretical debate it is a response to and what is the current state of the dispute especially in light of the findings of empirical research that the topic under consideration has prompted, and (iii) what kind of meta-theoretical lessons can be learned from the first two dimension. Following the advice that my late professor Paul Stirling used give, I often start by stating what I am going to talk about in the rest of the class session, and try to explain what it is about this topic that makes it an interest for sociological thinking or dispute. This is followed by explaining what is said, how it is said and what is the current state of our knowledge about the topic or the issue. The third dimension necessarily comes last but not necessarily at the end of each lesson.

I rely on several sources of feedback to monitor if what I am doing works and helps at all in achieving the objectives and outcomes that are stated in the syllabus. The first source is the questions that the students ask, the requests and the comments they make of me and criticisms that they make of my teaching style. The questions assume two main forms: either seeking affirmation of the hypothesis they derive from the content of the lecture or asking for if such and such case can also be explained by the same kind of thinking. These provide invaluable clues to monitor if I am able to carry the message successfully to their minds. On the whole, the great majority of the students avoid asking such questions in the early weeks of my lessons and according to the feedback I get from them later on, the reason is rooted in an attitude of self-preservation: they say that they did not want sound stupid in case what they understood is far removed from what is being the case. Voiced requests from students at this stage come in three main forms: The first is for a break so that they can refresh themselves after listening to rather long and tiresome ideas, concepts and debates. The second is for me to slow down to help them in taking notes, and the third is a request for less abstract and more concrete language. The criticisms are on the whole directed against my efforts to contextualize the topic in the larger framework of sociological debates.

The second source of feedback about their grasp of the material I present is their performance in exams. Not only setting but also assessing the exams is the personal responsibility of the instructor according to the university rules and regulations. When I am teaching the first part of the course my exam questions are about the what, how and why of the matter (that is the

internal structure of the theory) from the perspective of a particular scholar. In the second part my exam questions tend to concentrate on two dimensions. One is on seeing if the students are able to identify and express how a particular scholar applies his own methodology or theoretical argument from one issue to the next. The other is if they are able to make a comparison of two or more authors' perspectives on a matter of or common topic of concern and what lessons they derive from this comparison. On the whole, the students perform well in answering the questions relating to their understanding of the internal structure of the theories and in their understanding of how a particular scholar applies his own methodology or theory from one topic to another. They show signs of weakness, however, in making comparisons between scholars' arguments and approaches and deriving meta-theoretical conclusions from their comparisons. But these observations tell the story from its end side and a successful exam performance is achieved only after a painful process of reading, re-reading of the primary and secondary texts, comparing the lecture notes with the notes they take from their own reading and developing their skills for writing. Therefore there is a significant difference between the general average scores that the students obtain from the first and second semester exams. The general average is upsettingly low in the first semester and gets unrecognizably improved in the second.

The third source of feedback concerning my ability to transmit the skills and knowledge this course is designed for is the cumulative results of the assessments that the students are required to make of the course and of the instructor. The forms they complete require them to respond to seventeen questions before they are enabled to see their final grades on the internet. The results of these questions are put in an online electronic file, to be seen only by the instructors themselves. For these courses I have always obtained poor scores at the end of first semester and significantly improved one by the end of the second one. My scores were 50 and 80 out 100 at the end of the first and second semesters respectively last year.

There are some other occasions in which I can inform myself about whether teaching classical theory is useful and worth the effort. These occasions vary from finding how these courses contribute to the other courses I teach to little remarks or comments that the students make about their studies and how they feel about themselves as future sociologists. What they most commonly refer to can be interpreted as the general socializing effect and intellectual empowerment they seem to be getting from their learning of sociological theory in general and classical sociologists in particular. Like learning a language, learning theory moves from being a strange and difficult external thing to being one's vernacular and a constitutive component of one's social-occupational identity. According to their own comments, this process is also intellectually empowering because after successfully completing these courses they feel more able to grapple with ideas and disputes in both their other courses and their social lives.

Announcements

Abstract for ISA RC 16 Theory Conference

The New Discourse of (in)Equality

By Jeffrey C. Alexander, Yale University

Abstract: In this talk, I theorize the new public focus on equality as a “discourse” rather than merely as a factual-empirical description of changes in material distribution and stratification. I begin by contextualizing the focus on (in)equality as broadly modern, one that unfolds only with the movement away from ascriptive hierarchies to societies in which social position is evaluated in terms of individuation, on the other hand, and civil solidarity, on the other. During Western industrial society, equality was understood primarily economically, as equal opportunity or equal result, with a focus on class. In postindustrial society, beginning in the 1960s, the focus shifted to equalities of gender, race, religion, and sexuality. The past half-century was marked by fierce struggles over these “non-economic,” putatively cultural issues, with dramatic social change and civil repair as the result. As these (still unfinished) struggles succeeded, and as the structural effects of post-socialist, neo-liberal market structures crystallized, a new discourse of (in)equality has emerged. The narrative patterning this discourse paints the period from the 1930s through the 1960s as a golden age of equality, and the decades after as a declension bringing increasing inequality and material suffering in its wake. This is a strikingly different temporality from that posited in the post-industrial narrative of equality, according to which the middle third of the 20th century was dark and the last third reached for the light. In narrative terms, the new discourse of (in)equality makes the last half-century of emancipation invisible; stratification becomes primarily economic. This new narrative recalls earlier images of monolithic stratification, in which cultural inflections are ignored and cultural resources for change are minimized. Calls for repair focus, not on civil society, but on the state. That mobility remains ongoing between quintiles, no matter the growing separation between them, is widely ignored by the new discourse. Thomas Picketty’s *Capital in the 21st Century* crystallizes the limitations of the new discourse; I will critically address it in my conclusion.

New Articles and Books

Browne, C., & Susen, S. (2014). Austerity and Its Antitheses: Practical Negations of Capitalist Legitimacy. *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 113(2), 217-230.

Link to [UfjVX''](#)

Susen, S. (2013). Introduction: Bourdieu and Language. *Social Epistemology*, 27(3-4), 195-198.

Link to [UfjVX'''](#)

Susen, S. (2013). A Reply to My Critics: The Critical Spirit of Bourdieusian Language. *Social Epistemology*, 27(3-4), 323-393.

Link to [UfjVX''''](#)

Susen, S. (2013). Bourdieusian Reflections on Language: Unavoidable Conditions of The Real Speech Situation. *Social Epistemology*, 27(3-4), 199-246.

Link to [UfjVX''](#)

Susen, S. (2014). Reflections on Ideology Lessons from Pierre Bourdieu and Luc Boltanski. *Thesis Eleven*, 124(1), 90-113.

Link to [UfjVX''''](#)

Susen, S. (2015). *The 'Postmodern Turn' in the Social Sciences*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Link to [Vcc_'''](#)

Susen, S. (2015). Towards a Critical Sociology of Dominant Ideologies: An Unexpected Reunion Between Pierre Bourdieu and Luc Boltanski. *Cultural Sociology*, 313-348.

Link to [article](#).

Susen, S. (2015). Une réconciliation entre Pierre Bourdieu et Luc Boltanski est-elle possible? Pour un dialogue entre la sociologie critique et la sociologie pragmatique de la critique. In B. Frère (Ed.), *Le tournant de la théorie critique* (pp. 151-186). Paris: Desclée de Brouwer.

Link to [book](#).

Susen, S. (2015). Boltanski, Luc (1940-). In J. D. Wright (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed., Vol. 2, pp. 747 - 754). Oxford: Elsevier.

Link to [book](#).

Susen, S., & Turner, B. S. (2014). *The Spirit of Luc Boltanski: Essays on the 'Pragmatic Sociology of Critique'* (S. Susen & B. S. Turner Eds.). London: Anthem Press.

Link to [book](#).

Susen, S. (2015). Emancipation. In M. T. Gibbons, D. Coole, E. Ellis, & K. Ferguson (Eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Political Thought* (Vol. 3, pp. 1024 - 1038). Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.

Link to [book](#).

Boltanski, L., Rennes, J., & Susen, S. (2014 [2010]). The Fragility of Reality: Luc Boltanski in Conversation with Juliette Rennes and Simon Susen (S. Susen, Trans.). In S. Susen & B. S. Turner (Eds.), *The Spirit of Luc Boltanski: Essays on the 'Pragmatic Sociology of Critique'* (pp. 591 - 610). Oxford: Anthem Press.

Link to [book](#).

Susen, S. (2014 [2015]). Towards a Dialogue between Pierre Bourdieu's "Critical Sociology" and Luc Boltanski's "Pragmatic Sociology of Critique". In S. Susen & B. S. Turner (Eds.), *The Spirit of Luc Boltanski: Essays on the 'Pragmatic Sociology of Critique'* (pp. 313 - 348). London: Anthem Press.

Link to [book](#).

Susen, S. (2014 [2012]). Is There Such a Thing as a "Pragmatic Sociology of Critique"? Reflections on Luc Boltanski's *On Critique* (S. Susen, Trans.). In S. Susen & B. S. Turner (Eds.), *The Spirit of Luc Boltanski: Essays on the 'Pragmatic Sociology of Critique'* (pp. 173 - 210). London: Anthem Press.

Link to [book](#).

Susen, S. (2013). The Place of Space in Social and Cultural Theory'. In A. Elliot (Ed.), *Routledge Handbook of Social and Cultural Theory* (pp. 333 - 357). London: Routledge.

Link to [book](#).

Vanderstraeten, R. (2015). Inclusion Ideals and Inclusion Problems: Parsons and Luhmann on Religion and Secularization. *Acta Sociologica*, 58(2), 173 - 185.

Link to [article](#).

Vanderstraeten, R. (2015). The Forgotten Temporal Dimension of Luhmann's Constructivism. *Constructivist Foundations*, 10, 211 - 213.

Link to [article](#).

Vanderstraeten, R., & Vandermoere, F. (2015). Disciplined by the Discipline: A Social-Epistemic Fingerprint of the History of Science. *Science in Context*, 28(2), 195 - 214.

Link to [article](#).

Call for Papers

Canadian Federation of Humanities and Social Sciences Annual Conference
Canadian Sociological Association
University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta
May 30 – June 3, 2016

SECT: Symposium for Early Career Theorists

In conjunction with the Canadian Federation of Humanities and Social Sciences, the Canadian Sociological Association's annual conference will be held at the University of Calgary in Calgary, Alberta from May 30 through June 3, 2016.

The Social Theory Research Cluster invites paper proposals for its second Symposium for Early Career Theorists (SECT). SECT is a dedicated group of sessions sponsored by the Canadian Sociological Association that spotlights the work of emerging/early career social theorists (defined here as PhD candidates who have ABD status to those who are no more than five years beyond completion of their doctorate/exclusive of parental leaves). Social theory is an open and dynamic field. In that spirit, we seek papers that reflect upon, expand, and/or critique theoretical perspectives and traditions within the social sciences, and which may also draw on any number of methodological resources or inter/trans/multi-disciplinary positions.

The Social Theory Research Cluster aspires to make SECT a flagship for social theory in Canada, and aims to renew and consolidate the place of theorizing in the Canadian sociological imagination. This requires creating a supportive and diverse network of early career scholars. We want to expand theoretical dialogue and ensure that scholars and topics traditionally not well represented in social theory are included in this symposium and Canadian social theory more broadly.

We welcome extended abstract submissions of 600-800 words. Please include 3-4 keywords and a short bio (2-3 sentences). All proposals will be given serious attention, and the session themes will be determined by the scope of the submissions. Complete papers must be submitted one month in advance of the symposium, and senior scholars will act as discussants.

The deadline for abstract submissions is February 1, 2016. For abstract submissions and guidelines, please see the conference site for all relevant details: <http://www.csa-scs.ca/files/webapps/csapress/annual-conferences/call-for-abstracts/>

Organizers: Dr. Saara Liinamaa, Acadia University (saara.liinamaa@acadiu.ca) and Dr. Marcia Oliver, Wilfrid Laurier University (moliver@wlu.ca)

ISA RC16 Sociological Theory Conference

Call for Papers

The conference continues the RC16 tradition of encouraging submission of abstract and session proposals on the entire range of topics under the general heading of sociological theory.

Submission Details

Proposals should be submitted to rc16conference@sociology.cam.ac.uk, strictly by the extended deadline of 15 January 2016.

The proposal consists of an abstract of maximum 300 words and a short biographical note (including your ISA & RC16 membership details if applicable). Acceptance will be confirmed by 30 January 2016.

Registration

The conference will begin at 5pm on Monday 27th and end at 5pm on Wednesday 29th June 2016.

[Registration](#) for the conference will open Monday 1st August 2015, and you must register before 15th February 2016. The conference fee includes access to all sessions, lunch and refreshments, and Monday evening drinks reception. A conference dinner will take place on Tuesday 28th evening, and bookings can be made at the time of registration.

- Conference fee (for ISA RC16 Members): £100
- Conference fee (for non-members): £140
- Optional 3 course dinner at Selwyn College: £25
- Optional accommodation at Selwyn College (2 nights – 27th & 28th): £144

Accommodation

A limited amount of accommodation has been reserved at at Selywn College, and is bookable at the time of registration by 15 February 2016. Accommodation will be allocated on first

come basis. A full range of other accommodation options are also available in Cambridge, we recommend visitcambridge.org to help you find suitable accommodation.

Contact

Queries and submissions should be directed to Kate Williams:
rc16conference@sociology.cam.ac.uk

THEORY

INTERNATIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

*The Newsletter of the Research Committee on
Sociological Theory*
