Annals of Human and Social Sciences
www.ahss.org.pk

Understanding Social Theory Creation: A Perspective from Pierre Bourdieu and Talcott Parsons

[1]Dr. Mir Sadaat Baloch* [2]Dr. Abdul Wahid Zehri [3] Safi Ullah

1. Assistant Professor, Institute of Management Sciences, University of Balochistan, Quetta, Balochistan, Pakistan
2. Assistant Professor, Institute of Management Sciences, University of Balochistan, Quetta, Balochistan, Pakistan
3. Lecturer, Institute of Management Sciences, University of Balochistan, Quetta, Balochistan, Pakistan

| ***Corresponding Author** | sonybaluch@gmail.com |

ABSTRACT

The paper looks into social theory critically and will discuss issues that are related with creating social theory. The basic aim of this study is to introduce the idea of social theory and identify the issues that are fundamental to theorizing. The discussed social thinkers such as Bourdieu and Parsons to create a perspective about social theory. This paper discusses an account of social theory then the two social thinkers are analysed. Finally, the issue of Macro/Micro during creation of social theory is discussed. The paper concludes that the field of social theory is in flux and there have been attempts for categorisation and tenet creation but the theorist still tends to transcend them. Social theory gives and takes from the world concurrently and for that reason it can be said that it will remain in a flux.

| **Keywords:** | Enlightenment, Romanticism, Social Action, Social Order, Social Theory |

Introduction

The social being tend to reflect and think upon happenings around, then reconcile with 'social' fitting according to their perceptual filter and relate it with their knowledge set (Layder, 2005). Individuals find it difficult to experience the world directly and take assistance from theory, our personal explanations of why and how things happen around us is 'theory' but we are inclined not to regard it as such (Layder, 2005). We may not express our feelings in terms of universal categories or formal structures that we find in textbooks but we do relate our thoughts to politics, economics, society, and history (Layder, 2005).

We find it hard to make sense of information without personalisation. The personalisation is based on our regulated knowledge while ignoring many fundamental theoretical doctrines of how things work in the way they do (Best, 2002). Our knowledge is based partially on intuition and may be ambiguous without a formal reasoning but it is based upon the personal observation of consequences and causes that are real to us (Best, 2002).

This reasoning and reflection lead us to epistemological and ontological assumptions and by following such assumptions we create a sense of social and ground theories (Layder, 2005). Then the question surfaces what is social theory and what is it purpose? The purpose of social theory is not to simply describe the social world that mandate may have already been taken by our individual intuition (Mooney, Clever & Van Willigen, 2021). The mandate of social theory is beyond simple description and concern answering the question: 'how society is possible'? (Best, 2002). The positivists will try to answer the question by gathering data to test a hypothesis, while other social theorists propose we can find the answer through simple investigation. Social theory is about developing understanding of 'social' and it is linked directly with the practice of research

(Mooney, Clever & Van Willigen, 2021). The sociologists refer to 'social' as rules, norms and appropriate behaviours that individuals follow while living their lives (Best, 2002).

In the early days of social theory, it was believed that social shape the experiences of individuals about the world and it mark our identity, thoughts, culture and ideas (Mooney, Clever & Van Willigen, 2021). There is a duality in the nature of social, "it mediates our relationships with others and at the same time we as individuals produce it" (Best, 2002). In social theory there is a healthy debate on the nature and origins of social and all the theories are concerned about constrains and welfares levied by social (Mooney, Clever & Van Willigen, 2021).

The paper looks into social theory critically and will discuss issues that are related with creating social theory. It is not an easy choice to select the issues and thinkers related to this paper at times there can be a bit of incoherence or repetition due to the subtlety and nature of social theory (Layder, 2005). The basic aim of this study is to introduce the idea of social theory and identify the issues that are fundamental to theorizing. The social thinkers such as Bourdieu and Parsons discussed in this paper are selected because of their unique approach towards social. When social thinkers such as Marx, Weber and Durkhiem tried to understand social through economics or biology (Halewood, 2014). Bourdieu and Parsons were more concern about the cultural and historic aspect of society (Collyer, 2018). Due to the richness of social theory, there was a tendency of getting overwhelmed and de-tracked from the core issue of research, because of this issue important social thinkers such as Marx, Weber and Durkhiem were not selected. The focus of their work is more on economics and political though and discussing their work can take debate to a different direction (Halewood, 2014).

This paper initially discusses an account of social theory then the two social thinkers mentioned before are analysed. Finally, the issue of Macro/Micro is discussed to set the mood for further critique in the subject area.

Literature Review

Theorizing the Social Theory

The domain of social theory remains stimulating and thriving due to the incoherence and influx in its conception (Hughes *et al.,2003*). For the purpose of critique or investigation a categorisation is devised to understand the process of theorizing. (Ritzer & Smart, 2001):

- Marxism
- Feminism
- Structuralism
- Post-Structuralism of Anthony Giddens
- Postmodernism
- Positivism

Such a categorisation could not limit the theorist to transcend or oscillate their thoughts across. There have been attempts to devise principles for social theory to bring a synchronisation in social thoughts and to define the social theory (Hughes *et al.,2003*). Establishment of tenets is considered a potentially unacceptable deed in present times after the formation of feminist, multicultural and postmodern perspectives (Ritzer & Smart, 2001). In the postmodern era of social theory, it is asserted by scholars that defining a field of study is a risky partisan act, as it can cast certain features significant through inclusion and in a covert manner can also express certain principles as insignificant because of exclusion (Ritzer & Smart, 2001). It can be said that a definition can give a direction for research through specification. Any definition is not absolute and final and this is the reason

that there are varying definitions to serve different epistemological and ontological assumptions for empirical purpose (Hughes et al.,2003).

Specification for the field of social theory is problematic as the theory is influenced from number of disciplines such as, linguistics, sociology, philosophy, political economy and psychoanalysis, secondly, theoretical development within the field generates further complications (Hughes et al.,2003). There are competing conceptualisations, perspectives, and social issues examined under a range of different approaches that creates a lack of agreed paradigm (Ritzer & Smart, 2001).

With such an apostolic subtext it is not prudent to extent the notion of a canon for social theory but there are a substantial body of work that is acknowledged as fundamental for the field (Ritzer & Smart, 2001). Social theory formation is discursive and dynamic; it is subjected to alteration in the light of innovations, new interpretations and novel syntheses, in response to changing social conditions (Giddens, 2013a).

Debates and arguments in social theory are based on a shared set of assumptions related to work of theorists that have the most significant impact on the critique of modernity (Giddens, 2013b). The selection of such social thinkers varies according to requirement of a research and it can lead to highly selective attention to particular authors or text. "As social theory has developed there has been a tendency for perspective to become associated with camps of followers who close themselves off from ideas and information at odds with their own conceptions, the upshot of which is that they become less and less motivated to examine other perspectives (Ritzer & Smart, 2011)".

To overcome such issues a range of limited but diverse social thinkers is discussed in this paper but before discussing them it is central to highlight the factors that have transformed the social theory.

Factors changing the Social Theory

Since its inception social theory is implied by flux and transformation. Initially it focused the rapid attrition of customary life style and occurrence of modern world, features such as, how factor of productions were transformed and all social conditions were faced by continuous activism and insecurity (Wendt, 1999). In the early days of social the transformation of social condition was mainly associated with economic factors and industrialisation was decreed the basis of life style change (Wendt, 1999). The changes in the social were ascribed mainly to material while ignoring the immaterial. Suggestion of this can be drawn from the work of Marx, Weber or Durkhiem. Elias was one of the early thinkers who casted light on the immaterial aspect of social life such as history and manner responsible for social change (Van Krieken, 2001). This uninterrupted change and transformation had a significant consequence on social theory and resulted in identification of a propagation of perspectives and 'the field is almost constantly in flux' (Ritzer & Smart, 2001).

In the following passages a list of reason will be identified that can be related to change in social theory in recent times (Calhoun et al., 2022).

- **Improvement:** New theories and syntheses are frequently coming in the front. Theories such as actor-network theory and discourse analysis have a pronounced impact on social theory.

- **Reclamation:** Older ideas are being reclaimed and retrieved on a consistent pace. The work of Norbert Elias was ignored for decades before it was recognised and it has a significant impact on social theory.

- **Translation:** Translation of classic theories or new work that were not translated previously is giving new dimensions to social theory. The work of Bourdieu and Foucault has given a new dimension to study of knowledge and power.

- **Reinterpretation:** The work of classic thinkers such as Marx and Durkheim have been in debate over the time and are being reinterpreted in the light of new social context.

- **Changing intellectual priorities:** The outline and importance of perspectives changes with time but there are communities that sustain 'out-of-vogue' perspectives (Ritzer & Smart, 2001). There is an issue whether an older paradigm die or add to a new level of intellectual diversity. The issue of meta-theorising had enjoyed a burst of limelight but later retreated to shadows may be due to a change in epistemological alertness (Ritzer & Smart, 2001).

- **Changing social conditions:** A significant change in social thought is a factor to change in social conditions. There is a complex relation between developments in social change and changes in social conditions, to find the rigorous association between specific theoretical narratives and particular event is a fundamental focus of empirical research (Giddens, 2013b). The transformation and development of modernity has resulted in 'a runaway modern world' and social analysts have responded to it by introducing new concepts to theorise the changing conditions (Ritzer & Smart, 2001). The theorists have articulated concepts such as: 'reflexive modernisation', 'network society', and 'culture of real virtuality' are few of them (Ritzer & Smart, 2001).

- **Development in cognate fields of enquiry:** The works of early social theorists were mainly influenced by; economics, biology and sciences of language and any development in these fields can also have a significant impact on social theory (Turner, 2008). The works of Karl Marx, Emile Durkheim and Auguste Comte all have drawn heavily from these fields.

Theorising of social theory can be claimed as internally diverse, with a varied discourse and is branded by a range of traditions and school of thoughts (Wendt, 1999). The work of founder has helped to derive a portfolio of perspective and their work remain a foundation for making sense of late modern works (Giddens, 2013a). As explained "a social science like sociology does not develop cumulative knowledge in the same way as the natural sciences" (Anthony, 1990). The knowledge generated by social theory cannot stand independent or detached form social world, instead the conceptions and ideas generated will infiltrate the social context and will transform the social knowledge and context (Giddens, 2013a). Social theory gives and takes from the world concurrently and for that very reason it can be said that it will remain in a flux (Wendt, 1999). This led us to the issue how social theory is created?

Creating Social Theory

Creation of social theory is often alleged to major social changes that have occurred in the nineteenth century due to the formation of the nation-state, industrialisation, change in social relations due to capitalism and realignments between civil society and the state (Ritzer & Stepnisky, 2022). Before the creation of sociology critiques and analyses of such changes was examined under the umbrella of political economy, history, political philosophy and philosophy (Rundell, 2001). . The work of Weber and Durkhiem may have created the pathway for the creation of social theory and the changes mentioned above were also present before nineteenth century (Ritzer & Stepnisky, 2022). This indicates that before the creation of social theory there were social and theoretical instances that led to its creation and it is fundamental to discuss them before turning our attention towards the social thinkers.

During the eighteenth century three major intellectual currents were developed: Romanticism, Enlightenment, and the revolutionary tradition (J.Rundell, 2001). Collectively these three currents were labelled as socio-centric current as the name suggests the main focus of this current was the society. Romanticism was originated in German but it also took root in England, France and Russia in nineteenth century and even today it is a major cultural force (Ritzer & Stepnisky, 2022). It was a cultural movement that critiqued the society through art, music, poetry and literature; it also blurred the boundaries between philosophy and other form of expression (Ritzer & Stepnisky, 2022). During eighteenth century context specific conceptual vocabulary was developed by social theory scholars to express their thoughts more clearly and out of that vocabulary three terms; civil society, civilisation and culture become common point of reference across the Enlightenment, the Romanticism, and the revolutionary traditions (J.Rundell, 2001). The part of society that was separate from the state in which people engaged in political and/or commercial life as citizen was referred as civil society (Ritzer & Stepnisky, 2022). During eighteenth century culture and civilization were two competing notions, civilisation was used in sense of society and culture was viewed as something distant and separate from state power, commerce, and bureaucratic rule (Ritzer & Stepnisky, 2022). It was the thinkers of Eighteenth-century that invoked the theoretical notes of civilisation, civil society and culture which resulted into further ideas and thinking about society.

Pierre Bourdieu

Pierre Bourdieu is one the leading French social scientist of modern times. It can be said that it is almost impossible to investigate any social conception without a reference to his work (Harker, Mahar & Wilkes, 2016). It is not possible to have a detail discussion on the diversity his work; even a summary of his main works can't be justified in such a limited space.

Bourdieu is known for disapproving the objectivist and subjectivist forms of knowledge and the substantialist view of reality, he lacked adherence to any given theoretical tradition, and his primary concern was not for a conceptual genealogy (Harker, Mahar & Wilkes, 2016) His sociology is explicitly political as he aims at the alteration of culture and society through revolutionary disclosure (Beilharz,1992).

Bourdieu is one of the first post-World War II sociologists to explore the issue of agency/structure and propose a "dialectical relationship", he was against the idea of conceptualisation human action as direct and result of internal factors (Swartz, 2012). His work is concern with reintroducing space and time into the theories of social structure and social action with empirical research, and his theoretical rigour is considered to be compatible with Anthony Giddens (Beilharz, 1992).

In Bourdieu's opinion a unified theory is not possible because of subjectivist and objectivist forms of knowledge, in response to that he has developed theories relative to power, culture, stratification, and sociological knowledge (Harker, Mahar & Wilkes, 2016). He identifies a relation between social structure, culture and action while analysing symbolic power. He proposes that by exploring the institutions, processes and cultural resources we can understand 'how stratified social systems of hierarchy and domination persist and reproduce inter-generationally without powerful resistance and without the conscious recognition of their members' (Swartz, 2012). For Bourdieu the heart of all social life is power hence he never treated it as a separate domain of study and to him exercise of power successfully legitimation is requisite (Harker, Mahar & Wilkes, 2016).

The main concern for Bourdieu is the debate between historical materialism and cultural idealism; he attempts to find a central road that transcends the classic bipolarity of idealism/materialism by suggesting a materialist yet non-reductive account of cultural life (Robson & Sanders, 2009). The pervious social thinkers such as, Marx, Weber or Durkhiem

tried to explain social with help of economics and factor of production but Bourdieu resonating with Elias thinking suggests to look beyond materialism (Robson & Sanders, 2009). His conception of culture is as a form of *capital* with particular decrees of exchanges, accumulation, and exercise, where power is established and retain through symbolic violence and *capital* that reinforces the active role of symbolic forms as resources (Swartz, 2012).

His theoretical arguments are not well demarcated and orderly and themes overlay and interpenetrate as they are drawn from a wide variety of intellectual influences. On a holistic level his thinking is that individuals and group are interconnected through cultural resources, institutions, and resources producing arrays of dominations and it is obligation of sociology to reveal this concealed aspect of power relations (Robson & Sanders, 2009). Bourdieu compares sociology with practice of psychology: a psychoanalyst duty is to analyse the unconscious of a patients and a sociologist is concern with 'social unconscious' (Swartz, 2012). The focus of *socioanalysis* is the unrecognised interests that individuals follow as they take part in an un-egalitarian social order (Swartz, 2012).

Bourdieu is an important social theorist of modern times, who has an influence over a wide array of conceptualisation and problematic. Without adhering to a theoretical tradition or genealogy he aims to unearth the elusive side of social. His work cultural idealism, historical materialism, socioanalysis, knowledge and power are fundamental to modern social theory. His concepts of *habitus, fields* and *capital* are fundamental for analysis of social from an idealist lens and the idea of *reflexivity* can ensure rigour in the process.

Talcott Parsons

In twenty-first century, many of current modes of theoretical effort are in difference with Parsons social theory (Parsons, 2010). Today the theory is split with epistemological disagreement; it is disjointed in scope, anti-foundational in temper and unsure of its relationship with political and social action (Parsons, 2010). Since the start of his career Parsons efforts were to generate an integrated chart of the social. He is considered an iconic figure in social theory for working against the anti-canonical doctrine and for his usage of the vocabulary of structured systems, determinate input-output relations and boundary interchanges (Holton, 2001).

Parsons sociological efforts were in a flux and oscillated between many of its curiosities and prominences as he met or tackled with different social changes and intellectual challenges, which seemed to defy facets of his pervious rational (Holton, 2001). The problem of social order and social action are the two main theoretical issues that mainly concerned his work (Parsons, 2010). The problem of social action asks why human act in certain ways, how far their actions are organized by stimuli external to their authority, and the consequences that follows (Halmwood,2014). The problem of social order investigates the option for a diversity of social actions to fabricate some kind of harmonized social designing, and whether such designing depends on influence or obligation, as against agreement (Halmwood,2014).

In the modern society these issues come under the umbrella of self-interest and rationality in social life (Halmwood,2014). But if we consider social action vis-à-vis rational and self-interest there remains the struggle to justify how self-interest can create social order. Explaining social action in terms of causal effect of structures outside individual power may compromise the concepts of rationality and human autonomy, judgement and perception in social life (Holton, 2001). Parsons tried to tackle these issues with some kind of new theoretical synthesis; he tried to combine agency and structure under the 'macro' institutions and rules underlying social order under the 'micro' personality or self (Holton, 2001).

The numerous forms of social differentiation signified in Parsons' pattern variables were established in both a theoretical and historical course; academically they were linked into the four-functions or AGIL paradigm, which stayed at the heart of his theoretic activities until his death (Holton, 2001). The social life is expressed in terms of four chief exigencies through an exceedingly immaterial scheme. "The adaptive (A) challenge comprises interaction between society and outer nature, generating resources available for social distribution. The goal-attainment (G) challenge involves the setting of resources to meet human goals. The integration (I) challenge is concerned with the harmonization of the entire social system, including A, I and L elements, through effective norms. The final component of this account is the latent pattern-maintenance (L) challenge, which involves interactions with the society and the inner metaphysical environment, and is concerned with the stabilization of the ultimate values held by individuals into patterns of social values. These are projected as latent insofar as they become taken for granted rather than explicit". (Holton, 2001).

This AGIL system is not a realistic explanation of social life rather an analytical paradigm. This paradigm offers a theoretical map of social in terms of four challenges faced by any social system and between exterior nature and the metaphysical state (Holton, 2001). These four AGIL categories are further divided into sub-division to make their differentiation easier. The social system in this paradigm is defined generally than the orthodox connotation of social system with national societies; an entity self-regulating with respect to an environment qualifies as a social system (Holton, 2001). Parsons' AGIL categories is criticised for its exceptionally ahistorical conception and he tried to respond this concern with article and books but that could not fit his grand theoretical organisation.

Another fundamental area of Parsons work is his use of system theory. His systems theory is seen both as an endeavour that remains mainly disprove in its overall considerations (Holton, 2001). It is about postulating of units that can be analytically distinguished from the environments, in which they function, but often mistaken as the theory of a particular kind of experimental object (Holton, 2001). Parsons didn't probe enough the relations between systems and their environment, he fails to identify in what sense systems are closed or open with respect to an environment (Holton, 2001). He did explore the openness of environment in the physical and metaphysical sense but he failed to discuss the communicative rationality of a system (Holton, 2001). The system theory is a major debated reference point but its outlook in modern social thought remains imprecise.

The problem of Macro/Micro in Social theory

Working in a specific field of empirical enquiry often considers the problem of Macro/Micro of little importance, but for the paper under discussion it does hold importance (Heller, 2014). The paper is related to social theory this discussion will create a good case for epistemological and ontological assumptions about theory generation.

The macro-sociologists have to fear on their right the individualistic reductionism and on left they face deconstruction by micro-sociologist and none of them have allowed their references to 'convenient simplification'(Barnes,2001). Whereas, the macro-sociologist strives for simplification, the micro-sociologists decree this simplification harmful for theory and intellect of social theory (Heller, 2014). Macro-descriptions tend to over-simply a concept/object while ignoring the composite character of it and turn into less problematic epistemologically compared to reductionist micro-account (Barnes,2001). But this virtue of compensation about macro-description does not exist in sociology and social theory rather macro-object are the trickier to realise here (Heller, 2014). In the field of sociology and social theory institutions and social system give rise to greater practical-epistemological problems than individuals and situations (Cowen et al., 2022). Micro-descriptions may have been regarded as the uncritical acceptance of appearances but for

the vantage of critical potency and profundity in social theory it has played a careful role (Cowen et al., 2022).

Many of macro-sociologists and social theorists consider the issue of macro/micro as a defence against reductionism (Cowen et al., 2022). "Critics have often regarded it as an imperialistic and undiscriminating intellectual movement lacking any genuine empirical curiosity – one that has sought to make sense of all it has encountered within a pre-ordained framework, rather as Marxism used to do (Ritzer & Smart, 2001).

It may be regarded as a rigid movement but on the flipside, it also had some beneficial effect such as keeping the vital issues into a prolonged debate hence resulting into some fruitful idea and counter-examples (Barnes,2001). The debate between descriptions has not been subjugated to metaphysical and ontological issues rather it was more about pragmatist and constructivist perspectives (Cowen et al., 2022). There are interesting inferences devoted to constructivist and pragmatist orientations related to field of enquiry but their significance is limited in sociology and social theory (Barnes,2001). "The macro/micro problem is then not a problem within the theory, of the relations of those levels of theory associated with real-world objects; it is a problem for theory, an observable product of human theorizing activity which has to made intelligible in and through that very activity" (Ritzer & Smart, 2001).

The macro/micro debate has now become mostly about the relationship of structure and agency and there is an unprecedented level of discussion about the issue (Cowen et al., 2022). One of the major parts of sociology and social theory is about agency of human beings and the nature of their voluntary actions. Sociology has established itself in the English-speaking world more than six decades ago and at that time human societies were considered as patterned and ordered and the task was to sought explaining for such patterns (Barnes,2001). The main concern of theory was to look into the voluntary actions and their patterns and influences; there was an urge to explain those actions with the help of other sciences. The popular cited influences were, external coercive powers, social pressures, class interest beside that, social norms and rules were dominated in field of structural functional sociology (Barnes,2001). The implications of these issues led to a series of assertions such as: actions are caused by norms, there is an overall pattern in actions because there is a pattern in norms they follow, the pattern followed is called the structure of society, norms are ordered according the statuses in society and actions can be explained and understood through these assertions (Barnes,2001). The macro-sociologist seen social structure as: separate, real, prior, explanatory and macro and pattern as a separate real micro-entity that actions manifest and that entity explain the actions (Barnes,2001). The reification of structure was dismissed and the main reason for its demise was not inherent inadequacies rather the concern about the dignity and standing of individual in a secular patter of social change (Barnes,2001).

Conclusion

The field of social theory is in flux and since its inception there has been a healthy discourse. There have been attempts for categorisation and tenet creation in the filed but the theorist still tends to transcend them. There have been differing definitions of social theory to fit the epistemological and ontological purpose of a research. Social theory gives and takes from the world concurrently and for that reason it can be said that it will remain in a flux. Before the creation of social theory there were social and theoretical instances that led to its creation. The eighteenth-century intellectual currents were of Romanticism, Enlightenment, and the revolutionary tradition can be attributed as the foundation of social theory.

In Bourdieu's opinion a unified theory is not possible because of subjectivist and objectivist forms of knowledge, in response to that he has developed theories relative to

power, culture, stratification, and sociological knowledge. The main concern for Bourdieu is the debate between historical materialism and cultural idealism; he attempts to find a central road that transcends the classic bipolarity of idealism/materialism by suggesting a materialist yet non-reductive account of cultural life. The pervious social thinkers such as, Marx, Weber or Durkhiem tried to explain social with help of economics and factor of production but Bourdieu resonating with Elias thinking suggests to look beyond materialism. His conception of culture is as a form of *capital* with particular decrees of exchanges, accumulation, and exercise, where power is established and retain through symbolic violence and *capital* that reinforces the active role of symbolic forms as resources.

Parsons sociological effort was in a flux and oscillated between many of its curiosities and prominences as he met or tackled with different social changes and intellectual challenges, which seemed to defy facets of his pervious rational. The problem of social order and social action are the two main theoretical issues that mainly concerned his work. The problem of social action asks why human act in certain ways, how far their actions are organized by stimuli external to their authority, and the consequences that follows.

The macro/micro debate has now become mostly about the relationship of structure and agency and there is an unprecedented level of discussion about the issue. One of the major parts of sociology and social theory is about agency of human beings and the nature of their voluntary actions.

References

Anthony, G. (1990). *The consequences of modernity*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Barnes, B. (2001). *The macro/micro problem and the problem of structure and agency.*

BEILHARZ, P. (1992). anthropology of The German Ideology, the critical history of the Eight. *Social Theory: A guide to central thinkers*, 168.Best, S. (2002). A beginner's guide to social theory: Sage.

Collyer, F. (2018). Envisaging the healthcare sector as a field: Moving from Talcott Parsons to Pierre Bourdieu. *Social Theory & Health*, *16*(2), 111-126.

Cowen, A. P., Rink, F., Cuypers, I. R., Grégoire, D. A., & Weller, I. (2022). Applying Coleman's Boat in Management Research: Opportunities and Challenges in Bridging Macro and Micro Theory. *Academy of Management Journal*, *65*(1), 1-10.

Giddens, A. (2013a). *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age*: John Wiley & Sons.

Giddens, A. (2013b). *Social theory and modern sociology*: John Wiley & Sons.

Halewood, M. (2014). *Rethinking the social through Durkheim, Marx, Weber and whitehead*. Anthem Press.

Haugaard, M. (2002). *Power: A reader*: Manchester University Press.

Holmwood, J. (2014). *Founding Sociology? Talcott Parsons and the Idea of General Theory*. Routledge.

Heller, M. (2014). Undoing the macro/micro dichotomy: Ideology and categorisation in a linguistic minority school. In *Sociolinguistics and social theory* (228-250). Routledge.

Holton, R. J. (2001). Talcott Parsons: Conservatlre Apologlst or lrreplaceable lcon? *Handbook of Social Theory*

Hughes, J. A., Sharrock, W., & Martin, P. J. (2003). *Understanding Classical Sociology: Marx, Weber, Durkheim*. Sage.

Layder, D. (2005). *Understanding social theory*. Sage.

Mooney, L. A., Clever, M., & Van Willigen, M. (2021). *Understanding social problems*. Cengage learning.

Parsons, T. (2010). *Essays in sociological theory*. Simon and Schuster.

Ritzer, G., & Stepnisky, J. (2022). *Contemporary sociological theory and its classical roots: The basics*. Sage Publications.

Ritzer, G., & Smart, B. (2001). *Handbook of social theory*: Sage.

Robson, K., & Sanders, C. (Eds.). (2009). *Quantifying Theory: Pierre Bourdieu* Dordrecht: Springer.

Rundell, J. (2001). Modernity, enlightenment, revolution and romanticism: Creating social theory. *Handbook of social theory*, 13-29.

Rundell, J. F. (1987). *Origins of modernity: The origins of modern social theory from Kant to Hegel to Marx:* Polity Press Cambridge.

Swartz, D. (2012). *Culture and power: The sociology of Pierre Bourdieu*: University of Chicago Press.

Taylor, C. (1985). *Philosophical papers: Volume 1, Human agency and language* (Vol. 1). Cambridge University Press.

Turner, B. S. (2008). *The body and society: Explorations in social theory*. Sage.

Van Krieken, R. (1998). *Norbert Elias*: Psychology Press.

Van Krieken, R. (2001). Norbert Ellas and Process Soclology. *Handbook of Social Theory*, 11994, 353.

Wendt, A. (1999). *Social theory of international politics* (Vol. 67). Cambridge University Press.