

functional space-as-flows and territorial nation-states as space-of-places are the grids wherein international or global society is anchored. Such ruptures render the conventional distinction between internal and external increasingly problematic because there are various tiers of making collectively binding decisions. It also calls into question the concept of state sovereignty as an expression of a single fixed viewpoint and the research strategy of "methodological nationalism," which takes for granted national states as containerlike units, defined by the congruence of a fixed state territory, an intergenerational political community, and a legitimate state authority. In its stead, multilayered systems of rule, such as the European Union, demand a multiperspectival framework.

On a mesolevel, the dialectics of flows and places go hand in hand with the possibility of transfer of resources in space. Financial capital, for example, is distinctly more mobile than social capital. It is therefore often seen as the prototype of a global good. By contrast, social capital, such as networks of solidarity and trust, are place-bound, local assets, which can be rendered mobile across space only by social ties in kinship groups, organizations, and communities that connect distinct places. Any conceptualization of space across borders would therefore depend on the type of ties and (social) goods to be exchanged. Glocalization then means, first, that the local is produced—to a large extent—on the global or transnational level. Second, the local is also important in reconfiguring place. An empirical example for this approach is "transnational social spaces." Transnational social spaces consist of combinations of ties and their contents, positions in networks and organizations, and networks of organizations that can be found in at least two internationally distinct places. The concept of transnational social spaces probes into the question by what principles geographical propinquity, which implies the embeddedness of ties in place, is supplemented or transformed by transnational flows. This raises the question about the transaction mechanisms embedded in social ties and structures, such as exchange, reciprocity, and solidarity.

SPACE AND TIME: SOCIAL RELATIONS AND CHANGE

To conclude, the social sciences have used space in manifold ways, ranging from a conceptual tool to a metatheoretical concept. The same seems to be true for its twin sibling, time. Space and time share important commonalities and distinctions. Both refer to social action and social institutions, based on relations between positions in processes. The analysis of social processes requires that both actors and their (physical) environment are treated holistically, not separately. In Norbert Elias's thinking, each change in "space" implies movement in "time" and vice versa. For example, one cannot be perfectly immobile in a

room while time is passing. One's heart is beating, cells are dying and growing—change is continuous in "time and space." In the end, space and time may be expressions of two sides of the same coin. Space relates to relations between positions within sequences of events and action, abstracting from the fact that these relations are forever changing. Time, by contrast, is taking into account that such relations are continuously changing.

— Thomas Faist

See also Capitalism; Cosmopolitan Sociology; Globalization; Internet and Cyberculture; Time

FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

- Appadurai, Arjun. 1996. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Elias, Norbert. 1990. *Über die Zeit: Arbeiten zur Wissenssoziologie II* [On Time: Studies on the Sociology of Knowledge]. Frankfurt, Germany: Suhrkamp.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1986. *The Constitution of Society: An Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Reprint. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Hägerstrand, Torsten. 1984. "Presence and Absence: A Look at Conceptual Choices and Bodily Necessities." *Regional Studies* 18:373–80.
- Lefebvre, Henri. [1974] 1991. *The Production of Space*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Robertson, Roland. 1995. "Glocalization: Time-Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity." Pp. 25–44 in *Global Modernities*, edited by Roland Robertson et al. London: Sage.
- Ruggie, John Gerard. 1993. "Territoriality and Beyond: Problematizing Modernity in International Relations." *International Organization* 47:139–74.
- Simmel, Georg. 1903/1995. *Soziologie: Untersuchungen über die Formen der Vergesellschaftung* (Sociology: Studies on the Forms of Social Organization). Gesamtausgabe, Band 11. Edited by Ottheim Rammstedt. Frankfurt, Germany: Suhrkamp.
- Soja, Edward W. 1989. *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. London: Verso.

SOCIAL STRUCTURE

The idea of social structure is closely linked to an intellectual tradition that goes back to the work of Émile Durkheim, as well as to the structural functional theory that owes such a deep debt to his work.

Famously, Durkheim distinguished between nonmaterial and material social facts. All social facts are external to and coercive over individuals (or, at least, should be treated that

way). Nonmaterial social facts (e.g., norms, values, social institutions) exist in the realm of ideas, while material social facts have a real, material existence. One type of material social fact is a social structure. Thus, social structures can be defined as real material social facts that are external to and coercive over actors. For example, the state is such a social structure, as is the market in the realm of the economy.

Durkheim's work played a key role in the development of both structural functionalism and structuralism. The latter, however, is based on Durkheim's later work (e.g., *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*) and moves off in a different direction in search of the "deep" structures that undergird social thought and social action. Thus, structural functionalism played a key role in developing the notion of social structures (and social institutions), according to a central role in social analysis.

As the name suggests, structural functionalists were interested in the "functional" analysis of social structures. That is, they were interested in analyzing the consequences of given social structures for other social structures, as well as the larger society. The American sociologists Talcott Parsons and later Robert Merton provided the most extensive elaborations of the structural functionalist theory. Parsons developed a complex theory in which he argued that social systems are regulated by four functional needs: adaptation, goal attainment, integration, and latency (often abbreviated with the acronym AGIL). To survive, a social system must be structured to ensure that these needs are adequately and efficiently met. Although, as a student of Parsons, Merton shared many of the basic assumptions of structural functionalism, he was also critical of its more extreme functionalist views. For example, in contrast to the assumption that all elements in a social structure are functional for a society, Merton claimed that certain social beliefs and practices could be dysfunctional, or even non-functional. In elaborating this concept of dysfunction, he drew on Durkheim's famous concept of "anomie" to argue that certain social structures can lead to deviant behaviors. Critics outside the structural functionalist paradigm argued that structural functionalists tended to ignore agents or to see them as being controlled by social structures. Thus, structural functionalism was an extreme example of the tendency of some social theories to treat actors as what Harold Garfinkel called "judgmental dopes."

Of course, it is possible, even desirable, to look at the *relationship* between social structures and actors without giving priority to the former (or the latter as did, for example, phenomenologists, symbolic interactionists, and the like). Indeed, a great deal of recent social theory can be seen as according roughly equal weight to social structures and actors. Prime examples are Anthony Giddens's structuration theory and Pierre Bourdieu's work on the relationship between habitus and field. Indeed, the whole idea of

structuration (a term that is sometimes also associated with Bourdieu's approach) is that what are termed here (although not necessarily by Giddens) as social structures cannot be examined without simultaneously examining the agents who are involved in them and who are their creators.

In George Ritzer's integrated sociological paradigm, the argument is made that there is a need for a paradigm that focuses on the dialectical relationship among four "levels" of social analysis. The macro-objective level encompasses social structures (and more generally Durkheim's material social facts) and the macrosubjective encompasses social institutions (and Durkheim's nonmaterial social facts, more generally). These levels must be looked at in relationship not only to one another but also to the microlevels—micro-objective (behavior, action, and interaction) and micro-subjective (mind, self, thought, the social construction of reality). The key point from the perspective of this discussion is that social structures cannot be examined in isolation from all these "levels" of analysis.

Thus, social structure remains central to social theory, but the long-term trend has been away from treating it in isolation from the rest of social reality. Rather, today social structure is seen as one aspect of the social world that must be seen in relationship to all other aspects. It affects, but is affected by, all the others. Thus, contemporary social theory has a more balanced view of social structures and their role in the social world.

— George Ritzer

See also Durkheim, Émile; Merton, Robert; Parsons, Talcott; Ritzer, George; Social Facts; Structuration

FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

- Durkheim, E. [1895] 1964. *The Rules of Sociological Method*. New York: Free Press.
- Merton, R. K. 1949. *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York: Free Press.
- Parsons, T. 1949. *The Structure of Social Action*. 2d ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ritzer, G. 1981. *Toward an Integrated Sociological Paradigm: The Search for an Exemplar and an Image of the Subject Matter*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

SOCIAL STUDIES OF SCIENCE

Social studies of science, or science studies, is a trans-disciplinary research field that investigates historical, political, cultural, conceptual, and practical aspects and implications of the sciences. Because modern sciences are deeply intertwined with technology, the more comprehensive