

Making Power Visible: Racialized Epistemologies, Knowledge (Re)Production and
American Sociology

Jennifer Lynn Padilla Wyse

Dissertation submitted to the faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State
University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy In
Sociology

David L. Brunsma, Committee Chair
Ellington T. Graves
Lakshmi Jayaram
Wornie Reed

September 23, 2014
Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords: race, U.S. American Sociology, knowledge reproduction, power,
epistemology

Copyright

Making Power Visible: Racialized Epistemologies, Knowledge (Re)Production and American Sociology

Jennifer Lynn Padilla Wyse

ABSTRACT

This dissertation methodologically analyzes triangulated qualitative data from a critical race and feminist standpoint theoretical approach in order to explore American Sociology's contemporary process of institutionalized knowledge reproduction, as well as how race structures that process. American Sociology is institutionalized knowledge that is structured into academic departments or an "institutional-structure" (Wallerstein 2007). Prestige structures the discipline, where the top-20 departments enact social closure through hiring practices and as such represent an element of elite power within the institutional-structure (Burris 2004; Lenski 1966). To be sure, institutional-structures are sites of collective memory, knowledge reproduction, professionalization and cognitive socialization processes. Therefore this dissertation data includes PhD-level required theory course syllabi, interviews with faculty that study race, Ph.D. candidates that study sociology, and defended dissertations from the year 2011, from the top-20 U.S. sociology departments that read as cultural representations of how race structures the reproduction of American Sociology's institutionalized knowledge. This study has implications for the teaching, learning, and practice of American Sociology, as well as future scholarly research on the reproduction of knowledge and the sociology of sociology.

Acknowledgements

Many people assisted me to this point in my academic career. I would first like to thank my committee. Dr. Dave Brunsma, my committee chair and devoted mentor, encouraged this research from the beginning. He provided valuable mentorship in helping to improve my research, writing, and teaching. His writing seminars proved to be invaluable, and have sharpened and molded skills that will prove useful throughout my career. I will forever be appreciative for what I have learned and hopefully continue to learn from him. I would also like to thank Dr. Ellington Graves for creating a vigorous intellectual environment; Dr. Lakshmi Jayaram for also encouraging this research from the beginning and providing invaluable support along the way; and lastly Dr. Wornie Reed for challenging my ideas, pushing me forward, and encouraging intellectual debate. And, of course, thank you to all the faculty and Ph.D. candidates who participated in this study; I very much appreciated your willingness to share your experiences at your respective departments and within our field more generally.

I would be remiss if I did not thank Dr. Terry Kershaw. Though I was set to only complete my master's degree, Dr. Kershaw encouraged me to pursue a PhD and affect change. Many thanks to Dr. Anthony Peguero for being a unwavering support, both personally and professionally. A special thanks to Dr. Woody Farrar who, though he is no longer with us, I am quite sure would have loved this dissertation topic. I would also like to thank Dr. Ansley Abraham and the Southern Regional Education Board Doctoral Scholars Program for their support along this journey. More broadly, I would like to thank the Africana Studies program and the Department of Sociology at Virginia Tech. It was my education in both sociology and Africana Studies that encouraged this dissertation topic. Specific shout outs to Dr. Polanah, Dr. Karl Precoda, Dr. Beverly Bunch-Lyons, and Dr. Carol Bailey.

I would like to think all my friends and colleagues who have supported me along the way; Nicklaus Spruill, Laura Agnich, Jahi Johnson, Pamela Mullins, Sara McDonough, Nate Chapman, Leighton Vila, Shawn Braxton, Carson Byrd, Lindsay Khale, Gary Wood, Njeri Kershaw, George Still, and April Stapp. I would also like to thank the many participants of Dr. Brunsma's writing seminars who, collectively, reviewed multiple manuscripts from this dissertation. If I have missed anyone, please know that I appreciate all your support and love.

I would like to outwardly express my appreciation and love for my parents, William Jay and Linda Wyse, who have always supported me in all my endeavors. My sister Emily and brother-in-law James Perkerson who always provided me with support and a much needed space outside of the Ivory Tower! I am proud to represent for my ancestors including Great Tata Merced and Great Grandma Sotera Padilla, Grandpa Walter Padilla, Grandma Mavis Wyse, Aunt Alice and Uncle Val Padilla. I am indebted to the unwavering support and prayers of the strongest women I know, the Padilla women, including Beryl Padilla, Dorita Rosewitz, Christine Lane, and Sandra Colón. Thank you to my cousins Ashley Colón, Eric Rosewitz, Joey Colón, Todd Rosewitz, Ryan Lane, Kurt Lane, and Miriam Kopels. I would also like to thank my grandparents Bill and Bess

Wyse for their prayers and support. To my niece Ryan Perkerson; my little cousins Mia, Bryanna, Isaiah, and Lilah Ruth; and my godkids Anthoni, Maleak, Tuck, and Alyssa. I hope that each of you will be able to do what you love. And of course I have to give a shout out to my friends who have witnessed this improbable journey and have supported me every step of the way: Maria Atubiga, Donetta Watson, Nicole Gonzales, Fallon Lewis, Laura Benjamin, Rose Cariazo, Stephen Guenzi, Debbie and Rod Burley, as well as Lori and Art Rowe.

Table of Contents

Introduction	Pg. 1
Chapter 1: American Sociology: History and Racially Gendered Classed Knowledge Reproduction	Pg. 2
Chapter 2: Reproduction of Racially Gendered Institutionalized Knowledge: The Case of American Sociology	Pg. 38
Chapter 3: The Reproduction of Race in American Sociology: Faculty Reflections	Pg. 81
Chapter 4: The Reproduction of Race in American Sociology: Ph.D. Candidate Reflections	Pg. 110
Chapter 5: American Sociology: Race, Gender, and the Production of Knowledge	Pg. 142
Conclusion: American Sociology: Contemporary Reproduction of Racialized Structural Inequalities of Knowledge	Pg. 172
Table 1: Top-20 U.S. Sociology Departments	Pg. 211
Appendix: Methodology	Pg. 212

Introduction

This dissertation seeks to understand U.S. American Sociology's contemporary institutionalized knowledge reproduction process as well as if, and how, race structures that process. Recent literature identifies American Sociology as an "institutional-structure" of both institutionalized knowledge and structured departments of prestige (Wallerstein 2007). The top-20 U.S. sociology departments through interdepartmental hiring processes enact social closure and as such are representative of disciplinary power with U.S. American sociology (Burris 2004). In order to understand US Americans sociologies contemporary institutionalize knowledge preproduction process, this dissertation utilized triangulated data from the top 20 US sociology departments including PhD-level required theory course syllabi, interviews with faculty that study race, Ph.D. candidates that study sociology, and defended dissertations from the year 2011 from the ProQuest database. This dissertation is formatted in manuscript style. The first manuscript (Chapter 1) historically contextualizes U.S. American Sociology, as an "institutional-structure," within racialized power-relations. The second manuscript (Chapter 2) is an analysis of the required PhD-level theory syllabi. The third manuscript (Chapter 3) is an analysis of the interviews with faculty that study race at the top-20 U.S. sociology departments. The fourth manuscript (Chapter 4) is an analysis of the interviews with PhD candidates that study Sociology at the top-20 US sociology departments. The fifth manuscript (Chapter 5) is an analysis of dissertations defended in 2011 at the top-20 U.S. sociology departments that were available on the ProQuest database. And the sixth manuscript (the conclusion) is analysis of the triangulated data dad allows for a robust understanding the contemporary process of knowledge reproduction in U.S. American Sociology. Together this data illustrates the contemporary reproduction of racialized structural inequalities of knowledge in U.S. American Sociology and has real implications for future research on the sociology of knowledge, sociology of sociology, as well as the practice of teaching and learning.

Chapter 1: American Sociology: History and Racially Gendered Classed Knowledge Reproduction

Abstract This paper explores how racially gendered classed power-relations structure history, knowledge and American Sociology's historical memory and disciplinary knowledge production. In order to do so, this paper 1) utilizes Cabral's (1970) theory of history to center humanity as historically developed into a racially gendered classed capitalist world-system, 2) employs intersectionality as a heuristic device to see how knowledge is manipulated to normalize dehumanization as well as to perpetuate exploitation and privilege by denying "Others'" knowledge, and lastly 3) sociologically imagines this racially gendered classed process in the institutional-structure of American Sociology by exploring the ancestry of the concept of "intersectionality." In all this paper argues 1) American Sociology under theorizes history, a central aspect of the sociological imagination and consequently the production of new sociological knowledge, 2) American Sociology reproduces a dehumanized theory of history per Marx's "historical materialism" and 3) the structure of American Sociology's knowledge is racially gendered classed, as illustrated in the collective memory of the concept of "intersectionality."

Introduction

Sociology is seeing and knowing humanity through the study of societies.¹ In order to "see" society, sociology utilizes the sociological imagination to "know" how historical forces shape contemporary humanity's socially lived experiences, both globally and locally (Mills 1959). Knowledge produced through the use of the sociological

imagination also enables us to “see” and “know” the global historical development of humanity into exploitative socially structured racially gendered classed power-relations of a total capitalist world system that is read in cultural representations (Lemert 2001; Glenn 1999:9). The sociological imagination enables us to see how historical forces shape our contemporary socially lived experiences (Mills 1959). Consequently the theoretical importance of history is central to understanding our social world.

The purpose of this paper is to explore how racially gendered classed power-relations structure history, knowledge and American Sociology’s historical memory and disciplinary knowledge production. In order to do so, this paper will 1) utilize Cabral’s (1970) theory of history to center humanity as historically developed into a racially gendered classed capitalist world-system, 2) employ intersectionality as a heuristic device to see how knowledge is manipulated to normalize dehumanization as well as to perpetuate exploitation and privilege by denying “Others” knowledge, 3) sociologically imagine this racially gendered classed process in the institutional-structure of American Sociology by exploring the ancestry of the concept of “intersectionality.”

Cabral and Theorizing the History of Humanity

In order to understand society (i.e. humanity) in a scientific manner, to produce sociological knowledge and to adequately develop a sociological imagination, the theorization of history is profoundly important (Mills 1959). American Sociology, as an institutional structure of sociology in the U.S., underdevelops the theorization of the history of humanity. Alternatively, American Sociology depicts history according to Marx’s “historical materialism,” where history is reproduced as “class struggle” and alienated from the very humanity that creates it (Marx 1972). Notably Marx asserted his

theorization of history was not applicable to the non-European “historical record” (Marx 1972). As a result, American Sociology underdevelops the theorization of history and consequently the sociological imagination, as well as inadequately explains the global and local histories of humanity that ultimately developed into the racially gendered classed capitalist world-system.

Amilcar Cabral’s weapon of theorized history is an epistemic product of the Black Radical Thought Tradition² that centers history in humanity’s development of productive forces socially organized and dependent on political ruling power (Cabral 1966, 1970; Robinson 1983). For Cabral, history is the nation’s³ “level of production” where “productive [human] forces” utilize technology to dominate nature that is socially organized into a “system of social utilization” dependent on 1) the access to the means of dominating nature and 2) the structure of political power (Cabral 1966:688). The development of history through space and time is the free, collective operation of “developing productive [human] forces” (Cabral 1970:705; Rabaka 2009). The socio-economic material relations of class result from “the level of productive [human] forces” and the “pattern of ownership of the means of production” (Cabral 1966:686). Contrary to contemporary theorizations (e.g. Wallerstein 1978), the development of productive human forces and the social system, taken together, determine the mode of production (Cabral 1966:686). According to Cabral (1970:706, 715) the economic, political and social conflicts of collective historical processes flower into culture. Culture then reads as the collective synthesis of humanity’s history.

Cabral’s theorization of history is more holistic and applicable to explaining humanity’s collective development across space and time. Utilizing Cabral’s humanistic

centered history, as well as accumulated knowledge of the Black Radical Thought tradition, this section explains the historical development of humanity into racially gendered classed power-relations within the capitalist world-system, beginning in 14thth century “Western Sudan.”⁴

Western Sudan in the 1400’s was politically dependent on the Mali Empire (1230-1494) that had a level of agricultural and trade production with a communal pattern of ownership organized by age and cultivator v. pastoralist systems (Rodney 1972:54). The Mali Empire was part of the regional Trans-Saharan trade (600-1600) and the African Transcontinental trade (1100-1600) that included interconnected core trading centers of “Kumbi Saleh, Jenne, Walata, and Gao” and material trade of “salt, gold, ivory, cloth, and kola nuts” (Rodney 1972; Okafor 2007:268).

In the 1400’s European kings and queens represented the political ruling power of nations, power centered on the economic system of feudalism. Feudalism was based on ownership of the level of production that was centered on fief (land) and socially organized as a system of lords, “noblemen who owned land,” vessels were “granted the land,” and serfs who were enslaved to the land (Cox 1948:124; Conley 2011:513). European merchants, the “opportunistic strata” of the soon-to-be Bourgeoisie, began to see trade as a global system, encouraged by European royalty who sought quality trade products including the blue cotton of Jenne (Robinson 1983:20). The trade in material goods was also the humanistic trade in knowledge. As such, the trade of knowledge and material goods revolutionized European technological domination of nature, or the Agricultural Revolution that developed European nation’s productive forces and gave rise to the need for large quantities of land and human labor to produce raw material from it

(Wallerstein 2004; Conley 2011). In a historical development Memmi (1965:xvii) proclaimed was “the greatest calamity of humanity,” the vision of a global trade system set in motion the historical development of humanity into the capitalist world-system that is socially organized into racially gendered classed human relations that have real lived consequences for human groups dependent on the ruling political power of the nation-state.

By the 1500’s the Bourgeoisie enslaved, and European nations colonized, Native American peoples for the purpose of accumulating capital and wealth respectively. As such, Native peoples’ social, political, and economic freedom to develop their level of productive forces was enslaved, colonized, and dehumanized. The colonization of Native peoples’ lands meant European nations and their Bourgeoisie required human labor to produce the lands, developing the trade in human productive forces; including indentured Europeans (criminals, debtors, free will, etc) and captive Africans. In this way, European merchants brought the external need of human productive labor to Western Sudan.

The global trade in human beings was part of the Mercantilist stage of capitalism (Williams 1961; Robinson 1983). Mercantilism required trade monopolies that allowed the Bourgeoisie and European nations to accumulate “primitive [private]...capital” and wealth respectively (Williams 1961; Wallerstein 2004). For example, England monopolized the shipping trade in captive human beings from Africa, a trade policy known as the “Exclusive,” that allowed English Bourgeoisie to accumulate primitive capital in industries related to the slave trade including shipbuilding, iron works, and banking (James 1938:60; Williams 1961:63, 101; Robinson 1983). In the 1600’s European accumulated primitive capital, extracted from enslaved labor and privately

owned by the Bourgeoisie financed the development of European nations' level of productive forces into an industrialized technological domination of nature; the Industrial Revolution (Williams 1961; Robinson 1983). The Industrial Revolution increased the need for raw materials used in manufacturing and, as a result, increased the need for enslaved human labor (Robinson 1983). This increased need coincided with the fall of the Songhai Empire in 1695 after years of warring "Moroccan invasions aided by Spanish mercenaries" (Anderson and Stewart 2007). The fall of the Songhai Empire allowed for the penetration of the slave trade into Western Sudan and set in motion the Transatlantic "trade" of between 11 and 20 million human beings. For example, between 1700 and 1710 the West Sudanese "Gold Coast" went from "gold-mining to slave-raiding" (Rodney 1972:107). The capital accumulated from enslaved labor allowed the Bourgeoisie to firmly obtain power of the political nation, making real the power-elite, the political-economy, and the nation-state; for example the materialization of the U.S. The French Bourgeoisie accumulated primitive capital from enslaved labor and trade with Western Sudan to finance France's industrial revolution (Williams 1961:96, 123, 136). To be sure, enslaved Africans were the "most dynamic and powerful social force in the [history of the] colonies" in that their productive human labor created the "very wealth" that destroyed Mercantilism and staged industrial capitalism; a central element to understanding the role of productive forces in the history of humanity developed into a capitalist world-system (Williams 1961:201, 208).

In the 1800's as part of capitalism's continual need for the expansion of production, accumulation of capital, and private appropriation, Western nation-states colonized African peoples and lands into "colonial possessions" by warring with and

technologically dominating African political entities (Rodney 1972). For example, including but not limited to the Xhosa's Hundred Years war (1779-1880), Angola's 1850's and 1880's wars, 1870's Ashanti war against Britain, and the Tanzanian Yao and Hehe 1890's war against Germany (Robinson 1983:220, 221). In 1884 at the Berlin Conference Western nation-states' planned to colonize Africa by constructing geo-political African nations to Imperialistically solidify the "international division of labour" composed of industrialized Western core nation-states and agricultural and mining non-Western periphery colonies (Rodney 1972:194; Wallerstein 2004). The structure of the capitalist Imperialist world-system, in economic relation to the development of productive forces, overdeveloped Western nation-states and underdeveloped non-Western nation-states (Rodney 1972:170; Robinson 1983:164). As an illustration, the U.S. nation-state colonized Liberia and allowed the Firestone Rubber Company to buy 1 million acres of rubber trees for 6¢ an acre; an exploitative process repeated by other members of the Bourgeoisie (Rodney 1972:168; Robinson 1983:164). By the 1950's and 1960's African nation-states obtained political independence, however true decolonization was elided as African nation-states' level of productive forces were not fully liberated; as such the historical stage of the capitalist world-system is contemporarily explained by socio-economic neocolonization (Fanon 1965; Nkrumah 1965).

Applying Cabral's theory of history explains the development of the capitalist world-system and empowers the sociological imagination in two distinct ways; 1) it centers the locomotive of history in humanity and 2) analyzes the historical development of the capitalist world-system to make visible political-economic structures of power. Utilizing Cabral's theory of history, and the knowledge accumulated from the Black Radical

Thought tradition, centers our sociological imagination in a humanistic understanding of history and historical development of the capitalist world-system; specifically exploitation and privilege. The social construction of the political-economy is consequently real in that our humanity is socially organized into racially gendered classed power-relations specifically dependent upon political formations of nation-states (Omi and Winant 1986). The capitalist world system's power-elite⁵ utilize race, class and gender to structure and socially organize the allocation of resources garnered from exploitation and privilege; in other words social oppression (Rodney 1972:99; Blauner 1972:21; Collins 1990; Higginbothom 1995; Mills 1999; Glenn 2002:12; Feagin 2006). The history of “social, political, and economic conflict” of the capitalist world-system flowers into culture that reads as both a culture of oppression and a culture of resistance (Cabral 1970). Grounded in a humanistic sociological imagination, per Cabral’s theory of history, the next section explores how racially gendered classed power-relations are read in the cultural reproduction of institutionalized knowledge and history that superstructure the total capitalist world-system.

Intersectionality: Critically Framing History and Knowledge

Intersectionality is an epistemological concept that operationalizes race and gender as “intersecting and interlocking structures” with real consequences where race is gendered and gender is racialized that together reflects classed material relations of exploitation and privilege (Collins 1990; Higginbothom 1995; Glenn 1999:8, 12, 13). Race class and gender analytically are 1) social structures that 2) structure and affect social human “relations” that can be read in 3) cultural representations of societies (Glenn 1999: 12, 13).

In accordance with Lemert's definition of social structures, race and gender structure society, often invisibly with enduring power that is reflexive of structured material relations of privilege and exploitation (Mills 1999; Glenn 1999:14; Lemert 2001; Bonilla-Silva 2010). Race and gender reproduce structures, relations, and cultural knowledges of oppression and resistance of white supremacy and patriarchy respectively (Mills 1999; Glenn 1999; Bonilla-Silva 2010). White supremacy justifies and reinforces political-economic material privileges of whiteness by racializing "Others" as inferior; a process dependent on the ruling power of the political nation-state (Omi and Winant 1986; Mills 1999; Bonilla-Silva 2010). White supremacy, for example, can be read in the history of the U.S. and the nation-state's racialized enforcement and protection, or lack thereof, of U.S. law that reinforces social-psychological ideas of racialized American citizenship (Wells 1895; Du Bois 1903). This racialized process of "citizenship" reinforced by the nation-state makes real racialized power-relations read in the meanings of "American," "second-class citizen," and "illegal immigrant" in the United States.

The Industrial revolution, financed by surplus capital accumulated from exploited enslaved labor, restructured the economy from family centered to worker centered that is based on wage labor (Einstein 1977; Davis 1981:32). Products women produced as part of the family economy were produced in the "workplace" by men, while "women's work" was segregated to the home and ideologically devalued; per the sexual division of labor (Davis 1981). This gendered structure made real the conflicting relations of manhood and womanhood that is also read in "citizenship" (Glenn 1999). For example the political roles of women and men in the U.S. nation-state were such that men were represented as public, active citizens and women were private, symbols thereof (Davis

1983). However, in the United States the gendered reproduction of the home was also racialized in that white middle-class women utilized Black women's productive paid labor to sustain their symbolic role of privately "keep[ing] house" (Davis 1983).

Race, gender, and class shape social relations that reflect material relations of the capitalist world-system such that social realities are relationally structured into dichotomies of "perpetual conflict," or the Manichean Structure; for example white/black, man/woman, rich/poor, privilege/oppressed (Fanon 1967:44, 45; Glenn 1999). The global reach of the Manichean Structure of racially gendered classed power-relations is such that humanity is "interconnected even if not face to face" (Glenn 1999:14). The dichotomized conflicts of the racially gendered classed capitalist world-system are read in cultural representations of "symbols, languages, and images [meant] to convey [racially gendered classed] meanings" (Glenn 1999:15). The power-elite manipulates human productive forces of knowledge production in order to reproduce the racially gendered classed structure of the political-economy, where the superstructure of knowledge is utilized to normalize dehumanizing power-relations by monopolizing knowledge "validity" and denying the histories of "Others" (Fanon 1963; Friere 1970; Rodney 1972:85; Bourdieu 1977; Robinson 1983; Collins 1990; Kaba 2007; Marx in Grusky 2008; Bonilla-Silva 2010:10; Stanfield 2011).

Our most basic social unit is our humanity, which is inherently reaffirmed by our knowledges and histories (Kaba 2007). Humanity socially produces knowledge that "facilitates 'seeing' and 'knowing'" our social world and constructs our social reality; what Stanfield (2011:20) operationalized as "cognitive style." Cognitive style collectively is the superstructure of society that reflects the political-economic capitalist

world-system structures, and also reflects racially gendered classed power-relations; where the structure is the superstructure (Marx in Grusky 2008; Stanfield 2011). The Western power-elite utilize power to monopolize and colonize social knowledge that reflects the “coloniality of power” structured by the capitalist world-system in order to justify and normalize dehumanization and alienation of humanity (de Sousa Santos, Nunes, and Meneses 2007:xlvii).

Western “cognitive style’s” monopolization of knowledge is taken for granted, reinforced as normal, and is seen as “universal” which in social structural reality illustrates hegemonic “monocultural” reproduction of the “ruling classes and elite members of dominant groups” (Stanfield 2011:33). Knowledge is politically-economically institutionalized to control and predict the social world and natural earth (de Sousa Santos et al. 2007:xlvii, xxxix; Stanfield 2011:26). As such, Western “cognitive style” monopolizes and colonizes paths of “valid” knowledge production, or “globalized localism;” a central element to Western nation-states ability to “conquer vast portions of the world” (Rodney 1972; de Sousa Santos et al. 2007:xlvii, xxxix; Stanfield 2011:26). The “globalized localism” of Western cognitive style is employed as ethnocentric in its objectivity, where racially gendered classed privilege is invisible and normalized, and as such Eurocentric in its science (de Sousa Santos et al. 2007). Western cognitive style’s institution of science is a disciplined boundary of objective and positivistic ideas that in practice seek to “predict, control, and master surroundings” (Huggins 1972:19; de Sousa Santos et al. 2007:xxxiii; Stanfield 2011:21).

As such Western cognitive style’s science scientifically “imposes [human] differences” to validate dehumanization in order to exploit and colonize racially gendered

classed “Others” (de Sousa Santos et al. 2007). In practice, the hegemonic reproduction of the monocultural “coloniality of knowledge” utilizes formal education (schooling) as a tool that promotes ignorance by submersing “Othered” historical consciousnesses and knowledges; where the purpose is to suppress the cultural knowledge of resistance in order to predict and control revolutionary action (Rodney 1972:263; Friere 1970:72, 77, 81; Bourdieu 1977; de Sousa et al. 2007:xxxiii; Steinberg 2007). As such the “intellectual endeavor” of the “coloniality of knowledge” dehumanizes and alienates humanity into racially gendered classed beings, who can in turn utilize knowledge to self-defensively and collectively liberate (Fanon 1965:224; de Sousa Santos et al. 2007:xxxiii; Stanfield 2011:224).

The superstructure of Western cognitive style is such that knowledge is compartmentalized, classified, institutionalized and disciplined into bounded areas of knowledge, or as Fuller (1993) states *disciplinary boundaries* with specific “rules” (Douglas 1986; Karenga 2007:358). While the boundaries of institutionalized knowledges are fluid, academically structured knowledge is disciplined into ideas of valid “thought style” (Douglas 1986; Fuller 1993; de Sousa Santos et al. 2007; Stanfield 2011). “Thought style” is a disciplining force of power that maintains boundaries of knowledge that is read in “institutionalized rituals, written history, [and] school curricula” that illustrate cultural representations of racially gendered classed “social, economic, and political conflict” (Blauner 1972:31; Robinson 1983; Mills 1999; Feagin 2006; de Sousa Santos et al. 2007; Wallerstein 2007; Stanfield 2011:21). Institutionalized “thought styles” discipline the reproduction of racially gendered classed power-relations by reproducing hegemonic monocultural knowledge and suppressing “Othered”

knowledge production in a competitive “struggle for dominance and power” (Bourdieu 1977; Cabral 1970:706, 715; Gieryn 2010). To be sure, the Western monocultural institution of science is still “accepted” as a “symbol of development and modernity” (de Sousa Santos et al. 2007:xxxiii). This racially gendered classed historical process underdevelops institutionalized sociological knowledge both by dehumanizing sociological knower’s and knowledges through exclusion, marginalization and subjugation, as well as the reproduction of humanity as merely racially gendered classed human beings.

To know the collective history of humanity, or historical consciousness, is the “highest level of knowledge” since “humans are producers and authors of history” (Trouilliot 1995:2; Kaba 2007:60). As part of the Western cognitive style’s “coloniality of knowledge” the discipline of history is compartmentalized, classified, and institutionalized knowledge of the “capitalist mode of production and the nation-state” that maintains “colonial and nationalist domination” by reproducing, in both thought and action, racially gendered classed power-relations read in the meanings of the citizen (nation-state) and the worker (capitalism) (Chakrabarty 1991:2163-2165). The structural imposition of the capitalist total world-system violently stagnates, “usurps,” and “distorts” “Othered” histories and suppresses cultural knowledge by monopolizing valid knowledge production, essentially underdeveloping the collective history of humanity as well as the development of colonized nation’s “productive [human] forces” (Fanon 1963; Memmi 1965:91; Cabral 1970; Friere 1970; Rodney 1972; Rabaka 2009).

While history is created by humanity, the production of history is narrated and produced by those with power (Diop 1974; Chakrabarty 1991; Trouilliot 1995; Kaba

2007)⁶. Political-economic power structures the institution of history, as part of the Western cognitive style, such that history is reproduced as a positivist linear progression where “history” is bounded to the past as “*objects of the past*” (Troulliot 1995:18; own emphasis added; Kaba 2007). As such Western cognitive style’s institution of history dichotomizes history with “contemporaneity” (past/present), removing history from consciousness to suppress cultural knowledge of resistance (Chakrabarty 1991:2165). This racially gendered classed process is read in the historical production and reproduction of compartmentalized, classified, institutionalized, and disciplined “history.”

The production of history is ideologically and methodologically purposeful, specific to 1) the assembly of sources, 2) the creation of archives, 3) the construction of narrative, and the 4) making of ‘history’ in its final form (Troulliot 1995:26, 151; Kaba 2007). An intersectional view of the reproduction of history makes visible the “coloniality of knowledge” and the monopolization of historical knowledge that is read in the privileged hegemonic ethnocentric and Eurocentric cultural narratives of historical production; or what Du Bois called the “propaganda of history” (Du Bois 1933:727; Diop 1974; Bourdieu 1977; Troulliot 1995:26). For example, the historical narrative of enslavement and colonization produces the importance of 1492 and the “myth of Christopher Columbus” that in relation negates “Others”’ knowledges, histories and socially lived experiences (Troulliot 1995; Zinn 2005). This process is culturally heard in the Haitian language where ‘kolon’ means both Columbus and colonization (Troulliot 1995:156, 114). The historical production that Christopher Columbus “discovered” the Americas colonizes and suppresses “Others” histories and cultural knowledges,

respectively. For example the ethnocentric and Eurocentric cultural narrative of “discovery” requires forgetting that in 1485 England and Portugal denied Columbus’s request for funds because the “court’s mathematical junta” had knowledge of more lands than Columbus envisioned; knowledge that was imported from Western Sudan and the impetus for the 1494 Treaty of Tordesillas⁷ (van Sertima [1976]2003).⁸

In order to structurally exploit and dehumanize, Western cognitive style monopolizes knowledge and suppresses culture; a process readable in the historical production of the genderless “Negro” and “Indian” (James 1980; Robinson 1983).

Proceeding the increased need for enslaved African labor in the 1700’s, enslaved Africans went from being identified as Mandinka, Yoruba, Igbo, Ashanti, Fanti, Hausa, Fulani, Wolof, Bambara, etc. on inventory lists and insurance claims to being “Negro;” an attempt to culturally and ideologically erase African histories and knowledges to suppress African cultures and action (Blauner 1972:13; Huggins 1977; James 1980; Robinson 1983:106, 164). Similarly, the same negation of historical development and suppression of culture (knowledge and action) is read in the creation of the genderless “Indian” from Chumash, Cherokee, Blackfoot, Pueblo, Navajo, Sioux, Lakota, Iroquois, Crow, Kwakiutl, etc (Blauner 1972:13; Robinson 1983;). This historical negation of history and knowledge, as part of the “coloniality of knowledge,” normalizes racially gendered classed power-relations and dehumanization.

Collective memory, however, is the history of humanity flowered into culture, the “synthesis of social, political, and economic conflicts” that challenges hegemonic cultural knowledge reproduction and ideology (Feagin 2006:277). The reproduction of monocultural knowledge reproduces racially gendered classed power-relations that deny

and stagnate the history of “Others” in an attempt to suppress historical consciousness and culture (both thought and action). This process, however, is never complete; instead “the embryo of the demon” that visits dehumanization, whether read in histories of enslavement or colonization, is the oppressed’s “humanity...their history and culture” (Cabral 1970; Robinson 1983:173). This is read in the history of cultural resistance of the Hausa peoples in Brazil, the political heirs of Songhai, who were notorious for being the least submissive, as well as the Obongi and Yoruba who organized secret societies that were sources of group militancy (Robinson 1983:209).

The historical reproduction of hegemonic monocultural knowledge as well as the suppression of knowledge and culture, together collective memory, is magnificently read in the historical silencing of the 1803 Haitian Revolution (Trouillot 1995). In the late 1700’s France’s economic gem was the Caribbean colony of Saint Domingue where surplus capital increased by significant lowering of the “cost of [sugar] production;” or in humanistic terms, literally working enslaved Africans to death so much so that between 1764 and 1770 between 10,000 and 15,000 African captives were imported to the colony *each year* to keep up with demand (James 1938:57). Consequently, the majority of Saint Domingue’s enslaved African population survived the TransAtlantic trade and were historically, culturally conscious of their humanity (Robinson 1983:199). In 1790 Toussaint L’Overture, a “privileged” enslaved African who garnered military experience fighting on behalf of France as an ally to the patriots during the American Revolution, organized enslaved Africans to fight for freedom; which in a few weeks grew to over 100,000 insurgents (James 1938:96). In 1803 the insurgent army defeated the French and the British, including Napoleon’s army, declared Haiti an independent nation-state and

outlawed enslavement; only the second Western colony to attain independence and the first to destroy slavery (James 1938; Trouilliot 1995). To be sure, historical consciousness is a weapon for liberation, as collective memory of history, knowledge, and culture humanizes dehumanized humanity (Fanon 1965).

Regardless of attempts to dehumanize by denying racially gendered classed Others knowledge, as well as suppressing historical consciousness and action, this process is never complete; rather the knowledge of humanity and the culture of resistance is revolutionary like the “slave who mutinied...a desperate pirate: the treasure he sought was his person” (Huggins, 1977:46, 117; Robinson 1983). Undeniably, the history of enslavement and colonialism, per the capitalist total world system, is too the history of the “triumph of the human spirit” flowered as the culture of resistance (Huggins 1977:xv).

Institutionalized knowledge reflects racially gendered classed power-relations that can be read in the reproduction of disciplinary historical memory and forgetfulness (Blauner 1972:142; Mills 1999; Gieryn 2010). Focusing on “unthinkables and unmemorables” illustrates this process of racially gendered classed institutional knowledge making visible “institutional epistemic authority” and the hegemonic reproduction of monocultural knowledge by historicizing the ancestral lineages of subjugated ideas and the marginalized knowers thereof (Douglas 1986:76). Sojourning the ancestry of ideas makes visible 1) whose ideas and what knowledge is remembered (institutionalized) and forgotten (marginalized and subjugated), 2) the collective memory of cultural habitus of oppression and resistance, and 3) exposes the roots of institutionally structured disciplinary knowledge (Foucault 1972; Bourdieu 1977; Douglas 1986:76;

Sprague 2005; Camis 2010). This racially gendered classed process of the institutionalization and the collective cultural habitus of knowledge are illustrated by following the ancestral lineage of the sociological concept of “intersectionality” in American Sociology, as the next section illustrates.

American Sociology: “Intersectionality” and Racially Gendered Classed Institutionalized Knowledge

The United States is an overdeveloped nation-state of the capitalist world-system socially organized into racially gendered classed power-relations (Davis 1983; Mills 1999; Feagin 2006). Just as theorized above American society’s superstructure is reflexive of the “coloniality of power;” where knowledge is power (de Sousa Santos et al. 2007:xxxiii).

In the 1850’s sociology was imported into American society and by the 1860’s was conceptualized as a “benevolent science” that was deeply influenced by Christianity and meant as a tool for racial uplift and social justice (Calhoun 2007:10). This is illustrated in the 1865 American Social Science Association that consisted of mostly “non-academics [including] ministers and aids to the poor” who encouraged the “rational benevolence” of American Sociology to “address social problems, social reform, and understand social change” (Calhoun 2007:2, 11, 12, 17; Wilson 2006). The introduction of sociology to America was significant especially for the Black Women’s Club Movement (BWCM), a tradition of Black women’s benevolent societies and mutual aid associations dating to the late 1700’s as part of a legacy of cultural resistance (Shaw 1995). Black middle-class clubwomen utilized sociology as a tool to understand social problems within the Black community for the purpose of racial uplift and social justice (Shaw 1995). Therefore to trace the ancestral lineage of the concept of “intersectionality,” we must center ourselves in the history of the BWCM in the 1850’s and 1860’s United States.

Black Women, historically and contemporarily, face intersecting oppressions of race, as white supremacy, and gender, as patriarchy, which together intersect to reflect classed material relations; a social location that provides Black women with “taken-for-granted” knowledge where the separation of race from gender and gender from race is impossible (Collins 1990). In the 1850’s and 1860’s Black women’s knowledge from their lived experiences as Black middle-class clubwomen made visible the needs of the Black community, while the “benevolent science” of American Sociology was utilized to become wise to “what is” and “what ought to be” within the Black community in order to practice racial uplift and social justice.

By the later 1860’s the end of the Civil War brought the political institutionalization of the 13th amendment that abolished slavery, except for criminal punishment, the 14th amendment that provided African Americans citizenship and the 15th amendment that enfranchised Black males. The political era between 1860 and 1880, historically known as Reconstruction, had many implications including the establishment of free public education in the U.S. South and public institutions of higher learning (Du Bois 1933). So, for example, in 1867 Atlanta University (today Clark Atlanta University) was “established by the American Missionary Association aided by the Freedmen’s Bureau,” and opened in 1869 with the purpose of emphasizing liberal arts education that stressed “the development of women and men” community leaders (Wright II 2002:168; Wright II 2009:712). As a result, the following generation of Black middle-class clubwomen were formally educated as part of schooling, the knowledge of which was intended for racial uplift and social justice (Shaw 1995). To be sure the racial segregation of schools and departments was politically solidified in the Supreme Court’s 1896

Plessey v. Ferguson “separate but equal” decision that legalized already practiced racial separation; a real consequence of which is the racialized segregation of institutionalized knowledge, or “epistemic apartheid” and structured departments; for example in American Sociology (Collins 2007:579; Rabaka 2009:16).

By the 1890’s Black clubwomen used their formal education to become wise to matrices of domination, reflected in the racially gendered scholarship of Black upper-class women. In 1892 Anna Julia Cooper, in her scholarship *A Voice from the South By a Black Woman of the South*, articulated the meaning of “intersectionality,” both the inability to separate race from gender and gender from race as well as its “womanist” center to frame understandings and practices of racial uplift and social justice, stating:

“when and where I enter, in the quiet, undisputed dignity of my womanhood, without violence and without suing or special patronage, then and there the whole *Negro race enters with me.*” (1892:31).

With this intersectional frame, Anna Julia Cooper centers social justice in a “womanist consciousness” that prioritizes race over gender to reflect the social reality that in the U.S. race dictates gender (Collins 2007; Higginbothom 1995; Hudson-Weems 2007). Therefore, “intersectionality” is centered on racial uplift and social justice, which Anna Julia Cooper ([1892]1988) discerns should be centered in the practices of the (middle-classed) idea of the family where issues of woman are the same of man and child, rather collectively issues of the family.

In that same year, 1892, Ida B. Wells(-Barnett), a Black middle-classed clubwoman, experienced her good friend Thomas Moss and two of his business partners murdered by a lynch mob essentially for the success of their popular Black-owned business The People’s Grocery in Memphis, Tennessee (Wells 1970). Prior to this deeply influential experience, Wells(-Barnett) believed the ideology that lynching resulted from

Black men raping white women; however the lynching of her friend launched her crusade to use sociology to “scientifically” call out America’s racially gendered classed morals and civility (Wells 1895). For example, in 1895 Wells published her social study, *The Red Record*, in which she used data from the Chicago Tribune, a white owned and operated newspaper, to illustrate the reproduction of hegemonic ideology and socially unjust morals and civility with regard to Lynch Law (Wells 1895). Specifically she illustrated controlling images of lynching that included the ideology that Black men are immoral, Black women can’t be raped, and white women are victims that, symbolically, need to be saved by white men (Wells 1895). Wells(-Barnett) published many social studies that illustrated how racially gendered classed power-relations intersected to shape citizens lived experiences with lynching as well as convicted criminals experiences within the convict-lease system; a subject brazenly illustrated by Wells(-Barnett) that Frederick Douglass wouldn’t even touch (Wells et al. 1893; Davis 1998). For the most part, Black clubwomen conducted surveys to determine the needs of the Black community and then used this knowledge to create solutions to said problems. The use of social science as a tool to design programs for racial uplift and social justice was reflected in the 1896 National Association for Colored Women’s (NACW) platform, a collective, national representation of over 198 Black Women Clubs in the U.S. (Shaw 1995:433; Wilson 2006).

Coinciding with the 1890’s creation of the NACW was the institutional structuring of sociology into academic departments in the U.S. (Wilson 2006; Calhoun 2007). In 1895 George Bradford funded the ‘Atlanta Sociological Laboratory,’ chaired by W.E.B. Du Bois from 1897-1910 and between 1933-1944 (Wright II 2005; Wright, II

2009). In 1895 and 1896 George Bradford organized the Atlanta University's "Conference on Negro Problems" where both scholars and activists disseminated knowledge and engaged methods, purposes, and practices of sociology with regard to the Black communities in the U.S. (Gabbidon 1999; Wright II 2002:165; Wright II 2005; Wilson 2006; Rabaka 2010). Black clubwomen presented social science studies that reflected an intersectional frame for the practice of racial uplift and social justice. For example, Black clubwomen disseminated knowledge that utilized the concept of intersectionality to analyze how race gender and class affected the Black community's lived experiences including "low wages, long work days, and living conditions" and to design "programs" to address issues (Wilson 2006:98). In 1897 W.E.B Du Bois became chair of the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory, and under his guidance Atlanta University's social science conference was segregated by gender, and as such so was the knowledge disseminated. Black women presented womanist centered understandings of both problems and solutions for the Black community (Wilson 2006:96). An excellent illustration is the work of Lucy Craft Laney, a member of the inaugural 1873 "noncollege graduating class of Atlanta University," who in 1886 opened a liberal arts school known as the Haines Normal School and Industrial Institute (Wright II 2009:708). Lucy Craft Laney presented at the "Atlanta University's Conference on Negro Problems" at least five times and her written reports are included in the 1896 and 1897 conference publications (Wright II 2009:709). For example, in Laney's 1896 conference publication she addressed "health issues across various class divisions" within the Black community and her 1897 conference publication was "a continuation of the previous...study" in which she addressed "the Women's Meeting" to "emphasize the important role of women

in the Black family;” illustrating the womanist center of knowledge disseminated at the women’s meeting as part of the gendered Atlanta University social science conference (Wright II 2009:709, 710). However, to be sure, the work presented by Black women and men at the Atlanta University’s social science conference, and the conference itself, reflected “themes of class bias and elitist assumptions” (Wilson 2006:99).

For the most part, Black women accepted for study at Fisk University’s department of sociology were required to partake in a gendered curricula; meaning women’s curricula included classes such as social science and domesticity courses (Wilson 2006). The gendered social science curricula did not meet the requirements for acceptance at prominent sociology departments and thus Black women who sought higher educational degrees in sociology in the later 1910’s and 1920’s were required to take remedial courses (Wilson 2006). Even further the dissemination of knowledge reflects racially gendered classed processes that underwrite the reproduction of knowledge (Rabaka 2009:29). Race dictated the process of knowledge dissemination, which explains why the *American Journal of Sociology*, in the formidable years of American Sociology and a main avenue of sociological knowledge dissemination, excluded Black scholars and privileged white scholars regardless of gender; for example Jane Addams had five articles published in AJS, while Du Bois’s important 1899 social study *The Philadelphia Negro* was not even reviewed (Calhoun 2007; Rabaka 2010:4). At the same time in 1903 Du Bois quoted Anna Julia Cooper *Souls of Black Folk*, but failed to cite her scholarship (Baldwin 2004; Rabaka 2009:4).

Thus, while Black women sociologists were predominately excluded from sociology departments at predominately white institutions, they too were marginalized

within the spaces of Black sociological knowledge reproduction. Black women's exclusion from sociology departments at predominately white institutions, and marginalization within sociology departments at HBCU's, underdeveloped the sociological concept of "intersectionality" and more broadly the sociological imagination of American Sociology.

By the 1920's U.S. sociology dissociated from the humanities and was disciplined as a science that 1) predicts and controls social groups and 2) scientifically reproduces racially gendered classed cultural hegemonic power-relations that supports the "survival of the" U.S. nation-state (Stanfield 2011:35, 36). For instance, the Bourgeoisie Rockefellers, on behalf of the "Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Fund," significantly funded the institutional-structuring of U.S. Sociology into departments including the "University of Chicago, Columbia, and University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill" (Stanfield 2011:37). While sociology departments at predominately white institutions received broad funding from the Bourgeoisie, "Atlanta University had difficulty procuring substantial funding" as a result of racism and Du Bois's "ideological battle with Booker T. Washington" (Wright II 2002:33). Nonetheless, Atlanta University's Sociological Laboratory accumulated enough funding to host 30 conferences and "publish 20 monographs" (Wright II 2002:18).

By the 1920's the cultural habitus of privileged U.S. institutionalized sociological knowledge was disciplined as ethnocentric "objectivity" and Eurocentric "positivistic" science used to predict and control humanity to perpetuate racially gendered classed power-relations of the total capitalist world-system; a "science of oppression" (Staples 1973:162; Calhoun 2007:21; Wallerstein 2007; Sica 2007; Zuberi and Bonilla-Silva

2008). In this frame, the assumption that sociology is a tool for social justice and racial uplift was invalidated and activism became synonymous as “antithetical to science” in the hegemonic reproduction of American Sociology (Feagin and Vera 2008). In this way, intersectional and womanist sociological knowledge by Black Feminist thinkers was excluded from the privileged American Sociology “thought style” and was marginalized to subjugated sociology departments at HBCU’s. For example, in 1913 Fisk University’s sociology department “formed a relationship with the Women’s Missionary Council of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Training School” to ensure “students could do their practical work in Sociology” at a settlement house for Black women in Nashville known as the “Bethlehem House” (Wright II 2010:52). This effort was principally led by the efforts of Sallie Hill Sawyer, a Fisk graduate, and resulted in a “Bethlehem House [one year] internship” that upon completion garnered a “social science training course” certificate (Wright II 2010:52,53). By 1918 Fisk University’s sociology department boasted 115 students “participating in the applied sociology program at Bethlehem House,” however that same year the program ended as a result of the National Urban League moving its headquarters and severing funding for the program, as well as the department head, George Haynes, leaving the university (Wright II 2010:53). While the work of the Black women scholars at the Bethlehem House was important for understanding sociology and it’s application for racial justice and social uplift, the program’s role in the sociology department at Fisk was dependent on both funding and the Black men who held positions of power at the department and university. Between the 1920’s and the 1960’s Black women sociologists were excluded from sociology departments at predominately white institutions and were marginalized with

gendered curricula at sociology departments at HBCU's; for example at Fisk University (Wilson 2006). Thus, Black women sociologists' lived experiences and knowledges reflect the interlocking and intersecting oppressions of both race and gender. To be sure, Black women continued to use sociology as a tool for understanding society, as well as racial uplift and social justice, both inside and outside of the ivory towers; for example Black women pursued Master's degrees in sociology at HBCU's and Black women writers of the Harlem Renaissance used sociology in their works outside of academia.

Racially gendered classed scientific knowledge eventually rocked American Sociology in the 1960's and 1970's when paradigmatic shifts revealed the hegemonic monoculture of sociological knowledge and the reproduction of race, gender and class epistemologically (Steinberg 2011). In addition of epistemological paradigmatic revolutions within American Sociology's institutionalized knowledge, the Supreme Court decision of *Brown v. the Board of Education* secured the illegality of racial segregation in institutions of higher education and as a result we see increased access to higher education for Black women in the U.S. In one of the only studies on Black women sociologists with PhD's, Jacquelyn Johnson Jackson (1974:272) illustrates that between 1945 and 1972 there were 145 Black sociologists with PhD's; of that only 21 (or 14.5%) were Black women. Of those 21 Black women sociologists with PhD's, 62% received their degree after 1960 (Jackson 1974:272). Jackson furthers this investigation by exploring the sociology department's from which Black women sociologists obtained their degree and found that Black women sociologists were more likely to have entered the field later than their Black male colleagues and were less likely to have obtained their degree from prestigious sociology departments (Jackson 1974:274). With regards to

knowledge dissemination, Jackson's survey data illustrates that by 1972 Black men sociologists were more likely to have their articles published in "major journals of sociology" than Black women sociologists, where only 4.6% of Black male sociologists' articles appeared in major journals including ASR; no Black women sociologists' articles appeared in AJS or *Social Forces* (Jackson 1974:284). Instead Black women sociologists' scholarship was more likely to appear in Black owned journals including *Phylon, Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, and *The Black Scholar* (Jackson 1974:286). Black women's exclusion from major journals in sociology, meant Black women sociologists knowledge was marginalized into racially colonized avenues of knowledge dissemination. Further, the fact that of the 21 Black women sociology PhD's only approximately 8 received their degree before 1960 speaks to the exclusion and marginalization of Black women from PhD programs at sociology departments both at PWI's and HBCU's

In the following decades of the 1980's and 1990's intersectionality became a visible epistemological concept or, as British Feminist sociology Floya Anthias identified, a heuristic device used to frame scholarship with the potential for "generating new questions" (Anthias and Yuval-Davis 1992; Collins 2007:598). In the 1980's the concept of "intersectionality" became visible in the discipline marked by the work of Bonnie Thornton Dill, Lynn Weber, and Elizabeth Higginbotham at the Center for Research on Women at Memphis State University (today the University of Memphis) who sponsored "curriculum workshops and research institutes in race, class, and gender studies for independent scholars, scholars across disciplines, and community activists" to foster a social network of scholars and activists (Collins 2007:589).

In the 1990's Patricia Hill Collins's (1990) scholarship of *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment* was published in which she theorized "intersectionality" as racialized white supremacy and gendered patriarchy that intersects to shape peoples socially lived experiences. Collins (1990) historically situates intersectional knowledge as intellectual wisdom of racially gendered classed power-relations, exemplified in the works of the ancestral mothers of Black Feminist Thought including Anna Julia Cooper, Maria Stewart, and Ida B. Wells-Barnett.

That same decade, in 1992 and 1993, Margaret Andersen, as editor of the *Gender & Society*, disseminated knowledge in two special issues that focused on sociological scholarship intersectionally framed by race, class, and gender (Collins 2007:590). During that same time, 1992, Margaret Andersen and Patricia Hill Collins pivotal work *Race Class and Gender: An Anthology* was published, a publication that continues to be re-published (Collins 2007:572). In 1996 the American Sociological Association, "garnered the two hundred dues-paying members needed to launch a Race, Class, Gender section" a process illustrative of the institutionalization of knowledge being that "ASA embodies the institutionalized image of [American Sociology]" (Collins 2007:573).

As of 2003, in the ASA *Guide to Graduate Programs* "54 programs classified themselves as specializing in race, class, and gender" out of a surveyed 211 programs of study (Collins 2007:573). The institutionalization of Race, Class, and Gender Studies, and specifically the institutionalization of "intersectionality," challenges disciplinary boundaries, segregated knowledge, and ideas of hegemonic "valid science" boundaries within American Sociology in what Collins (2007) and other scholars have identified as the transdisciplinarity of intersectionality. Primarily because intersectionality utilizes

knowledge from the depths of American Sociology and knowledge from across Western cognitive style's compartmentalized and classified knowledges. Further, the emphasis and historical purpose of intersectionality to frame social science as a tool for social change challenges American Sociology's emphasis on "social problems" rather than "social solutions" and as such challenges "prevailing norms of scientific objectivity that view advocacy as antithetical to science" (Collins 2007:604; Feagin and Vera 2008).

Conclusion: History, Knowledge Production, American Sociology and Rehumanizing Implications

In this article, I argue American Sociology's racially gendered classed historical memory oppresses and dehumanizes sociological knowledge production. First American Sociology underdevelops the theorization of history, institutionally reproducing Marx's "historical materialism." Specifically Marx's theory of history as class struggle is problematic in that it reproduces the history of humanity as that of classed relations and it is applicably limited both spatially and in terms of fully understanding the historical development of humanity. As a result, this under theorization of history and the institutional reproduction of history as class underdevelops the American sociological imagination. Rather, I argue Cabral's theory of history empowers the American sociological imagination by centering history in humanity that is more globally and locally applicable to understanding the history of humanity. Utilizing Cabral's theory of history challenges the transdisciplinary and interdisciplinary boundaries of American Sociology. In this paper the application of Cabral's history to explain humanity's historical development into racially gendered classed productive forces of the total capitalist world-system challenges "hegemonic intellectualism" by making visible

African history and cultural knowledge of resistance that humanizes historical processes (Okafor 2007:266).

Furthermore intersectionality as a heuristic device to frame the racially gendered classed reproduction of history and science makes visible the hegemonic cultural reproduction of the “coloniality of knowledge” and “institutional epistemic authority” (Douglas 1986:76; de Sousa Santos et al. 2007:xxxiii). This process is highlighted by seeing and knowing the ancestry of the idea of “intersectionality” in American Sociology, by 1) making visible how race gender and class underwrite the history of the discipline’s institutional-structure, 2) illustrating the collective memory of both oppression and resistance, and lastly 3) exposes the discipline’s roots as a benevolent science meant to practice social justice by finding social solutions.

The importance of history to the sociological imagination is central to the production of sociological knowledge. However, it is profoundly important that the theorization of history be centered within humanity rather than a reproduction of humanity as class. Even further, a discipline’s historical consciousness, and cultural collective history, is essential to understanding American Sociology’s level of knowledge production, as well as how race, gender, and class socially organize said knowledge production. This exploration in the role of history in American Sociology, the utilization of Cabral’s (1970) theory of history to explain the development of humanity into racially gender classed power-relations, the ways in which power structures knowledge, and as such what that means for the institutionalization of American Sociology, however, yields more questions. What is the institutional memory of American Sociology? What ought to be the reproduction of American Sociology? Did the paradigmatic revolutions of the 1960’s

and 1970’s “demise the [sociological] canon” and affect the reproduction of American Sociology’s institutionalized knowledge? These questions are important to seeing and knowing the contemporary reproduction of American Sociology’s institutionalized knowledge, which is informed by the historical exploration of humanity’s history, the development of racially gendered classed power-relations, and the role of knowledge production thereof.

Endnotes

¹ Humanity is the social aspect of being human.

² Cabral’s theorization of history, utilizes some of Marx’s concepts but is completely theoretically reoriented, following the Black Radical Thought tradition (Cabral 1970; Robinson 1983; Rabaka 2009).

³ Nation as a collective linguistic, traditional, historical political entity (Robinson 1983).

⁴ Western Sudan is today Western Africa.

⁵ Power-elite per C. Wright Mills (1956).

⁶ To be sure, power is determined by those who control political-economic productive forces (Kaba 2007).

⁷ The Treaty of Tordesillas, between Spain and Portugal, split South American lands into areas of “colonial possession” today flowers as South American Spanish and Portuguese linguistic realities (see Mills 1999 *The Racial Contract...*)

⁸ Western Sudanese “mariners in Guinea” and scholars at Timbuktu universities had produced “fairly accurate longitudinal and latitudinal” maps of African and South American “Atlantic coastlines” that were eventually reproduced in a 1513 map that was “found” in the Library of Alexandria (van Sertima [1976]2003).

⁹ See James D. Anderson’s *The Education of Blacks in the South 1890-1935*.

References

- Anderson, Talmadge and James Stewart. 2007. *Introduction to African American Studies: Transdisciplinary Approaches and Implications*. Baltimore, M.D.: Imprint Editions.
- Anthias, Floya and Nira Yuval-Davis. 1992. *Racialized Boundaries: Race, Nation, Gender, Colour, and Class and the Anti-Racist Struggle*. New York: Routledge.
- Baldwin, Davarian. 2004. “Black Belts and Ivory Towers: The Place of Race in U.S. Social Thought, 1892-1948.” *Critical Sociology* 30(2):397-450.
- Blauner, Robert. 1972. *Racial Oppression in America*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2010. *Racism without racists: color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States*, 3rd ed. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. "Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction." In *Power and Ideology in Education*, edited by J. Karabel and A.H. Halsey, pp. 487-511. New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press.
- Cabral, Amilcar. 1970. "National Liberation and Culture." Pp. 703-721 in *Ideologies of liberation in Black Africa, 1856-1970: documents on modern African political thought from colonial times to the present*, edited by Ayodele J. Langley. London: R. Collings.
- _____. 1966. "The Weapon of Theory." Pp. 682-702 in *Ideologies of liberation in Black Africa, 1856-1970: documents on modern African political thought from colonial times to the present*, edited by Ayodele J. Langley. London: R. Collings.
- Calhoun,Craig. 2007. "Sociology in America: An Introduction." In *Sociology in America A History*, edited by Craig Calhoun, pp. 1-38. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press..
- Camic, Charles. 2010. "How Merton Sociologizes the History of Ideas." In *Robert K Merton: Sociology of Science and Sociology as Science*, edited by Craig Calhoun, pp. 273-295.
- Chakabarty, Dipesh. 1991. "History as Critique and Critique(s) of History." *Economic and Political Weekly* XXVI(37):2162-2166.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 1990. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. Boston, MA: Unwin Hyman.
- _____. 2007. "Pushing the Boundaries or Business as Usual? Race, Class, and Gender Studies and Sociological Inquiry." In *Sociology in America A History*, edited by Craig Calhoun, pp. 572-604.
- Conley, Dalton. 2011. *You May Ask: An Introduction to Sociology*, 2nd ed. Portland, OR: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Cooper, Anna Julia. 1988. *A Voice From the South*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cox, Oliver C. 1948. *Caste, class, & race; a study in social dynamics*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.
- Davis, Angela Y. 1998. "From the Prison of Slavery to the Slavery of Prison: Frederick Douglass and the Convict-Lease System." Pp. 74-95 in *The Angela Y. Davis reader*, edited by Angela Yvonne Davis and Joy James. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

- _____. 1981. *Women, Class, and Race*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Diop, Cheikh Anta. 1974. *The African Origin of Civilization: Myth or Reality*. New York: Lawrence Hill.
- Douglas, Mary. 1986. *How Institutions Think*. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press.
- DuBois, W.E.B. 1933. *Black Reconstruction in America 1860-1880*. New York: Free Press
- _____. [1903]1973. *The Souls of Black folk*. Millwood, N.Y.: Kraus-Thomson Organization Ltd.
- Eisenstein, Zillah. [1977]1990. “Constructing Theory of Capitalist Patriarchy and Socialist Feminism.” *Women, Class, and the Feminist Imagination: a socialist-feminist reader*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Fanon, Frantz. [1963]2008. *Black skin, white masks*. New York: Grove Press.
- _____. 1965. *The wretched of the earth*. New York: Grove Press.
- Feagin, Joe. 2006. *Systemic racism: a theory of oppression*. New York: Routledge.
- Feagin, Joe and Hernan Vera. 2008. *Liberation Sociology*, 2nd edition. London: Paradigm Publishers.
- Foucault, M. 1972. *The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse on language*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Freire, Paulo and Myra Bergman Ramos. 1970. *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Fuller, Steve. 1993. “Disciplinary Boundaries and the Rhetoric of the Social Sciences.” In *Knowledges: Historical and Critical Studies in Disciplinarity*, edited by Ellen Messer-Davidow, David R. Shumway, and David J Sylvan, pp. 125-149.
- Gabbidon, Shaun L. 1999. “W.E.B. Du Bois and the ‘Atlanta School’ of Social Scientific Research, 1897-1913.” *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* 10(1):21-38.
- Gieryn, Thomas F. 2010. “Paradigm for the Sociology of Science.” In *Robert K Merton: Sociology of Science and Sociology as Science*, edited by Craig Calhoun, pp. 173-139.
- Glenn, Evelyn N. 1999. “The Social Construction and Institutionalization of Gender and Race.” Pp. 3-43 in *Revisioning Gender*, edited by Mara Marx Ferree, Judith Lorber, and Beth B. Hess. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Higginbothom, Evelyn Brooks. 1995. "African-American Women's History and the Metalanguage of Race." Pp. 3-24 in *"We Specialize in the Wholly Impossible: A Reader in Black Women's History*, edited by Darlene Clark Hine, Wilma King, and Linda Reed. Brooklyn, N.Y.: Carlson Publishing, Inc.
- Hudson-Weems, Clemora. 2007. "Africana Womanism: An Overview." Pp. 205-217 in *Out of Revolution: The Development of Africana Studies*, edited by Delores P. Aldridge and Carlene Young. New York: Lexington Books.
- Huggins, Nathan Irvin. 1977. *Black odyssey: the Afro-American ordeal in slavery*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Jackson, Jacquelyne Johnson. 1974. "Black Female Sociologists." In *Black Sociologists: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, edited by James Edward Blackwell and Morris Janowitz, pp. 267-295.
- James, C. L. R. 1980. *The Black Jacobins: Toussaint L'Ouverture and the San Domingo Revolution*. London: Allison & Busby.
- Kaba, Lansine. 2007. "Historical Consciousness and Politics of Africa." Pp. 58-69 in *Africana Studies: Philosophical Perspectives and Theoretical Paradigms*, edited by Delores P. Aldridge and E. Lincoln James. Pullman, WA: Washington State University Press.
- Karenga, Maulana. 2007. "Black Studies and the Problematic of Paradigm: The Philosophical Dimension." Pp. 356-368 in *The African American Studies Reader* 2 ed., edited by Nathaniel Norment, Jr. Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.
- _____. 2007. *Introduction to Black Studies*. University of Sankore Press.
- Lemert, Charles. 2001. "Mysterious Power of Social Structures." Pp. 3-11 in *Understanding Inequality: The Intersection of Race/ethnicity, Class and Gender* edited by Barbara A. Arrighi. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Marx, Karl. 1972. "Capital: Capital Volume1." Pp 294-442 in *The Marx-Engels Reader*, edited by R. C. Tucker. New York: Norton.
- _____. 2008. "Ideology and Class." Pp 89-90 in *Social Stratification: Class, Race, and Gender in Sociological Perspective*, edited by D. B. Grusky. Philadelphia: Westview Press.
- Memmi, Albert. 1965. *The colonizer and the colonized*. New York: Orion Press.
- Mills, Charles. 1999. *The Racial Contract*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Mills, C. Wright. 1959. *The Sociological Imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 1956. *The Power Elite*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nkrumah, Kwame. 1965. *Neo-colonialism: The Last Stage of Imperialism*. New York: International Publishers.
- Okafor, Victor Oguejiofor. 2007. "Towards an Africolgical Pedagogical Approach to African Civilization." Pp. 266-279 in *Africana Studies: Philosophical Perspectives and Theoretical Paradigms*, edited by Delores P. Aldridge and E. Lincoln James. Pullman, WA: Washington State University Press.

- Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. 1986. *Racial formation in the United States: from the 1960s to the 1980s*. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Outlaw, Lucius T. 2005. *Critical Social theory in the interests of Black folks*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Rabaka, Reiland. 2009. *Africana Critical Theory: Reconstructing the Black Radical Tradition, From W.E.B. Du Bois and C.L.R. James to Frantz Fanon and Amilcar Cabral*. New York: Lexington Books.
- _____. 2010. *Against Epistemic Apartheid: W.E.B. Du Bois and the Disciplinary Decadence of Sociology*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Robinson, Cedric J. 1983. *Black Marxism: the making of the black radical tradition*. London: Zed.
- Rodney, Walter. 1972. *How Europe underdeveloped Africa*. London: Bogle-L'Uverture Publications.
- Shaw, Stephanie J. 1995. "Black Club Women and the Creation of the National Association of Colored Women" in *We Specialize in the Wholly Impossible: A Reader in Black Women's History*, edited by Darlene Clark Hine, Wilma King, and Laura Reed, pp. 433-448. New York: Carlson Publishing, Inc.
- Sica, Alan. 2007. "Defining Disciplinary Identity: The Historiography of U.S. Sociology." In *Sociology in America A History*, edited by Craig Calhoun, pp. 713-731.
- de Sousa Santos, Boaventura, João Arriscado Nunes, and Maria Paula Meneses. 2007. "Introduction: Opening Up the Canon of Knowledge and Recognition of Difference" in *Another Knowledge is Possible: Beyond Northern Epistemologies*, edited by Boaventura de Sousa Santos, pp. xvivx-lxii.
- Sprague, Joey. 2005. *Feminist Methodologies for Critical Researchers: Bridging Differences*. New York: AltaMira Press.
- Stanfield II, John H. 2011. *Black Reflective Sociology: Epistemology, Theory, and Methodology*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Staples, Robert. 1976. *Introduction to Black sociology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Steinberg, Stephen. 2007. *Race relations: a critique*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Social Sciences.
- Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. 1995. *Silencing the past: power and the production of history*. Boston, Mass: Beacon Press.

- Van Sertima, Ivan. [1976]2003. *They Came Before Columbus: the African Presence in Ancient America*. New York: Random House Trade Paperbacks.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1978. "Civilizations and Modes of Production: Conflicts and Convergences." *Theory and Society* 5 (1):1-10.
- _____. 2007. "The Culture of Sociology in Disarray: The Impact of 1968 on U.S. Sociologists." In *Sociology in America A History*, edited by Craig Calhoun, pp. 427-437.
- _____. 2004. *World-systems analysis: an introduction*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Wells-Barnett, Ida B. 1970. *Crusade for Justice: The Autobiography of Ida B. Wells* Edited by Alfreda Duster. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wells, Ida B. 1895. *A Red Record: Tabulated Statistics and Alleged Causes of Lynchings in the United States, 1892-1894*. Chicago: Donohus & Henneberry.
- Wells, Ida B., Frederick Douglass, Irvine Garland Penn, and Ferdinand Lee Barnett. 1893. *The Reason Why the Colored American Is Not in the World's Columbian Exposition*. Chicago, IL.
<http://digital.library.upenn.edu/women/wells/exposition/exposition.html#back>
- Williams, Eric. 1961. *Capitalism & slavery*. New York: Russell & Russell.
- Wilson, Francille Rusan. 2006. *The Segregated Scholars and the Creation of Black Studies, 1890-1950*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.
- Wright II, Earl. 2002. "The Atlanta Sociological Laboratory 1896-1924: A Historical Account of the First American School of Sociology." *The Western Journal of Black Studies* 26(3):165-174.
- _____. 2009. "Beyond W. E. B. Du Bois: A Note on Some of the Lesser Known Members of the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory" *Sociological Spectrum* 29(6): 700-717.
- _____. 2010. "The Tradition of Sociology at Fisk University." *Journal of African American Studies* 14:44-60.
- _____. 2002. "Using The Master's Tools: Atlanta University and American Sociology, 1896-1924." *Sociological Spectrum* 22(1):15-39.
- _____. 2005. "W.E.B. Du Bois and the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory." *Sociation Today* 3(1). Retrieved Oct. 5 2012
<http://www.ncsociology.org/sociationtoday/v31/outline5.htm>.
- Zinn, Howard. 2005. *A People's History of the U.S.* New York: Harper Perennial.
- Zuberi, Tukufu and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva. 2008. *White Logic, White Methods: Racism and Methodology*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Chapter 2: Reproduction of Racially Gendered Institutionalized Knowledge: The Case of American Sociology

Abstract:

This study methodologically analyzes qualitative data from a critical race and feminist standpoint theoretical approach in order to explore American Sociology's contemporary process of institutionalized knowledge reproduction and to illustrate how race and gender structure this process; exemplified by the discipline's institutionalized collective memory (and amnesia), per "habit memory" (Kansteiner 2002). American Sociology is institutionalized knowledge that is structured into academic departments; an "institutional-structure" (Wallerstein 2007). Prestige structures the discipline, where the top-20 departments enact social closure through hiring practices and as such represent an element of elite power within the institutional-structure (Burris 2004; Lenski 1966). Within academic disciplines of institutionalized scientific knowledge, theory represents a central component to the reproduction of knowledge and as such is a cultural representation of institutionalized knowledge. Therefore this paper analyzes PhD-level required theory course syllabi at the top-20 U.S. sociology departments that read as cultural representations of how race and gender structure the reproduction of American Sociology's institutionalized knowledge and "habit memory." This study has implications for the teaching, learning, and practice of American Sociology, as well as future scholarly research on the reproduction of knowledge and the sociology of sociology.

Keywords:

Critical Race Theory, institutionalized knowledge reproduction, American Sociology, race, gender, habit memory

I. Introduction

In the 1960's and 1970's a paradigmatic shift rocked American Sociology that materialized as Black Sociology and illustrated the discipline's hegemonic knowledge production as ethnocentric and Eurocentric. Since this time various scholars have questioned what the contemporary identity of American Sociology is, even going as far to say that the discipline is in "chaos" and in need of coherence (Turner 2006). Other scholars have argued that since the paradigmatic shift of the 60's and 70's, the predominately white male canon of American Sociology has been demised (Wallerstein 2007). However, with the exception of some studies, there exists a gap in the literature on American Sociology's 1) contemporary reproduction of knowledge, 2) collective memory, per "habit memory," and 3) racially gendered reproduction of structural inequalities of knowledge.

The purpose of this paper is to explore American Sociology's 1) contemporary reproduction of institutionalized knowledge, 2) disciplinary identity by utilizing Bergson's methodological conceptualization of "habit memory," as well as 3) the role of race and gender in structuring the discipline's reproduction of knowledge. In order to do so, this paper will 1) theorize race and gender as structural and relational representations of white supremacy and patriarchy, respectively, 2) theorize the process of the institutionalization of knowledge, 3) employ an intersectional frame to understand the historical development of American Sociology's institutional-structure, and 4) methodologically analyze required PhD-level theory syllabi at the top-20 U.S. sociology departments from a critical race and feminist standpoint theoretical approach in order to understand the contemporary reproduction of American Sociology's institutionalized

knowledge, the discipline's "habit memory," as well as how race and gender structure both. The findings of this analysis, per the theoretical frame and methodology, found that American Sociology's contemporary reproduction of knowledge is largely a white male space that underdevelops the theorization of race while maintaining a white habit memory that renders whiteness invisible.

II. Literature Review

Racially Gendered Classed Power-Relations

The historical development of humanity into the capitalist colonial and Imperialist world-system has real consequences for human groups and their socially lived experiences. The capitalist world-system is such that core nation-states of the West colonized periphery nations for the purposes of exploiting material resources and labor in order to develop their own productive forces and labor (Wallerstein 2004; Robinson 1983). Power is established by those who command the political and economic forces of society; the consequence of which is always personal (Glenn 1999:13; Collins 2000; Higginbothom 1995; Kaba 2007). As such, the capitalist colonial and Imperial world-system is a political-economic structure that has real consequences for power-relations among human groups, including but not limited to racially gendered classed power-relations. This section theorizes race, gender, and class as 1) social structures that are 2) relational and can be read as scripts of 3) cultural representations (Glenn 1999).

Race and gender, as social constructions, are "interlocking and intersecting" matrices of domination that have real consequences for socially lived experiences (Collins 2000; Glenn 1999). Race and gender share three analytic concepts that shape social interactions and human relations (Glenn 1999). First, race and gender are social

structures, where power is the central element that underwrites social processes, systems, and outcomes (Glenn 1999). Race is a global social structure of white supremacy historically rooted in enslavement and colonization that organized human groups into enslaved/free and colonized/colonizer, where the property of whiteness is privileged and non-whiteness is oppressed (Mills 1999). Today, the social structure of white supremacy endures to organize human groups into racialized groups (i.e. white, Black, American Indian, etc) that is centered on political-economic power with real consequences including white privilege and racism within social institutions, social processes, and social outcomes.

Coinciding, gender is a social structure of patriarchy historically rooted in the sexualized division of labor born out of industrialization, where the property of manhood is privileged and womanhood is oppressed (Davis 1981; Eisentein 1977). Before industrialization the political-economy was centered in the home and the family, however with industrialization “traditional women tasks [were] taken over by the factory system” and an “ideological consequence...was the shaping of a more rigorous notion of female inferiority” Davis 1981:31). Together these social structures are centered on economic exploitation and privilege, illustrated in the racialized and sexual division of labor and ideologies thereof, which have real consequences in the form of racism, sexism, and [whiteness/manhood] privilege (Mills 1999; Eisentein 1977; Davis 1981). As such race and gender together, as “intersecting” and “interlocking” systems of oppression reflect and affect peoples’ class situation (Collins 2000; Glenn 1999).

Second race, gender, and class are social structures centered on political-economic power that have real meanings for human relations and interactions; hence

power-relations (Glenn 1999). Analytically, race, gender, and class are relational social constructions that are dichotomized into meanings that require each other (Glenn 1999). Frantz Fanon (1967:44) argued the capitalist colonial and Imperial world-system dichotomizes the social world into “perpetual conflict,” or the “Manichaeian Structure.” As such, human groups are dichotomized as manhood/womanhood, white/Black, rich/poor, colonizer/colonized, Bourgeoisie/proletariat, etc. (Glenn 1999). The saliency of race and gender makes privilege invisible, such that whiteness is raceless and manhood is genderless (Glenn 1999:11). Being that racially gendered classed power-relations are born out of the capitalist colonial and Imperial world-system, these meanings do not “require face to face interactions;” instead they “interconnect humanity, even if not physically” (Glenn 1999:11). For example, Europe as white and Africa as Black, the “West” as first-world and the “rest” as third-world, does not require one to travel the world to know this.

Lastly, racially gendered classed power-relations are also read as scripts of cultural representations (Glenn 1999). Cabral (1970:706, 715) illustrates culture is a “synthesis of economic, political and social conflicts” that flowers from historical processes. Specifically cultural representations are the “deployment of symbols, language and images to express and convey racially gendered [classed] meanings (Glenn 1999:12). Therefore, racially gendered classed power-relations can be read in “institutionalized rituals, written history, school curricula, mass media” (Blauner 1972:31). For example, racially gendered classed power-relations can be read in the meaning of “lady,” “good hair/bad hair,” and “civilized/savage” (Blauner 1972:31; Glenn 1999; Moore 2007).

Consequently, the three analytic concepts of race, gender, and class (i.e. social structure, relational, and cultural representational) are such that they are conceptualized as power-relations in which racism, sexism, and privilege [whiteness/manhood] have real consequences that underwrite institutions, processes, systems, interactions, outcomes, and actions (Davis 1981; Glenn 1999; Feagin 2006; Mills 1999; Bonilla-Silva 2010). While racially gendered classed power-relations are centered on the political-economic structure of the capitalist colonial and Imperial world-system, they too are represented in the superstructure (de Sousa Santos et. al. 2007). To holistically understand the capitalist colonial and Imperial world-system, we must interrogate it as a *total* system that includes the epistemological and ideological aspect (Rodney 1972; Mills 1999; de Sousa Santos et. al 2007). Thus while racially gendered classed power-relations structure human groups, these power-relations too superstructure humanity's knowledges.

Epistemology and Institutionalized Knowledge

The creation of knowledge is a socio-historical, political, cultural process of meaning-making that is both subjective and objective; epistemology being theories of the social creation of knowledge (Bourdieu 1977; Pascal 2011; Collins 2000). Epistemology explores how knowledge creation is a social process including a triad of interconnected facets: the knower, the known, and the process of knowing (Sprague and Kobrynowicz 1999; Sprague 2005:31). Feminist standpoint theorists explore the way knowledge emerges from a person's social location, based on their racially, gendered, and classed lived experiences (Collins 2000; Sprague 2005; Hesse-Biber and Leavy 2006). Black Feminist standpoint theorists elucidate that knowledge created through everyday lived experiences becomes the basis for intellectual thought, where reflection of lived

experiences creates social wisdom that reflects multiple social realities (Collins 2000). For feminist standpoint theorists, while epistemology is analyzed as a triad of the knower, the known, and the process of knowing, the process of knowing is particularly important to understand (Sprague 2005; Hesse-Biber and Leavy 2006). Power is a part of the process of knowing and knowledge construction; therefore standpoint epistemology speaks to the role of power in “who is a legitimate creator of knowledge and what kind of knowledge is created” (Sprague 2005:53). For example, researchers are seen as legitimized creators of knowledge, per their privileged, powerful positions within institutions (Sprague 2005).

Stanfield (2011:20) distinguished social knowledge as “cognitive style,” or a “mode of reality construction [that] facilitates ‘seeing’ and ‘knowing’ the social world.” Cognitive styles of social knowledges reflect communities and societies cultural histories (Stanfield 2011; Zerubavel 1999). Contemporarily, a global perspective of social knowledge reflects the historical development of the political-economic structure of the capitalist world-system, specifically the colonial and neo-colonial stages, that superstructures knowledge such that humanity’s social knowledge is dichotomized into culturally distinct Indigenous Knowledges and Western education (de Sousa Santos et. al. 2007; Smith 2012).

Indigenous Knowledges frame a circular cognitive style centered within the community’s understanding of social and natural environments (Stanfield 2011:20). Spirituality underwrites the superstructure of Indigenous Knowledges that shape understanding of the material world (Rodney 1972:42). Accordingly Indigenous Knowledges serve to impart key values, norms, and mores that reflect the community’s

cultural focal point to instill social responsibility (Dei and Asgharadeh 2005; Abdi and Cleghorn 2005; Diop 1990). Knowing the social world (epistemology) is reflected as doing in the social world (ontology); where epistemology is ontology.

In comparison, knowledge within the Western education cognitive style is compartmentalized into non-formal (i.e., lived experiences), informal (i.e., deliberate occasions), and formal (i.e., schooling) educations (Abdi 2005; Rodney 1972). Within Western formal education, knowledge is classified into distinct institutions of knowledge that are further disciplined into *disciplinary boundaries* (Fuller 1993). Disciplinary boundaries contain the set(s) of ideas and preferred paths of “valid” knowledge production, as well as the roles and behaviors of producing said knowledge; instead “thought style” (Douglas 1986:13; Fuller 1993). The institutionalization and disciplining of knowledge requires political-economic funding to organize academic disciplines into academic departments of schools and universities; as such institutionalized knowledge represents “middle-class” and elite knowledge (Stanfield 2011). The institutionalization of knowledge as disciplinary boundaries and the building of academic departments (organizations) into schools and universities mean academic disciplines are “institutional-structures” (Stanfield 2011; Wallerstein 2007:427).

Within disciplinary boundaries, institutionalized knowledge is segregated and stratified, where ranked ideas are rewarded and stigmatized, or the “logic of [knowledge] segregation,” which results in very real consequences of ideas losing their holistic value (Collins 2007). The segregation of knowledge is a “symbolic hierarchy of knowledge” that requires “[gatekeeping of] symbolic and social boundaries...by excluding certain peoples and ideas” (Collins 2007:577). Here, ideas become structured. Gatekeepers of

disciplinary boundaries discipline by validating and invalidating knowledge(s); a critical element of “disciplining knowledge” is “knowledge dissemination” (Collins 2007:578; Rabaka 2010:29; Fuller 1993; Douglas 1986).

The disciplining, or gatekeeping, of institutionalized knowledge reproduces elite, privileged knowledge by consciously excluding racially gendered classed “Others” “thought styles;” this hegemonic reproduction, however, is rendered invisible (Douglas 1986:13; Collins 2007). For example, Western cognitive style’s “thought style,” is disciplined as “objective,” “positivistic” truth that monopolizes “valid” knowledge production (Stanfield 2011; Smith 2012). The domination of Western “cognitive style” is a “globalized localism,” or what Mills (1999:44) identified as “epistemological ethnocentrism,” that reinforces monocultural Eurocentric knowledge production and invalidates “Othered” knowledges (de Sousa Santos et. al 2007; Smith 2012). In terms of the superstructure de Sousa Santos et. al. (2007:xlvii, xxxix) operationalized this as the “coloniality of knowledge” that reflects the “coloniality of power” of the capitalist colonial and Imperial world-system (Smith 2012; Rodney 1972). As such, racially gendered classed power-relations structure “objectivity” so that it is never in favor of the “Other” and is instead used as an ethnocentric and Eurocentric tool to invalidate racially gendered oppressed knower’s and knowledges (Cesaire 1972; Smith 2012). Consequently “objectivity” denies Indigenous Knowledges of shamans’ and medicine men within Western cognitive style; while economically Indigenous Knowledges are exploited by Western educated scientists who synthesize medicinal plants in Western science labs (Narby 1998).

Zerubavel (1997:15) conceptualizes a “sociology of thinking” that explores how “culturally specific cognitive traditions” reinforce “cognitive norms” that “affect and constrain ways of thinking” through “cognitive socialization.” Cognitive socialization is the process of knowing/thinking that “allows us to enter the social institutional world” of particular thought communities (Zerubavel 1997:15). Though communities include professions where cognitive socialization determines knower’s “mental horizons [of knowledge]” including “what is relevant from the irrelevant[;]” an “important aspect of power” (Zerubavel 1997:51).

As such, critical theorists argue education is a tool of dominant power to perpetuate privilege by reproducing hegemonic power-relations for the purpose of socializing knower’s into embodying power-relations; what Bourdieu (1977) operationalized as “habitus.” Bourdieu’s (1977) concept of “habitus” is an excellent example that reads cultural representations of racially gendered classed power-relations, as habitus reflect social structures. Habitus is a “system of predispositions” that is a “product of history” that “produces individual and collective practices” achieved through socialization processes within social institutions; hence, Bourdieu’s (1977:446) assertion that “the dialectic between habitus and institutions” is most “significant.” For example, Bonilla-Silva (2010) conceptualized how race as white supremacy structures Bourdieu’s concept of habitus as “white habitus.” “White habitus” is “a racialized, uninterrupted socialization process that conditions and creates whites’ racial taste, perceptions, feelings, emotions, and their views on racial matters;” where, importantly, “white habitus” upholds a “sense of group belonging (a white culture of solidarity)” (Bonilla-Silva 2010:104).

Within institutional-structures of the academy the socialization process is called professionalization, where knower's learn the process of knowing and being in said profession (i.e. sociologist) (Margolis and Romero 1998). For example, Margolis and Romero (1998:1306) explore the effect of the hidden curriculum, both the weak form "professionalization" and strong form "acts that reproduce inequality," on women of color graduate students and found more critical studies of the "treatment of race in the curriculum and validation of paradigms as "mainstream" need to be explored."

Institutionalized knowledge reflects structured power-relations and dominant ideologies that reproduce hegemonic cultural knowledge of elite ruling classes, privileged whiteness, and privileged manhood that is normalized as the "mainstream;" where "the ultimate mark of power is its invisibility; the ultimate challenge, the exposition of its roots" (Trouilliot 1995:xix; Stanfield 2011; Feagin 2006; Sica 2007; Better 2008). As such, racially gendered power-relations can be read in the cultural reproduction of institutionalized knowledge; for example in the discipline of American Sociology (Dillabough 2003; Oakes 1985; Bourdieu 1977). Rabaka (2010:16, 24) illustrates how the process of institutionalized racism reproduces "epistemic apartheid," or the "academic racial colonization and conceptual quarantining of knowledge, anti-imperial thought and/or racial political praxis produced and presented by non--white--especially Black—[and female] intellectual activists;" specifically in American Sociology. Mary O'Brien (1981) argues the reproduction of American Sociology is "malestream," making visible the reproduction of male privileged institutionalized knowledge. However to be sure, the boundaries of institutionalized, segregated knowledges are continually confronted and challenged. This was most evidently seen in the 1970's, 1980's and 1990's in which

Black Studies, Women’s Studies, Chicano Studies, and American Indian Studies were institutionalized as various programs and departments in universities and colleges. This is also read in the institutionalization of epistemological concepts within disciplines. For example, Collins (2007) illustrates how the institutional epistemic segregation of race, class, and gender distinctly is problematic for the development of the sociological imagination and as such the institutionalizing of Race, Class and Gender studies from the 1990’s to today challenges the disciplinary boundary of American Sociology. The institutionalization, or lack thereof, of Race, Class, and Gender studies can be historically situated in the fact that Black women knower’s were “marginalized and their intersectional knowledge was subjugated;” where exclusion made the concept of “intersectionality” invisible within the hegemonic “thought style” of American Sociology (Collins 2007:602; Wilson 2006). Even further, Collins (2007:579) has argued the “adherence to norms of classification, ranking, and segregation” of knowledge makes American Sociology blind to how race, gender, and class structure and segregate the discipline’s knowledge (re)production and disciplinary boundary.

Collective Memory

Institutions are socio-historical constructs that have the ability to remember and forget (Douglas 1986). Collective memory, first coined by Halbwachs in 1925, is a “collective phenomenon that only manifests itself in the actions and statements of individuals” and is a “complex process of cultural consumption and production” (Kansteiner 2002:179&180). Collective memories exist in shared communities where the past has meaning with mnemonic practices; a mnemonic community or organizations that are communities with collective memories (Kansteiner 2002:188; Griffin 2004:555;

Zerubavel 1996:289; Zerubavel 2003:90). Thus, Kansteiner (2002:188) illustrates collective memory resides “in the material, in the practices, and institutions.” Zerubavel (1996:286) explores collective memory through the context of remembering, which is “regulated by rules of remembrance,” including mnemonic socialization.

Collective memory is read in objectified cultural representations that are sites for collective memory, and thus collective memory studies utilize cultural sociology. Cultivated from the fertile ground of history, culture is the “the synthesis of social, economic, and political conflict” that can be read in cultures of oppression and liberation (Fanon 1967; Cabral 1970). Halbwachs read “collective memory as a plural [showing] that shared memories can be effective markers of social differentiation” (Olick and Robbins 1998:112). For example collective memory studies have illustrated memory as 1) spatialized, 2) important for understanding actions and 3) monumentalized to “divest ourselves of the obligation to remember” (Griffin 2004:555; Griffin and Bollen 2009; Young 1992; Olick and Robbins, 1998:119). Importantly, collective memories serve the purpose of “establishing and maintaining group identities” (Kansteiner, 2002:190; Levine, 1995).

Much of the literature focuses on micro-level understandings of collective memory, but there is a gap in the literature linking collective memory to social collectives and historical consciousness (Kansteiner 2002:179). To bridge the methodological gap from the individual to collective memory understandings, Kansteiner (2002:190) argues that Bergson’s concept of “habit memory” must be employed. Bergson’s “habit memory” is “the physical being as an incarnation of all the possibilities of acting out the past in the present” and very much relates to Bourdieu’s habitus (Kansteiner 2002:190).

“Habit memory” is the embodiment of the past in the present, and Bourdieu’s habitus is the embodiment of class position. Applying a critical race and feminist standpoint methodological approach, “habit memory” can also be read as both the reproduction of knowledge and the reproduction of structural inequalities of race and gender.

The process of reproducing racially gendered institutionalized knowledge is specifically read in institutional-structure’s “collective memory” and the dissemination of knowledge therein. Race and gender structure institutionalized knowledge, and just as race and gender are cultural representations, they are too representations of oppression and resistance that can be read in sites of collective memory. As such, collective memory is a script which racially gendered classed power-relations can be read in the reproduction of knowledge. Rabaka (2010:24) stated that historical amnesia, the ability for institutions to forget knowers and knowledges while relationally privileging other knowers and knowledges is “undeniably [a] consequence of epistemic apartheid.” The real consequences of racially gendered historical amnesia include American Sociology’s institutionalized forgetting of W.E.B. Du Bois and Oliver C. Cox, except for symbolically naming awards after them, and the exclusion of the epistemological concept of intersectionality until more recent institutionalization (Rabaka 2010; Wright II 2005; Collins 2007; Wilson 2006).

In total, race, gender, and class are structures that are relational and culturally representational that have real consequences for the creation of knowledge. Knowledge is institutionalized and structured into disciplinary boundaries and academic departments, respectively; a process structured by race, gender, and class that is read in the cultural representations of the institutional-structures. Habit memory allows for understanding

how the past is reincarnated in the present by reading cultural representation sites of collective memory and socialization processes therein. Cultural texts are representative of 1) knowledge reproduction and collective memory, 2) how race and gender structure knowledge reproduction, and 3) how structural inequalities of knowledge are reproduced. With this theoretical framework, this paper analyzes required Ph.D.-level theory course syllabi from the top-20 U.S. sociology departments as cultural texts that represent knowledge reproduction and collective memory; as required courses represent an aspect of the professionalization process, and a key example of Bergson's "habit memory." However, before exploring American Sociology's contemporary reproduction of institutionalized knowledge, it is critical to understand how race, gender, and class structure the history of American Sociology.

American Sociology

American Sociology is an "institutional-structure" of the U.S. and is part of Western formal education (Wallerstein 2007). The institution of social science traveled to the U.S. from Europe (Calhoun 2007). The beginnings of sociology in the U.S. must be contextualized with deep religious Christian movements and as such the science of society was seen as a "benevolent science" to be used as a tool for social justice and racial uplift (Calhoun 2007:10; Wilson 2006). The 1865 formation of the American Sociological Science Association with members including "non-academics [including] ministers and aids to the poor" exemplified the idea of the social science as a tool for "rational benevolence" (Calhoun 2007:2). In the decades of 1870's and 1880's public schools and universities became organized throughout the United States, most notably in the South as a result of Reconstruction era state conventions (Du Bois 1933). By the

1890's, the institutionalization and structuring of American Sociology (institutional-structure) in U.S. colleges and universities began.

Institutionalized knowledge is structured in organized schools, a process that requires political-economic funding for departments and chairs (Fuller 1993; Douglas 1986; Camic 2010; Stanfield 2011). In the 1890's Bourgeoisie and philanthropists funded U.S. sociology departments and chairs; for example in 1892 William Rainey Harper funded sociology at the University of Chicago, while in 1895 George Bradford funded sociology at Atlanta University; Columbia was also funded in 1893 (Sica 2007:722; Calhoun 2007:2; Wright II 2005). The institutional-structure of American Sociology however reflected the social structure of the United States. Therefore academic departments were racially segregated into predominately anti-Black universities and Historically Black Colleges and Universities just as U.S. society; a reality politically solidified in 1896 by the Supreme Court's *Plessey v. Ferguson* decision of "separate but equal" (Wallenstein 2008; Wallerstein 2007). Consequently American Sociology's "knowledge [is] stratified by [racially gendered classed] group differences" and "differentiated through institution building and development;" represented as academic departments (Stanfield 2011:30).

In the 1890's many knowers' engaged the discourse of disciplining American Sociology including Jane Addams, Albion Smalls, and W.E.B. Du Bois (Sica 2007). Since the dissemination of knowledge is a critical aspect of the disciplining process, it is also an important element of the historical disciplining, the legitimizing and institutionalizing of American Sociology. In July 1895 Albion Smalls, chair of sociology at the University of Chicago, created the very influential *American Journal of Sociology*

(aka “Small’s Journal”) which was, and is, central to the dissemination of sociological knowledge in the U.S., and too disciplining said knowledge (Sica 2007:722). It is here that we can see how race and gender underwrote the dissemination of sociological knowledge in the early decades of the institutionalization of American Sociology. Jane Addams was influential to the discourse of legitimizing and institutionalizing American Sociology, specifically in relation to “rational benevolence” and the Hull House movement¹; in fact Albion Smalls, W.I. Thomas, and Herbert Mead were all active participants at Hull House (Calhoun 2007:17). Jane Addams had five articles published in AJS as well as reviews of her other publications (Calhoun 2007:17).

During that same time W.E.B. Du Bois engaged the disciplining and institutionalization of American Sociology and in 1897 was appointed chair of the ‘Atlanta Sociological Laboratory’ at Atlanta University after George Bradford specifically sought out his unquestionable experience and knowledge (Wright II 2005; Wright 2009). As chair, Du Bois continued the department’s “Social Science Conference on Negro Problems,” where once a year various sociologists both non-academic practitioners and academic scholars engaged the discipline and the dissemination sociological knowledge for the purpose of social justice and racial uplift (Wright II 2005; Wright II 2009). For example Black club women, as part of the legacy of the Black Women’s Club Movement in the U.S., presented social studies done to understand social problems in the Black community which were used to create “social solutions” as well as engage social realities of race, gender, and class (Wilson 2006). Soon after Du Bois

¹ Hull Houses were political, social, economic, educational centers for “practical reform....[and] social transformations” (Calhoun 2007:16). Influential white males sociologists including Albion Small, Herbert Mead, and W.I. Thomas were all active at Hull House (Calhoun 2007:17).

become chair, Atlanta University’s Social Science Conference was segregated by gender into two meetings, where knowledge disseminated at the woman’s meeting employed a womanist (middle-classed) center (Wilson 2006; Wright II 2009). For the most part, Black women scholars were accepted for social science study at Fisk University, albeit a gendered curricular program that included courses on domesticity (Wilson 2006).

However, while Du Bois engaged the discipline and conducted social studies, he, as a knower and his knowledge, was excluded from the discipline, reflected in the dissemination of knowledge. For example Du Bois’s groundbreaking social study *The Philadelphia Negro* was not even reviewed in AJS (Rabaka 2010:4). While race and gender are distinct social structures that are relational and representational, they also interlock such that race is gendered and gender is racialized (Glenn 1999; Collins 2000). To explain the exclusion of W.E.B. Du Bois’s work from AJS, yet the publication of Jane Addams work, knowledge which would too be subjugated within the discipline, we must recognize how race, i.e. white supremacy, serves as a metalanguage to dictate gender (i.e. patriarchy) in the United States (Higginbothom 1995). In this case, the editors of AJS afforded Jane Addams’ white privileged inclusion and W.E.B. Du Bois racist exclusion from influential knowledge dissemination, an important part of “disciplining knowledge” (Rabaka 2010:29). However, to be sure racism and sexism are interlocking matrices of domination such that within the hegemonic institutionalized reproduction of the discipline both Jane Addams and W.E.B. Du Bois have been made invisible for an enduring period of time, while Black women scholars (i.e. Ida B. Wells-Barnett, Anna J. Cooper, Angela Davis) have been largely excluded.

By the 1920's American Sociology was disciplined into a social "science" of "objectified [ethnocentric] knowledge" centered in a functionalist "positivism" that "reflect[ed] and reproduce[d] Euro-American hegemony" (Stanfield 2011). The gatekeepers of institutionalizing American Sociology excluded and subjugated racially gendered Othered knowers' and knowledges, while at the same time divorced sociological knowledge from "humanities" to legitimize the discipline as "social *science*" (Stanfield 2011:39). In the 1920's Bourgeoisie invested money into sociology; for example the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial contributed millions to the University of Chicago, Columbia, UNC at Chapel Hill and University of Virginia (Stanfield 2011:37). Sociology was an imperative tool for the "survival of the emerging [U.S.] corporate state;" specifically to control and predict urbanization, industrialization, and social services in the U.S. (Stanfield 2011:34). In so doing, gatekeepers privileged white male sociological knower's and knowledges while marginalizing and excluding racially "Othered" knower's, especially Black women knower's, and knowledges; for example at the University of Chicago (Baldwin 2004).

Race and gender underwrite American Sociology's institutionalized knowledge such that racially gendered ways of creating scientific knowledges, or racialized paradigms, have materialized. The hegemonic white, male paradigm of ethnocentric "objectivity" and Eurocentric positivism was challenged in the 1960's by racially gendered knower's and knowledges including but not limited to Black Studies, Women Studies, Chicano Studies, American Indian Studies, and Asian American Studies. Black Sociology, is part of the interdisciplinary Black Studies/Africana Studies, African

American Studies.² As such, in the 1960's and 1970's American Sociology as a social science experienced a paradigmatic shift with the materialization of a Black sociological paradigm (Staples 1976). Since the paradigmatic shifts of the 1960's and 1970's, scholars have discussed the “demise of the canon,” including but not limited to the inclusion of race and gender studies within sociology department (Wallenstein, 2007). However, what is not known is if the “demise of the [racially gendered] canon” is empirically reflected in the contemporary reproduction of American Sociology’s institutionalized knowledge. To what extent does race and gender structure the contemporary reproduction of the discipline? Has the canon of theory really been demised as some have stated? Does the racially gendered socio-historical construction of American Sociology as an “institutional-structure” endure with real consequences in the reproduction of racially gendered inequalities of knowledge?

III. Methods

This study explores American Sociology’s contemporary reproduction of knowledge, collective memory, per “habit memory,” as well as how race and gender structure this process. (see Table 1). Graduate departments are sites of institutionalized knowledge, professionalization, and collective memory. As part of the professionalization process in sociology, there are certain classes that Ph.D. students are required to take. Required theory courses are a part of the professionalization process that too reproduces the institutionalized knowledge of the discipline. While other theory courses may be available for students to take, required theory courses specifically represent “habit memory” because they encompass past sociological thinkers that

² All are interchangeable because they are centered in the same Black Sociological paradigm.

professionalized Ph.D. students are required to know in the present. As such, required Ph.D.-level theory syllabi can be read as representative of 1) the reproduction of institutionalized knowledge, 2) Bergson's "habit memory" since required classes are part of professionalization, 3) disciplinary identity maintenance and thus gatekeeping processes, as well as 4) how race and gender structure American Sociology's institutionalized knowledge reproduction.

[Insert Table 1 here]

The syllabi are purposefully sampled from the top-20 U.S. sociology departments, per Burris's (2004) sample. Recent sociology of sociology studies illustrate how prestige structures sociology departments at respective U.S. universities, organizing American Sociology into prestigious (elite) and non-prestigious (non-elite) departments (Burris 2004; Weakliem et al 2011; Wallerstein 2007). Prestige in American Sociology's institutional-structure is important as Burris (2004) found the top-20 departments enact social closure through interdepartmental hiring; to be sure social closure is illustrative of power within the discipline (Weeber 2006; Lenski 1966). Theoretically, since the top-20 U.S. sociology departments represent elite power within American Sociology, then the institutionalized knowledge reproduced is representative of the dominant institutionalized knowledge reproduced within the discipline. As such, the sample can be limited to the top-20 and still be representative of American Sociology as a whole. Even further, by exploring the knowledge reproduction process in the top-20 U.S. sociology departments, this study problematizes American Sociology as an "institutional-structure;" something scholars have called for (Wallerstein 2007). Therefore this study includes a purposive,

non-probability sample of contemporary required Ph.D.-level theory course syllabi at the top-20 U.S. sociology departments.

Required Ph.D.-level theory course syllabi for the year 2011-2012 were collected by contacting all 20 prestigious departments requesting either a copy of the syllabus/i or the appropriate avenue to obtain it/them. In all I obtained 21 syllabi from 14 of the top-20 U.S. sociology departments of which three were from Fall 2012, four from Spring 2012, seven from Fall 2011, one from Spring 2010, one from Spring 2009, one from Fall 2007, one from Fall 2004 and one from Fall 2000. The Fall 2000 syllabus was excluded from the sample as ‘contemporary’ was operationalized between 2002-2012. Some syllabi were publically available on the internet, while most were not.

Of the top-20 U.S. sociology departments ten require one theory course (50%), nine require two courses (45%) and one department requires three theory courses (5%). Seven of the ten departments requiring one course specify a particular theory course, while other three offer course options to satisfy the theory requirement. Of the nine departments that require two theory courses, eight specify a classical and contemporary two semester-sequence that satisfies the theory requirement. In all, the sample includes twenty required PhD-level theory syllabi that represent fourteen of the top-20 U.S. sociology departments; a response rate of 70%.

Of the twenty syllabi, six were coded as “sociological theory” in general, five as exclusively “classical theory,” five as exclusively “contemporary theory,” two “micro-level theory” courses, one “social change theory” course, one “structural theory” course, one “social action theory” course, and one course coded as classical theory with

contemporary applications. Six of the twenty syllabi represent complete two-semester sequence course requirements at three departments.

The syllabi were methodologically analyzed from a critical race theoretical approach framed within a feminist epistemological standpoint. Specifically “critical race theoretical approaches to education...[are centered on] the intersection of race and property,” where “curriculum represents a form of intellectual property” and the “construction of whiteness [is] the ultimate property” (Ladson-Billings and Tate 1994:54&58; Harris 1993). Further, critical race theory or “race-based[,] methodologies make visible what is often invisible, taken for granted, or assumed in our knowledge and practice, and do this work out of necessity.” More pointedly, Pillow (2003:183) argues race-based methodologies do not offer an ‘add race and stir’ approach but offer an epistemological shift in how we know what we know, how we come to believe such knowledge, and how we use it in our daily lives. This shift impacts and raises questions that are central to educational research including who can be a “knower,” what counts as knowledge, and what the purposes of research and knowledge production are or should/could be...that contributes to a decentralization of Eurocentric thought.

Feminist standpoint epistemology is specifically concerned with the process of knowing, including the known and the knower (Sprague 2005). As Harding (2004:12) argues, carrying out standpoint projects within disciplines is a crucial task since a main objective of standpoint theory and research is precisely to map the conceptual practices through which particular institutions, such as disciplines, serve oppressive forms of power.

Together this methodological approach makes visible marginalized voices, those not seen as legitimate creators of knowledge within hegemonic discourses, and subjugated knowledges that do not reproduce the hegemonic discourse, as well as the construction of whiteness (Foucault 1976; Hesse-Biber and Leavy 2006; Ladson-Billings and Tate 1994; Pillow 2003). Bergson’s “habit memory” is a methodological tool to sociologically

imagine American Sociology's present, or contemporary, knowledge reproduction as the embodiment of the discipline's past (Kansteiner 2002). "Habit memory" in conjunction with critical race and feminist standpoint theoretical approaches, makes visible how race and gender structure American Sociology's collective memory and contemporary knowledge reproduction.

In order to read the cultural representations of institutionalized knowledge, collective memory, as well as race and gender the syllabi were analyzed in a number of ways. First, the syllabi were coded how the author of the syllabi (knower) situated the knowledge being reproduced in the course; specifically themes emerging from the stated objectives and purpose of the courses were coded. Second, the syllabi were coded by the title of each class section that organized the required readings from which three themes emerged; specifically that class sections were organized by theorists, theoretical concepts, and/or theoretical traditions. Third, all of the required readings on the twenty syllabi were coded by author(s) and then sub-coded by specific required reading titles. In total there were 892 required readings (i.e journal articles, chapters of books, and books) written by 452 authors. 90 of the required readings were written by two or more authors. Fourth, all required readings that originated from journal articles were coded by journal title, an analysis that allows for interpretation of power and knowledge dissemination. Of the 892 required readings, 275 were journal articles from a total of 86 journals. The most represented journal was the *American Journal of Sociology* (AJS) with 60 required journal article readings, next was the *American Sociological Review* (ASR) with 52, *Sociological Theory* with 22, and *Theory and Society* with 11 required journal article readings. The other 145 required journal article readings spanned across 82 journals with

an average of one article but in some cases up to seven readings from a particular journal. This illustrates the power of AJS and ASR as gatekeepers of disseminating knowledge within the discipline, as well as *Sociological Theory* and *Theory and Society* within the subspecialty of theory. Fifth, the syllabi were coded by if 1) race and/or 2) gender were engaged. This analysis included coding specific class sections organized as “race theory,” “group prejudice,” “feminist theory,” or more pointedly class sections organized as “W.E.B. Du Bois” or “Patricia Hill Collins.” In some cases, class sections organized as “social stratification” that included readings such as Massey and Denton’s *American Apartheid* were coded as engaging race and/or gender. For those syllabi that had either class sections or required readings that specifically engaged race and/or gender, the race and/or gender required readings were coded by author and then sub-coded by the title of the required readings. Lastly, the syllabi were coded for if the knowledge being reproduced was historical contextualized. Specifically themes regarding the history of American Sociology and the history of American Sociology’s theoretical canon were coded.

To be sure, invisibility is an important aspect of the reproduction of racially gendered power-relations; as such this analysis unmasks American Sociology’s reproduction of institutionalized knowledge, collective memory, and racially gendered structural inequalities of knowledge. The limitations of this study includes that in some departments professor’s that teach the required theory courses may change and thus too the dissemination of knowledge, per the syllabi. Also, since a content analysis of all 892 required readings was not performed, some readings may minimally engage race or gender but were not organized in the syllabi as such.

IV. Findings

Situating of Knowledge Reproduction by Syllabi Author

Of the twenty syllabi, twelve identified acquainting students with theoretical approaches as an objective, eight identified the objective of acquainting students with major themes in sociology, eight syllabi identified acquainting students with theoretical concepts as an objective and seven syllabi identified the objective of acquainting students with specific theorists. Seven syllabi identified teaching the practice of doing theory or theoretical work as an objective. Five of the twenty syllabi specifically identified acquainting students with “current debates in sociological theory.” Six syllabi identified connecting theoretical understandings with “informing empirical sociological research.” Four syllabi specifically identified historically situating sociological knowledge as a course objective. Of the twenty syllabi, two included an objective on “acquainting students with the idea of sociological paradigms and the tools for understanding and evaluating specific paradigms.” Two syllabi did not have any stated objectives.

Institutionalized Knowledge Reproduction and Habit Memory

The required readings of the syllabi were organized into class sections, which were coded by theoretical approaches/traditions, theorists, and theoretical concepts. Of the twenty syllabi, nine syllabi required readings were organized by theorists, theoretical approaches/traditions, and theoretical concepts. Six syllabi were organized by approaches and concepts. Three syllabi required readings were organized by theorists and concepts. One syllabus was organized by strictly theorists and another syllabus strictly by theoretical concepts.

The most represented theoretical approaches/traditions in organizing the required readings were “structural-functionalism” on seven syllabi, “micro-sociology” on six syllabi, and “conflict theory” on five syllabi. “Institutional Theory” was represented on four syllabi. The following theoretical approaches/traditions were represented on three syllabi respectively; “Dukheimian tradition,” “feminist theory,” “Weberian tradition,” “Marxist tradition,” and “network theory.”

Of the required readings organized by theorists, Durkheim, Marx, and Weber were each represented on eleven syllabi. Simmel was represented on eight syllabi, Bourdieu on seven, Engels on five, and Foucault on four syllabi. Lastly, the most represented theoretical concept used to organize the required readings was coded as “rationality” on seven syllabi. “Capitalism,” “power,” and “structure” were used to organize required readings on six syllabi respectively. The next most represented theoretical concepts were “gender,” “history,” “humanity,” “religion,” “science/epistemology,” and “stratification” each on four syllabi.

[Insert Table 2 here]

In total there were 892 required readings, of which there were 452 authors. Table 2 illustrates the most frequently represented authors along with their most frequently required works. Marx and Engels were reading on eleven of the twenty syllabi, represented on 55.5% of the syllabi. Max Weber, Emile Durkheim, and Karl Marx were required reading on ten syllabi, represented on 50.0% of the syllabi. Georg Simmel was required reading on nine syllabi, or 45.0% of the syllabi and Pierre Bourdieu was required reading on eight syllabi or 40.0%. Erving Goffman, Michel Foucault, Robert K. Merton, and Randall Collins were each required reading on seven syllabi, represented on

35.0% of the syllabi. In total, six authors (Marx and Engels, Weber, Durkheim, Marx, Simmel, and Bourdieu) wrote 241 of the 892 required readings. Over 446 authors wrote the other 651 of the 892 required readings.

The courses coded as “classical theory,” “contemporary theory,” and “sociological theory generally” were further analyzed to understand the representation of required authors therein. Analysis of the five “classical theory” syllabi found that Durkheim, Marx, Simmel, Weber, Marx and Engels, and Mead were required reading on all five syllabi. Analysis of the five “contemporary theory” syllabi found that Foucault was the most required reading represented on four syllabi. Additionally, Habermas and Bourdieu were represented on three of the five syllabi. Lastly, the analysis of the “sociological theory generally” course syllabi revealed that Bourdieu, DiMaggio and Powell, Durkheim, Marx, Marx and Engels, and Weber were each represented on three of the four syllabi.

Race and Gender

Of the twenty syllabi, ten syllabi required readings that engage race. One contemporary theory course syllabus was centered on “Critical Theories of Race and Racism.” Beside this one course, an analysis of the other nine syllabi that engaged race revealed that three syllabi required only reading Patricia Hill Collins to engage race (two required “Learning From the Outsider Within” and one required the entirety of *Black Feminist Thought*). One syllabus required reading only William Julius Wilson’s *The Declining Significance of Race* to engage race; which was organized under “ethnicity.” Another syllabus required reading Massey and Denton’s *American Apartheid* and Devah Pager’s “The Mark of a Criminal Record.” Another syllabus that engaged race required

reading selections from Patricia Hills Collins' *Black Feminist Thought* and W.E.B. Du Bois's *Souls of Black Folk* where *Black Feminist Thought* was organized under "power" and *Souls of Black Folk* was organized under "identity." Another syllabus that engaged race required reading David Sears "Symbolic Racism," Lawrence Bobo's "Group Conflict, Prejudice, and the Paradox of Contemporary Racial Attitudes," and Massey, Garth, R. Hodson, and D. Sekulic's "Ethnic Enclaves and Intolerance: The Case of Yugoslavia" organized under "group prejudice and group tolerance." Lastly, one syllabus of the nine that engaged race (minus the one course on "contemporary race theories") required reading Du Bois's "The Philadelphia Negro", selections from Omi and Winant's *Racial Formation*, Laurent Dubois's "An Enslaved Enlightenment," Stephanie M. McClure's "White Matters: When, Where, and How?," Bourdieu and Wacquant's "On the Cunning of Imperialism," and Hanchard's "Acts of Misrecognition: transnational black politics, anti-imperialism and the ethnocentricisms of Pierre Bourdieu and Loic Wacquant" that were organized under "race theory." Further analysis reveals of the five "classical theory" course syllabi, only one required readings that engaged race. Of the five "contemporary theory" syllabi, three syllabi engaged race. Lastly, of the four "sociological theory" course syllabi, three engaged race.

[Insert Table 3 here]

Three syllabi required readings that engaged ethnicity, two of which did so separately from the nine syllabi that engaged race. The readings included Bonacich's "A Theory of Ethnic Antagonism: The Split Labor Market," Kiyoteru Tsutsui "Global Civil Society and Ethnic Social Movements," and Massey, Garth, R. Hodson, and D. Sekulic's "Ethnic Enclaves and Intolerance: The Case of Yugoslavia."

In addition to race, the syllabi were coded for required readings that engaged gender; overall, of the twenty syllabi twelve require readings that engaged gender. The contemporary theory syllabus on “Critical Theories on Race and Racism” engaged gender through examining black feminist thought and transnational feminism, specifically requiring Patricia Hill Collins’s *Fighting Words: Black Women and the Search for Justice*. Four other syllabi also required only one reading on gender. One syllabus required reading only Bittman et al’s “When does Gender Trump Money? Bargaining and Time in Household Work,” another required only Foucault’s *History of Sexuality*, another syllabus only Engels *Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*, and one that required reading only Szelenyi and Olvera’s “The Declining Significance of Class: Does Gender Complicate the Story?.” One syllabus required two readings on gender including selections from both Collins’s *Black Feminist Thought* and Foucault’s *The History of Sexuality*. Another syllabus required three readings on gender including “Engels on capitalism and gender,” Collins’s “Learning from the Outsider Within,” and selections from Foucault’s *The History of Sexuality*. The other five syllabi had four or more readings each; three syllabi had four required readings, one had six and another syllabus had nine required readings. The syllabi with more than 3 required readings that engaged gender, organized the majority of these readings under class sections titled “intersecting categories,” Feminist and Black Feminist Theory,” “Bringing Gender In,” “Feminist Theory,” and “Postmodern Thought and the Conflict Tradition: On the Way to Standpoint Theory- the Feminist Case.” Table 3 illustrates the most represented required author, where the readings are then coded by title that engaged race and/or gender. Further analysis reveals that of the five “classical theory” course syllabi,

two required readings that engaged gender; and both of which required reading Engels.

Of the five “contemporary theory” syllabi, four syllabi engaged gender. Lastly, all four of the “sociological theory” courses engaged gender.

Collective Memory

Of the twenty syllabi, seven represented attempts to historicize American Sociology either through required readings, the organization of a class section, or the syllabi author situating why certain knower’s and readings are represented on the syllabi. Three syllabi situated American Sociology by organizing class sections, where two syllabi had a class section on the “American Micro-tradition and Pragmatist Thought” and one syllabus had a class section on “the theory of action, structural-functionalism, and the course of American Sociology.” Two syllabi required reading Calhoun’s introduction to the ASA’s *Sociology in America: A History*. The one syllabus on “contemporary theories of race and racism” had a class section on contemporary meanings of race, including specifically within American Sociology, and as such required reading Bonilla-Silva’s *Racism without Racists* and the American Sociological Association’s *Race Statement of 2003*. While it is not to be expected that one theory course represent the full gamete of theory, only two syllabi acknowledged that fact.

One syllabus discussed “what [was] missing” including “older American Sociology” and the “Frankfurt School and Post-Frankfurt critical theory,” stating that “Cooley, Mead, Dewey, Mills, Park, and Hughes are, sadly, neglected in favor of their more famous European contemporaries.” Another syllabus, which included only five theorists, argued that “classical theory” basically means Marx, Weber and Durkheim” where “the generation of the 1960’s forced the addition of Marx...[into] the mainstream

disciplinary view.” Further this syllabus author affirmed Simmel was included because “the mainstream has come to take Simmel more seriously,” as well as including “the canonical Mead” since “[he] is as important as the others [and]...because unlike the others he was an American (not all social theory is European).” This same syllabus author also states “Dewey is probably the more comprehensive of the pragmatist theorists, but for some reason American Sociology...has shied away from [him].” This same syllabus requires students be responsible for two theorists not on the syllabus, where a list of “classical theorists” included, but was not limited to “Dorothy Smith, John Dewey, Frantz Fanon, Charlotte Perkins Gilman.”

Breaking the Habit: Agency in the Reproduction of Knowledge and Collective Memory

This analysis explores the syllabi that engaged race and/or gender. One syllabus author illustrated the course was not a “theory” course but rather a learning of the “sociological tradition.” This syllabus exemplified a broad collective memory of American Sociology, including required readings from Jane Addams, W.E.B. Du Bois, Dorothy Smith, West and Zimmerman, and Patricia Hill Collins; and as such engaged both race and gender.

One contemporary theory course was entirely centered on “Critical Theories on Race and Racism” and included required readings on white supremacy and Eurocentric thought. The one syllabus that dedicated a class section to “Race Theory” is the only syllabus that specifically required a reading that engaged whiteness, per McClure’s piece, beside the aforementioned course dedicated to “Contemporary Theories of Race and Racism.” Further this same syllabus required reading Patricia Hill Collins’s “The Social

Construction of Black Feminist Thought,” but was organized under “Feminist Theory” not “Race Theory.” Du Bois was required reading on three syllabi of the twenty, at three departments respectively; on one “classical theory” syllabus, on one “contemporary theory” syllabus, and on a syllabus coded as “micro-level and meaning.” At the same time one syllabus required reading three of Jane Addams works.

V. Conclusion

Being that Ph.D.-level theory syllabi represent institutionalized knowledge required for professionalized sociologists in the U.S. to know, it too represents an aspect of the discipline’s “habit memory.” Privileging the intellectual property of whiteness is part and parcel with the discipline’s reproduction of a “white habit memory.” Rather, the discipline’s historical property of whiteness is privileged as what is required to be remembered in the present. As Bourdieu (1974:448) stated “the habitus—embodied history, internalized as a second nature and so forgotten as history—is the active presence of the whole past of which it is the product” and “functions as accumulated capital.” As such the privileging of American Sociology’s intellectual property of whiteness and the reproduction of white habit memory serves American Sociology’s professionalized knower’s as accumulated capital. Thus, professionalized sociologists are expected to know Marx, Weber, Durkheim, and Simmel or their sociological intellect may be questioned. However knowing, or not knowing, racially “Othered” sociological knowledges, for example W.E.B. Du Bois or Oliver C. Cox, has no bearing on perceived intellect because racially “Othered” cultural knowledge does not have the privileged property of whiteness. In other words, knowing American Sociology’s privileged intellectual property of whiteness, or the “dominant cultural capital[,]...facilitate[s a]

particular [style] of self-representation perceived consciously or implicitly by institutional gatekeepers to be markers of a superior student, endowed with sophistication and intelligence" (Bourdieu 1996:31 cited in Lizardo 2010:310).

While this analysis of the syllabi makes visible American Sociology's normalization and privileging of the intellectual property of whiteness, as well as the reproduction of "white habit memory," it seeks to problematize much more. As Dorothy Smith (2004:21) stated in her "Radical Critique of Sociology," "it is not enough to supplement an established sociology by addressing ourselves what is left out [or] overlooked...that merely extends the authority of the existing sociological procedures." Rather, this discussion problematizes how the reproduction of "white habit memory" informs sociological thought. Bourdieu (1974:444) stated, "habitus...is constituted in practice and is always oriented toward practical functions." The question is then, how does the reproduction of "white habit memory" adversely affect the production of sociological knowledge by professionalized sociologists. Just as Smith (2004:24) illustrated, as graduate students learning to become sociologists, we learn to think sociology is as it is thought and to practice it as it is practiced. We learn that some topics are relevant and some are not...to confine or focus our insights within the conceptual frameworks and relevances which are given in the discipline...we learn a way of thinking about the world which is recognizable to its practitioners as *the* sociological way of thinking (own emphasis added).

Therefore one can problematize, what does the de-emphasis on theory, as institutionally exemplified by the fact ten of the top-20 sociology department require only one Ph.D.-level theory course, mean for the practice of using theory in sociological research. What does the limited reproduction of race theory as a central importance to sociological understanding mean for the production of knowledge? Will professionalized sociologists, in practice, undertheorize race in the production of knowledge and use race as a variable

that is controlled for (a process that is not applicable in reality)? How does the limited reproduction of race theory underdevelop race theory? If theoretical understandings of race are not required for professionalized knower's, meaning only sociologists who are specifically interested in race will have the theoretical understanding of race, then how does this underdevelop the sociological imaginations of professionalized sociologists?

The implications of these findings are important for the teaching, learning and doing of sociology. If sociologists agree race is an important determinant of socially lived experiences, then to what extent must race theory be a part of the "habit memory" of American Sociology. How would including race theory as a central theme to the discipline enhance the theorization of race and the real consequences of empirically studying race. These findings encourage future research on the process of knowing and learning of race and gender in American Sociology graduate departments, specifically with regard to the reproduction and production of knowledge. How do graduate students experience the process of knowing about race, per their graduate school training? Further, based on their professionalization and "habit memory," illustrated by this data, how do PhD's produce new knowledge and how does race and gender structure that process? How do race scholars, as faculty, understand the reproduction of race in their departments? We need to more fully understand this process in order to liberate our discipline from ethnocentric and Eurocentric sociology which results in the reproduction of the very "social problems" which the historical roots of our discipline encourage us to find "social solutions" to.

Table I: Prestige Ranking of U.S. Sociology Departments and Number of Required Ph.D.-level Theory Courses

Rank	PhD-granting Soc. Depart.	# of required theory courses	# of syllabi in sample
1	Wisconsin	1	1
2	Chicago	1	1
3	Michigan	2	2
4	UC Berkeley	2	0
5	Harvard	2	0
6	Columbia	1	0
7	Stanford	3	0
8	North Carolina	1	1
9	Indiana	1	1
10	Washington	1	0
11	Yale	1	0
12	Texas	2	2
13	Pennsylvania	2	2
14	Northwestern	2	1
15	Cornell	2	1
16	Princeton	2	1
17	Minnesota	1	1
18	Ohio State	1	5 (6 course options)
19	Duke	1	1
20	Johns Hopkins	2	1

Table II: Most Represented Theorists and Their Most Frequently Required Readings

Knower's (theorists)	# of syllabi out of 20	% of syllabi represent- ation	# of req'd readings	Most Represented readings and # of readings
Marx and Engels	11	55.5%	25	Communist Manifesto (9)
Max Weber	10	50.0%	59	The Protestant Ethic & the Spirit of Capitalism (8)
				Bureaucracy (6)
				Economy and Society (5)
Emile Durkheim	10	50.0%	44	Elementary Forms of Religion (14)
				The Division of Labor (11)
				Suicide: A Study in Sociology (9)
Karl Marx	10	50.0%	51	Capital (11) [Vol. 1 (10) and Vol. 3(1)]
				Feuerbach (7)
Georg Simmel	9	45.0%	40	Metropolis and Mental Life (4)
Pierre Bourdieu	8	40.0%	22	The Logic of Practice (4)
Erving Goffman	7	35.0%	13	Interaction Ritual (5)
				The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life (4)
Michel Foucault	7	35.0%	16	Discipline and Punish (5)
				History of Sexuality (4)
				Governmentality (3)
Randall Collins	7	35.0%	26	Interaction Ritual Chains (4)
Robert K. Merton	7	35.0%	14	Manifest and Latent Functions (3)
				Middle-Range Sociological Theories (3)
				Social Theory and Social Structure (3)
Dorothy Smith	6	30.0%	7	The Everyday World as Problematic (2)
				Conceptual Practices of Power: A Feminist Sociology of Knowledge (2)
William H. Sewell	6	30.0%	7	A Theory of Structure: Duality, Agency, and Transformation (5)
Talcott Parsons	6	30.0%	7	The Structure of Social Action (2)
Paul J. DiMaggio and	6	30.0%	6	“The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective

Walter W. Powell				Rationality in Organizational Fields.”(6)
Patricia H. Collins	6	30.0%	6	Black Feminist Thought (2)
				Learning From the Outsider-Within: The Sociological Significance of Black Feminist Thought (2)
Craig Calhoun	6	30.0%	14	Critical Social Theory: Culture, History, and the Challenge of Difference (4)
Herbert Mead	5	25.0%	6	Mind, Self, and Society (5)
James S. Coleman	5	25.0%	7	Foundations of Social Theory (4)
Ann Swidler	5	25.0%	5	Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies. (5)

Table III: Required Authors and Specific Readings on Syllabi that Engage Race and/or Gender

Knower (Author)	# of syllabi out of 20	Known (Req'd Reading)	# of rq'd readings
Patricia Hill Collins	6	<i>Black Feminist Thought</i> (1990)	2
		“Learning from the Outsider Within: The Sociological Significance of Black Feminist Thought” (1986)	2
		“The Social Construction of Black Feminist Thought” (1998)	1
		<i>Fighting Words: Black Women and the Search for Justice.</i> (1998)	1
Dorothy Smith	6	<i>The Everyday World as Problematic: A Feminist Sociology</i> (1987)	2
		“Ideology, Science, and Social Relations: Reinterpretation of Marx’s Epistemology” (2004)	1
		“Sociology from Women’s Experience: A Reaffirmation” (1992)	1
		“Conceptual Practices of Power: A Feminist Sociology of Knowledge” (1990)	2
		“Women’s Perspective as a Radical Critique of Sociology” (1987)	1
W.E.B. Du Bois	3	<i>The Philadelphia Negro</i> (1899)	1
		<i>The Souls of Black Folk</i> (1903)	2
Jane Addams	1	<i>Democracy and Social Ethics</i> [selections]	1
		“A Function of the Social Settlement”	1
		“Residents of Hull-House, Hull-House Maps and Papers	1

References

- Abdi, Ali A. 2005. "African Philosophies of Education: Counter-Colonial Criticisms," In A. Abdi and A. Cleghorn (eds.), *Issues in African Education: Sociological Perspectives*: pp. 25-42. New York: Palgrave MacMillian.
- Abdi, Ali A., and Ailie Cleghorn. 2005. "Sociology of Education: Theoretical and Conceptual Perspectives," In A. Abdi and A. Cleghorn (eds.), *Issues in African Education: Sociological Perspectives*: pp. 3-23. New York: Palgrave MacMillian.
- Baldwin, Davarian. 2004. "Black Belts and Ivory Towers: The Place of Race in U.S. Social Thought, 1892-1948." *Critical Sociology* 30: 2: 397-450.
- Better, Shirley. 2008. *Institutional Racism: A Primer on Theory and Strategies for Social Change*, 2nd ed. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Blauner, Robert. 1972. *Racial Oppression in America*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2010. *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism & Racial Inequality in Contemporary America*, 3rd Edition. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. "Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction." In J. Karabel and A.H. Halsey (eds.), *Power and Ideology in Education*: pp. 487-511. New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1974[2010]. "Structures, Habitus, and Practices." In *Social Theory: The Multicultural and Classic Readings*, edited by Charles Lemert, pp. 444-449. Philadelphia, PA: Westview Press.
- Burris, Val. 2004. "The Academic Caste System: Prestige Hierarchies in PhD Exchange Networks." *American Sociological Review* 69: 239-264.
- Cabral, Amilcar. 1970. "National Liberation and Culture," In edited by Ayodele J. Langley (ed.), *Ideologies of liberation in Black Africa, 1856-1970: documents on modern African political thought from colonial times to the present*: pp. 703-721. London: R. Collings.
- Calhoun, Craig. 2007. "Sociology in America: An Introduction," In Craig Calhoun (ed.), *Sociology in America A History*: pp. 1-38. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Césaire, Aimé. 1972. *Discourse on Colonialism*. New York: MR.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 2000. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Thought*, 2nd edition. New York: Routledge.
- _____. 2007. "Pushing the Boundaries or Business as Usual? Race, Class, and Gender Studies and Sociological Inquiry." In Craig Calhoun (ed.), *Sociology in America A History*: pp. 427-437. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Davis, Angela Y.. 1981. *Women, Class, and Race*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Dei, George and Alireza Asgharzadeh. 2005. "Indigenous Knowledges and Globalization: An African Perspective," In Abdi, K. Puplampu and G. Dei (eds.) *African Education and Globalization: Critical Perspectives*: pp. 53-78. Lanham, M.D: Lexington Books.
- Dillabough, Jo-Anne. 2003. "Gender, Education, and Society: The Limits and Possibilities of Feminist Reproduction Theory." *Sociology of Education* 76: 4: 376-379.
- Diop, C.A. 1974. *The African Origin of Civilization: Myth or Reality*. Chicago: L. Hill.

- Douglas, Mary. 1986. *How Institutions Think*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- Du Bois, W.E.B. 1933. *Black Reconstruction in America 1860-1880*. New York: Free Press
- Eisenstein, Zillah. [1977]1990. “Constructing Theory of Capitalist Patriarchy and Socialist Feminism.” *Women, Class, and the Feminist Imagination: a socialist-feminist reader*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Fanon, Frantz. 1965. *The wretched of the earth*. New York: Grove Press.
- Feagin, Joe. 2006. *Systemic racism: a theory of oppression*. New York: Routledge.
- Fuller, Steve. 1993. “Disciplinary Boundaries and the Rhetoric of the Social Sciences,” In Ellen Messer-Davidow, David R Shumway, and David J Sylvan (eds.), *Knowledges: Historical and Critical Studies in Disciplinarity*: pp. 125-149. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.
- Glenn, Evelyn N. 1999. “The Social Construction and Institutionalization of Gender and Race,” In Mara Marx Ferree, Judith Lorber, and Beth B. Hess (eds.), *Revisioning Gender*: 3-43. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Griffin, Larry J. “Generations and Collective Memory Revisited: Race, Region, and Memory of the Civil Rights Movement.” *American Sociological Review* 69: 4: 544-557.
- Griffin, Larry J. and Kenneth A. Bollen, “What Do These Memories Do? Civil Rights Remembrance and Racial Attitudes.” *American Sociological Review* 74: 4: 594-614.
- Harding, Sandra. 2004. “Introduction: Standpoint Theory as a Site of Political, Philosophic, and Scientific Debate.” Pp. 1-16 in *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies*, edited by Sandra Harding. New York: Routledge.
- Harris, C.I. 1993. “Whiteness as property.” *Harvard Law Review*. 106(8):1709–1795, 1710–1712.
- Hesse-Biber, Sharlene Nagy and Patricia Leavy. 2006. *The Practice of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Higginbothom, Evelyn Brooks. 1995. “African-American Women’s History and the Metalanguage of Race,” In Darlene Clark Hine, Wilma King, and Linda Reed (eds.), *We Specialize in the Wholly Impossible: A Reader in Black Women’s History*: pp. 3-24. Brooklyn, N.Y.: Carlson Publishing, Inc.
- Kaba, Lansine. 2007. “Historical Consciousness and Politics of Africa,” In Delores P. Aldridge and E. Lincoln James (eds.), *Africana Studies: Philosophical Perspectives and Theoretical Paradigms*: pp. 58-69. Pullman, WA: Washington State University Press.
- Kansteiner, Wulf. 2002. “Finding Memory in Meaning: A Methodological Critique of Collective Memory Studies.” *History and Theory* 41: 2: 179-197.
- Ladson-Billings, G.J. and Tate, W.F. 1994. “Toward a theory of Critical Race Theory in education.” *Teachers College Record*. 97:47–68.
- Lenski, Gerhard E. 1966. *Power and Privilege: a theory of social stratification*. New York: McGraw-Hill, esp. chapters 3-4 and 10-13.
- Lizardo, Omar. 2010. “Culture and Stratification.” In *The Handbook of Cultural Sociology*, edited by John R. Hall, Laura Grindstaff, and Ming-Cheng Lo, pp. 305-315. New York: Routledge.

- Margolis, Eric and Mary Romero. [1998]2000. "The Department is Very Male, Very White, Very Old, and Very Conservative": The Functioning of the Hidden Curriculum in Graduate Sociology Departments." In Stephen J. Ball (ed.), *The Sociology of Education Volume III*: pp. 1276-1311. London: Routledge.
- Mills, C.W. 1997. *The Racial Contract*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Moore, Robert B. 2007. "Racist Stereotyping in the English Language," In Margaret L. Andersen and Patricia Hill Collins (eds.), *Race, Class, and Gender: An Anthology*: pp. 365-376. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.
- Narby, Jeremy. 1998. *The Cosmic Serpent: DNA and the Origins of Knowledge*. New York, N.Y.: Jeremy P. Tarcher/Putnam.
- O'Brien, Mary. 1981. *The Politics of Reproduction*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Oakes, Jeannie. 1985. *Keeping track: how schools structure inequality*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Olick, Jeffrey K. and Joyce Robbins. 1998. "Social Memory Studies: From Collective Memory to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 1: 105-140.
- Pascale, Celine-Marie. 2010. "Epistemology and the Politics of Knowledge." *The Sociological Review* 58: s2: 154-165.
- Pillow, Wanda. 2003. "Race-Based Methodologies: Multicultural Methods or Epistemological Shifts." In *Interrogating Racism in Qualitative Research Methodology*, edited by Gerardo R. Lopez and Laurence Parker, pp. 181-202. New York: Peter Lang.
- Rabaka, Reiland. 2010. *Against Epistemic Apartheid: W.E.B. Du Bois and the Disciplinary Decadence of Sociology*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Rodney, Walter. 1972. *How Europe underdeveloped Africa*. London: Bogle-L'Ouverture Publications.
- Sica, Alan. 2007. "Defining Disciplinary Identity: The Historiography of U.S. Sociology," In Craig Calhoun (ed.), *Sociology in America A History*: pp. 713-731.
- Smith, Dorothy E. 2004. "Women's Perspective as a Radical Critique of Sociology." In *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies*, edited by Sandra Harding, pp. 21-34. New York: Routledge.
- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 2012. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, 2nd Edition. New York: Zed Books.
- de Sousa Santos, Boaventura, Joao Arriscado Nunes, and Maria Paula Meneses. 2007. "Introduction: Opening Up the Canon of Knowledge and Recognition of Difference" in *Another Knowledge is Possible: Beyond Northern Epistemologies*, edited by Boaventura de Sousa Santos, pp. xvix-lxii.
- Sprague, Joey. 2005. *Feminist methodologies for critical researchers: bridging differences*. Walnut Creek, CA: Lanham, MD
- Stanfield II, John H. 2011. *Black Reflective Sociology: Epistemology, Theory, and Methodology*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Staples, Robert. 1976. *Introduction to Black sociology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. 1995. *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*. Boston: Beacon Press.

- Turner, Jonathan H. "American Sociology in Chaos: Differentiation without Integration." *The American Sociologist* 37: 2: 15-29.
- Wallenstein, Peter. 2008. "Black southerners and nonblack universities: the process of desegregating Southern higher education, 1935-1965," In Peter Wallenstein (ed.), *Higher education and the civil rights movement: white supremacy, black Southerners, and college campuses*. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2007. "The Culture of Sociology in Disarray: The Impact of 1968 on U.S. Sociologists," In Craig Calhoun (ed.), *Sociology in America A History*: pp. 427-437. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- _____. 2004. *World-systems analysis: an introduction*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Weakliem, David L., Gauchat, Gordon and Bradley R. E. Wright. 2011. "Sociological Stratification: Change and Continuity in the Distribution of Departmental Prestige, 1965–2007." DOI 10.1007/s12108-011-9133-2.
- Wilson, Francille Rusan. 2006. *The Segregated Scholars and the Creation of Black Labor Studies, 1890-1950*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.
- Wright II, Earl. 2005. "W.E.B. Du Bois and the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory." *Sociation Today* 3: 1. Retrieved Oct. 5 2012 (<http://www.ncsociology.org/sociationtoday/v31/outline5.htm>).
- Zerubavel, Eviatar. 1996. "Social Memories: Steps to a sociology of the past." *Qualitative Sociology* 19: 3: 283-299.
- _____. 1997. *Social Mindscapes: An Invitation to Cognitive Sociology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- _____. 2003. *Time Maps: Collective Memory and the Social Landscape of the Past*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Chapter 3: The Reproduction of Race in American Sociology: Faculty Reflections

Abstract: This study uses qualitative data to explore American Sociology's contemporary social and cultural process of institutionalized knowledge reproduction, as well as how race structures this process. American Sociology is an "institutional-structure" that includes institutionalized knowledge and structured departments of prestige (Wallerstein 2007; Burris 2004, Weakliem et al 2001). Prestige structures American Sociology such that the top-20 departments enact social closure through hiring practices, representing an element of power within discipline (Burris 2004; Lenski 1966). Faculty who study race at prestigious departments have situated knowledge that provides important insight into American Sociology's contemporary process of knowledge (re)production since they too 1) are knower's of American Sociology, 2) have themselves produced sociological knowledge, and 3) are teachers who engage in the process of knowing sociology in the classroom, on dissertation committees, and so forth. Even more so, they also provide situated knowledge on how race is contemporarily represented and reproduced within their departments. Therefore this paper analyzes semi-structured interviews with faculty that study race at the top-20 U.S. sociology departments that read as cultural representations of institutionalized knowledge reproduction, as well as how race structures the reproduction of American Sociology. This study has implications for the teaching, learning, and practice of American Sociology, as well as future scholarly research on the reproduction of knowledge and the sociology of sociology.

Keywords:

Institutionalized knowledge reproduction, American Sociology, race,

I. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to explore American Sociology's contemporary cultural reproduction of knowledge and how race structures that process. In order to do so, this paper will 1) theoretically situate institutionalized knowledge and Western formal education, 2) conceptualize race as a structure of white supremacy that is relational and culturally representational with real consequences including institutionalized racism, 3) historically situate American Sociology as an "institutional-structure" that is both structured by and reproduces race, and 4) methodologically analyze 15 interviews with faculty who study race at the top-20 U.S. sociology departments from a critical race and feminist standpoint theoretical approach.

II. Literature Review

Epistemology, Institutionalized Knowledge, and Education

Epistemology is the study of the social creation of knowledge (Sprague 2005). The social creation of knowledge is a cultural process of meaning-making cultivated from the history of humanity, the producers of knowledge (Bourdieu 1977; Trouillot 1995). Analytically, Feminist standpoint theorists break epistemology into a triad of interlocking parts; the knower, the known, and the process of knowing (Sprague 2005). The cultural process of creating knowledge serves as "a mode of reality construction [that] facilitates 'seeing' and 'knowing' the social [and natural] world;" what Stanfield (2011:20) defines as "cognitive style." Cognitive styles are cultivated from societies and communities histories and, as such, are cultural representations of humanity's collective histories.

The process of knowing sociologically imagines knowledge as social and therefore thinking as a social act; the study of which Zerubavel (1997:5) identifies as a "sociology of thinking." Thought communities are groups, family (i.e. primary) and professions (i.e.

secondary), socialize members to see and know the social world, or think about the social world, in the manner of the thought community; the process of which Zerubavel (1997:15) conceptualizes as “cognitive socialization.” Thought communities include primary cognitive development (i.e. the family) and secondary cognitive development (i.e. specialized professions) (Zerubavel 1997). The socialization process of knowing or thinking within thought communities reproduces “cognitive norms” that “affect and constrain ways of thinking” (Zerubavel 1997:12). For example, Zerubavel (1997:39), in his chapter titled “The Social Gates of Consciousness,” discusses how the “role of our ‘mental horizons’ in ‘closing’ our minds” reads the process of “moral focusing,” where mental horizons “focus on the ‘figure’ but not the ‘ground,’ [rather] it decontextualizes the perception.” Learning what to ignore results from the separation of what is relevant and irrelevant which is in “accordance with particular norms of focusing that we learn from our “optical socialization” and leads us to regard certain parts of reality as mere background” (Zerubavel 1997:50). Making certain parts of reality relevant and irrelevant is a social act of power (Zerubavel 1997:47). To be sure, Zerubavel (1997:10) argues the more we become aware of our cognitive differences as members of different thought communities, the less likely we are to follow the common ethnocentric tendency.

The historical development of humanity into the total capitalist world-system means too that knowledge is superstructured to reflect political-economic power-relations (de Sousa Santos, Nunes, and Meneses 2007; Rodney 1972:99). Imperialism colonizes Indigenous “cognitive styles” that perpetuates a “coloniality of knowledge” that reproduces Western cognitive style as a “globalized localism” of hegemonic “monocultural knowledge;” or what Rodney (1972:85) called the “monopoly of

knowledge” (de Sousa Santos, Nunes, and Meneses 2007:xxxiii; Stanfield 2011). This “coloniality of knowledge” reflexively is a “coloniality of [political-economic] power” that validates knowledges rooted in Eurocentric whiteness and invalidates non-whiteness or Indigenous and racialized “Othered” knowledges; where denying human groups’ humanity through their knowledges and histories is a social act of power (de Sousa Santos, Nunes, and Meneses 2007; Smith 2012; Mills 1997).

Within the perpetual, binary conflict, or the Manichaen structure, of the total capitalist world-system, or what Fanon (1967:44/45) termed the Manichean Structure, humanity’s collective knowledges are contemporarily theorized as institutions of Indigenous Knowledges and Western Education. Knowledge within Western Education is compartmentalized into non-formal (based on lived experiences), informal (based on purposeful learning moments), and formal (based on schooling) (Abdi 2005; Rodney 1972). Knowledge of Western formal education is classified into institutionalized ways of knowing that is disciplined into “disciplinary boundaries” (Fuller 1993). To be sure, “institutions...by the very fact of their existence, control human conduct by setting up pre-defined patterns of conduct, which channel it in one direction as against many other directions;” with regards to thinking and the process of knowing, Zerubavel (1997:17) argues “sociomental control is one of the most insidious forms of social control” (Berger and Luckman [1966]XXX:392). Disciplinary boundaries, which are institutionalized thought communities, enforce certain rules of valid knowledge creation, or “thought styles” (Douglas 1986:13; Fuller 1993). The process of creating, maintaining, and revolutionizing disciplinary boundaries reads as cultural scripts of power-relations, where within bounded disciplines knowledge is segregated to maintain “inclusion and

exclusion,” relevant or irrelevant (Collins 2007:577). Knowledge of Western formal education is compartmentalized and classified that exists as disciplined institutions, that are also organized within schools and university departments (Stanfield 2011). The historical process of institutionally organizing university departments makes real the structured prestige of departments and the status of knowledges (Burris 2004; Weakliem 2011).

Critical theorists elucidate that education is a “tentacle” of the power-elite utilize to enforce the “coloniality of knowledge” by submersing Indigenous and Othered knowledges and consciousnesses in order to reproduce dehumanizing, hegemonic racialized and gendered power-relations and structural inequalities (Fanon 1963; Friere 1970:44; Rodney 1972:35&85; Bourdieu 1977; Robinson 1983; Kaba 2007; Marx in Grusky 2008; Bonilla-Silva 2010:10; Stanfield 2011). Within the “coloniality of knowledge,” objectivity is used as a tool to invalidate and dehumanize racialized and gendered Indigenous and Othered human groups’ histories, knowledges, and lived experiences; where “ethnocultural and hegemonic institution’s knowledge validation is grounded in objectification processes” (Smith 2012; de Sousa et. al 2007; Stanfield 2011:19). However the “objectification of knowledge [is a] matter of power and privilege;” or as Memmi (1965) illustrates objectivity is never in favor of the colonized. As such, Friere (1970:20) argued “education shouldn’t be value-free or neutral [but] should be ethically...and politically clear.” Liberatory education should promote humanized dialogue and critical thinking of reality, where “empowerment rejects dimensions of knowledge that perpetuate objectification and dehumanization” (Friere 1970; Collins 1990:230).

Racialized Gendered Classed Power-Relations and Institutionalized Knowledges

Analytically race and gender “intersecting and interlocking” 1) social structures that 2) praxis relationality, and are also read as 3) cultural representations, which together are reflexive of classed power-relations. (Collins 1990; Glenn 1999). Race is a social structure of white supremacy where whiteness is privileged and non-whiteness is oppressed, a process that is centered on economic exploitation and socially constructed by political nation-states that include the real consequences of white privilege and racism (Omi and Winant 1994; Mills 1997). Gender is a social structure of patriarchy where the male sex is privileged and non-males are oppressed, a process centered economic exploitation and social constructed by the sexual division of labor that includes the real consequences of male privilege and sexism (Davis 1984). To be sure, power that stems from control of political-economic structures is central to understanding race and gender (Glenn 1999; Kaba 2007). Second, race and gender are in praxis relationality, where racialized and gendered social constructions require each other to make meaning for human groups and actions or relations that together exhibits itself as power-relations (Glenn 1999). These power-relations reflect Fanon’s (1967:44/45) Manichaean Structure where the capitalist world-system presents human groups, or humanity, into perpetual conflict; for example, colonizer/colonized, whiteness/non-whiteness, male/female, man/woman, rich/poor, and so on. Third, race and gender can also be read in cultural scripts as cultural representations (Glenn 1999). Racialized and gendered power-relations are cultivated from the historical development of the capitalist world-system, white supremacy and patriarchy that read as a dialectic culture of oppression and the culture of liberation (Higginbothom 1995).

Race and gender powerfully underwrite socially lived experiences, social processes and social institutions, including the social process of knowing (Collins 1990; Better 2008; Mills 1997; Zuberi and Bonilla-Silva 2008; Feagin 2006:2). Institutionalized knowledge requires political-economic funding and as such is represented as middle-class and elite knowledge (Stanfield 2011). Even more so, racialized and gendered power-relations can be read in the cultural scripts of the social institutionalization and cultural reproduction of knowledge, where cultural scripts provide a space to read structures. The next section will explore how racialized and gendered power-relations underwrite American Sociology.

American Sociology: Race, Gender, and Institutionalized Knowledge

American Sociology, as an “institutional-structure,” reflects the racialized and gendered society from which it emerges (Wallerstein 2007; Collins 2007; Stanfield 2011:70). Racialized and gendered power-relations can be read in the cultural script of American Sociology’s institutionalized knowledge and the social process of knowing therein. The sociology of knowledge has historically, and contemporarily is, an important area of sociology that provides an avenue to understand racialized and gendered power-relations of institutionalized knowledge and make visible racialized and gendered structural inequalities of knowledge. As such scholars have completed research on the racialized and gendered segregation, marginalization, and subjugation of knowledge, the epistemological reproduction of white supremacy in theory and methods, as well as the reproduction of race and gender in American Sociology’s institutionalized knowledge.

During the same time that the U.S. and universities therein experienced racialized and gendered social movements of the 1960's and 1970's, American Sociology experienced a racialized paradigmatic shift that made visible Eurocentric, whiteness privileged knowledge and racialized Othered knowledges. To be sure, "paradigmatic revolutions are political struggles as well as intellectual" struggles (Stanfield 2011:40). It was at this same time, the 1960's and 1970's, that "mainstream sociology became [a part of the discipline's] language;" however, to be sure, "mainstream [is a] hegemonic force" that makes "hierarchy of departments, scholars" and knowledges invisible (Sica 2007). Sica (2007:410) emphasized that scholars should not "use [the terminology] mainstream [because] a more reflexive critical engagement [of American Sociology is] needed."

Scholars have researched the racialized and gendered segregation, marginalization, and subjugation of knowledge and the real consequences of institutional racism and sexism. In 1935 early American Sociologist W.E.B. Du Bois (1935) explored how white supremacy structured the thinking and learning of the U.S. Civil War as reproduced in university history department research and public primary schools' history textbooks. The real consequence of racialized segregation in the U.S., reinforced through the *Plessy v. Ferguson* decision, also meant the segregation and exclusion of racialized Othered knowledges (Zuberi and Bonilla-Silva 2008:279; Stanfield 2011; Rabaka 2010; Collins 2007). The segregation of knowledge is a "symbolic hierarchy of knowledge" that requires "[gatekeeping of] symbolic and social boundaries...by excluding certain peoples and ideas" (Collins 2007:577). As such Rabaka (2010) illustrates that American Sociology enacts epistemic apartheid that is the "process of institutionalized racism [that is read in the] racial colonization and conceptual quarantining of knowledge, anti-imperial thought, and/or radical

praxis produced and presented by non-white---and especially Black---intellectual activists.”

Black women’s exclusion and marginalization from university departments, both Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Predominately White Institutions, means the real consequence of the subjugation of Black women’s knowledges. So while Black women’s “taken-for-granted” knowledges on the intersection of race, gender, and class was historically excluded and marginalized from American Sociology, until more recent (1990’s) institutionalization of Race, Class, and Gender Studies, the real consequence was the institutionalization and reproduction of race, gender, and class as segregated and distinct areas of knowledge (Collins 2007). Knowing race, gender, and class as separate, distinct concepts lessens the explanatory power of race, gender, and class and thus devalues understanding the social world (Collins 2007). Collins (1990:10) explains that Black women’s lived experiences provides “knowledge of intersections of race, gender and class oppression,” which is “subjugated by dominant white society” to suppress “knowledge of Black women’s culture of resistance.”

Scholars have also illustrated how white supremacy underwrites American Sociology’s institutionalized knowledge and sociological research, including both theory and methods. Zuberi and Bonilla-Silva (2008:17) explain that white supremacy “define[s] the techniques and processes of reasoning about social facts,” or “white logic.” To be sure, “white logic” is the “epistemological arm of white supremacy” that reproduces a Eurocentric and “ethnocentric orientation [that] is not objective” (Zuberi and Bonilla-Silva 2008:332). At the same time “white methods” are “tools [that] manufacture empirical data and analysis to support the racial stratification of society” (Stanfield 2011). Together “white logic” and white methods” are ways of thinking and

praxis that “create racial knowledge” and reproduce racialized structural inequalities of knowledge and institutionalized racism (Zuberi and Bonilla-Silva 2008:17). To deracialize and humanize, or to liberate, knowing race must be “theoretical[ly] and historical[ly]” grounded; where the “deracializing” of sociology requires the “privilege[ing of] the human over the racialized individual” (Stanfield 2011:40; Zuberi and Bonilla-Silva 2008:335&337).

Various sociological studies have explored the ways in which “race,” as a concept, is reproduced within sociological work. Scholars have illustrated how the use of race as control variable or as an “independent causal variable” is problematic because it solidifies race as a “fixed construct, rooted in biology” (James 2008:32&43). Other studies have looked at how race and racialized Others are represented in introductory sociology textbooks. Stone (1996:356&361) did an analysis of 25 introductory sociology textbooks published between 1982 and 1994 and found that while “people of color are cited far more frequently...their coverage is largely ghettoized in a single chapter;” namely the chapter on race. Marquez (1994:232) explored the representation of “Hispanic women” in six introductory sociology textbooks that revealed Latinos were problematically represented as a homogenized group, segregated to the “race and ethnicity chapter” and discussions of which emphasized “disadvantage,” while Latinas were excluded from texts and “simply precluded by a generic portrait of “Hispanic men.” When looking at the reproduction of gender, Wagenaar’s (2004:11) study that included a survey of sociologists to determine the “core of sociology,” found that “Feminist Theory” was one of the lowest rated items in terms of importance to sociology or, in other words, Feminist

theory was rendered irrelevant. Dorothy Smith (2004:24) discussed American Sociology's social process of thinking and professionalization, stating:

as graduate students learning to become sociologists, we learn to think sociology as it is thought and to practice it as it is practiced. We learn that some topics are relevant and some are not...to confine or focus our insights within the conceptual frameworks and relevances which are given in the discipline...we learn a way of thinking about the work which is recognizable to it practitioners as *the* sociological way of thinking. (own emphasis added)

Even more so, she made visible American Sociology's gendered power-relations of knowledge and argued "women are outside of how sociology, its understanding and knowledge, its idea of the social world" and as such, "women's perspective...discredits sociology's claim to constitute an objective knowledge independent of the sociologist's situation."

Scholars have illustrated the need for more empirical research on American Sociology as an "institutional-structure" and the reproduction of racialized and gendered power-relations of knowledge in order to deracialize and humanize American Sociology's knowledge reproduction (Margolis and Romero 1998; Wallerstein 2007). The sociology of knowledge provides an important avenue of empirical research that can "challenge established ideas" and empowers a sociological imagination "to see beyond the created facades of organizations and institutions to the reality of their social processes" (Garrison 1999:75&78). While recent studies have looked at American Sociology's contemporary knowledge reproduction in sociology textbooks, racialized research methods, experiences within sociology graduate departments, no studies (to the knowledge of the author) utilize scholars who study race at the top-20 U.S. sociology departments to understand American Sociology's contemporary knowledge reproduction and the reproduction of race therein. Therefore this study explores the important issue of

how race structures knowledge production, as understood by professionalized scholars at elite sociology departments, and as such adds to the literature on American Sociology as an “institutional-structure” (Wallerstein 2007).

III. Methods

This study seeks to better understand American Sociology’s contemporary social and cultural reproduction of institutionalized knowledge, as well as how race structures this process. In order to do so, this study utilizes qualitative data that includes semi-structured interviews with faculty that study race at the top-20 U.S. sociology departments. The population for the semi-structured interviews was specifically chosen from the top-20 U.S. sociology departments since recent literature demonstrates that American Sociology is both institutionalized [knowledge] and structured [departments]; rather an “institutional-structure” (Wallerstein 2007). Prestige structures American Sociology such that the top-20 U.S. sociology departments enact social closure and thus represent an element of power within the reproduction of institutionalized knowledge (Burris 2004; Lenski 1966; Weeber 2006; Weakliem et al 2011).

[Insert Table 1 here]

I identified the population of faculty that study race by examining CV’s posted on the top-20 U.S. sociology department’s web pages and then directly contacted faculty, via email, who listed race, race/ethnicity, multiracial studies, ethnic studies, whiteness studies and/or critical race studies as one of their research interests. In all, the sample includes a total of fifteen (15) faculty that study race, representing twelve (12) of the top-20 departments (60%). Three departments were represented by two faculty, respectively, and thus the total of 15 faculty participants. The fifteen (15) participants were interviewed between August and October 2012 that included in-person interviews and

interviews over the phone and Skype. The interviews were audio-recorded and then transcribed. To maintain participant confidentiality, the specific departments represented will not be identified, however together they are representative of the top-20 U.S. sociology departments. The fifteen (15) participants included eight (8) white women, two (2) white men, four (4) Black men and a Black woman. Pseudonyms were created using names from the American Sociological Association's publication, the *Centennial Bibliography on the History of American Sociology*. In terms of professor rank within departments, the fifteen (15) faculty participants included eight (8) Full Professors, three (3) Associate Professors, three (3) Assistant Professors, a Visiting Assistant Professor, and a Professor Emeritus. The large number of Full Professors who participated in this study may be reflective of a willingness to participate in such a study as a result of full tenure. The areas of sub-specialty, outside of race and ethnicity, represented amongst the participants includes social psychology, demography, immigration, social movements, sociology of the family, sociology of education, stratification, inequality, qualitative methods, quantitative methods, as well as the Criminal Justice system, law, crime, and deviance. To be sure, twelve (12) of the fifteen (15) participants, or 80%, received their PhD's from departments included in Burris's sample of the top-20 U.S. sociology departments.

The interviews were methodologically analyzed from a critical race and Feminist standpoint theoretical approach in order to both understand the process of knowledge production, as well as illuminate if and how race structures that process. To be sure “critical race theoretical approaches to education...[are centered on] the intersection of race and property,” where institutionalized knowledge is “a form of intellectual

property,” where the “construction of whiteness [is] the ultimate property” and form of cultural capital (Ladson-Billings and Tate 1994:54&58; Harris 1993). Pillow (2003:183) furthers that race-based methodologies

impacts and raises questions that are central to educational research including who can be a “knower,” what counts as knowledge, and what the purposes of research and knowledge production are or should/could be...that contributes to a decentralization of Eurocentric thought.

A most important part of the interconnected triad of epistemology, per Feminist standpoint theorists, is the process of knowing (Sprague and Kobrynowicz 1999; Sprague 2005:31). Specifically, Feminist standpoint theorists illustrate that “standpoint structures epistemology; where a “feminist standpoint...allows us to understand patriarchal institutions and ideologies as perverse inversions of more human social relations (Hartsock 2004:36). Utilizing standpoint methodologies within disciplines, as Harding (2004:12) explains,

is a crucial task since a main objective of standpoint theory and research is precisely to map the conceptual practices through which particular institutions, such as disciplines, serve oppressive forms of power.

Sociology faculty provide important insight into American Sociology’s contemporary process of knowledge (re)production since they too 1) are knower’s of American Sociology, 2) have themselves produced sociological knowledge, and 3) are teachers who engage in the process of knowing sociology in the classroom, on dissertation committees, and so forth. Further since the faculty participants identify race as a scholarly interest, they also provide situated knowledge on how race and gender are contemporarily represented and reproduced within American Sociology.

IV. Analysis

Lived Experiences that Shape Scholar’s Sociological Imagination of Race

The participants were asked “How have your lived experiences shaped the way you use your sociological imagination to see race?” Of the ten (10) participants that were white, six (6) discussed the invisibility of race in their lived experiences of whiteness, including living in predominately white spaces and white privilege. For example, Helen described,

Well, first of all I am white. I think like a lot of people I didn’t really think about race too much. When I was being socialized as a kid, or thinking about what I wanted to do with my life, that was probably even more dominant since I grew up in Texas where Black/White issues are less visible and prominent because there are simply so few Black people in the community I was in.

Two (2) other white participants discussed the vividness of race in their lived experiences of whiteness, while two (2) other participants did not discuss race and or lived experiences of whiteness particularly but discussed the role of gender and/or sexuality as a marginalizing status.

Of the six (6) participants that discussed the invisibility of their lived experiences of whiteness, two (2) discussed how a geographical move made race visible. For example, Grace stated

“I grew up in North Carolina and I lived a very, very white area. And then we moved to Georgia...and suddenly I was...in the middle of the school where there was 30% African Americans...a lot more Asian Americans; there was much more diversity. And I think that experience was when I started thinking about race at all. Like I didn’t have to think about race until I moved to a place where not everybody looked like me.”

The other four (4) participants that discussed the invisibility of race conferred that their being a woman influenced their sociological imagination and learning of race. On the other hand, the two (2) participants that detailed the vividness of race in their lived experiences of whiteness specifically referred to their living memory of the 1960’s and

1970's social movements are pivotal or how they use their sociological imagination to sociologically imagine race and white privilege. For example, James explained

I did voter registration in Greenwood, Mississippi...Whites went on, entrenched to the South, it was kind of important what they did, we got things done and it was scary. But we got to leave! We went down, helped people to register to vote, marched, sang in the Black churches, but after a couple of months, boom we're gone! And the brave people who did all those things and lived in the area, they stayed and lived with the consequences...That had a profound effect on me.

Neither of the two (2) white male participants discussed the role of gender or their lived experiences as a man as influencing how they sociologically imagine race.

All five (5) of the participants that identified as persons of color discussed that their lived experiences, or socialization, as people of color directly shapes how they sociologically imagine race, including the visibility of race, sensitivity to particular issues, and directions of their research interests. As Charles illustrated,

my life experiences starting with my socialization and my mother's knee, has determined my interest in race and race relations as a sub-division of sociology...[my socialization] has had a terrific effect on my certain interests, my sociological imagination, the kind of teaching I do, everything.

Arthur extrapolated that personal lived experiences are fundamental,
I think that is also kind of, most of my friends and colleagues would say the same thing, that is how we [scholars of color] contrast with kind of more mainstream of white academics in race. This is very personal to us.
None of the four (4) male participants of color discussed their lived experiences as a man as affecting how they sociologically imagine race.

In total, six (6) of the eight (8) white women participants identified that their gendered personal lived experiences as women influenced their sociological imaginations of race. Specifically, the participants' personal lived experiences as women influenced their sociological imagination and research interests of gender. It was the interest in

gender that eventually informed their sociological imaginations of race. For instance,

Jane illustrated

I am interested in gender as a feminist, my own personal lived experiences as a woman. Then I would attend these women studies conferences and be really concerned that Black women, in particular, were not feeling welcomed or included and there was a great deal of anger around that...[That] probably had the most to do with realizing I wanted to look at intersections of race, class, and gender because I didn't feel like we could really make progress as women unless we are also looking at race and class.

Carol similarly demonstrates that “it was really the changes through Feminist scholarship that kind of taught a lot of us to think about these things much more generally as interlocking systems.” Cora also illustrated

And then the interest in race discrimination came because that was the sort of genre of literature I was looking at to explore gender discrimination issues. So my interest in race has really come academically.

Of the fifteen (15) participants, five (5) discussed their living memory of the 1960's and 1970's social movements as having influenced how they use their sociological imagination to study race and/or gender. Specifically, three (3) participants discussed the Civil Rights Movement, including the Black Power Movement, as influential to how they sociologically imagine race. For example, James illustrated

I am old enough [that] I remember the Civil Rights Movement, I remember the riots. My grandparents were living...in Los Angeles during the Watts Riot. I mean, I wasn't in the riot area [but] I could see the flames from the riot from my house at night.

Edith conferred living during the 1960's and 1970's social movements meant

race is just obviously on the table...I went off...[o]...North Carolina. It had integrated but for example when I got there the bathrooms in the courthouse, the “white” and “colored” signs had been pulled off the bathrooms but the shadows from where those signs...were still on the doors....When I was first teaching...they all remembered segregation. Black, white, I mean there was just no bullshit, everyone knew there had been segregation and that race was an issue.

Two (2) participants discussed how the social movements of the 1960's and 1970's made them aware of gender inequalities. For example, Carol illustrated

You know like those of us who are pretty senior now, I came to it probably out of my own college experiences and the years after college in the early and mid-1970's and all those social movements. But it made me, typical of that time, much more aware of gender inequalities than of racial.

Reproduction of "Race" and "Race Theory"

When discussing how "race" is reproduced in their department, seven (7) of the fifteen (15) participants illustrated that race is mostly reproduced and engaged as a variable. For example Anna stated,

I am certain that all of my colleagues include race as a factor in the work that they do; it's how they use it. For the most part, not 100%, but for the most part, my colleagues deal with race as a variable and trying to simply measure greater or lesser outcomes by virtue of one's racial identity, which I find fairly vacuous.

Arthur furthered:

Typically, I think, and such as in sociology generally, race as a control variable, and it's one of several dozen control variables, and so it's there as a kind of knee jerk reaction.

The reproduction of race as a variable percolates in graduate student work as well, as illustrated by Grace,

I have advised very few graduate students and I have not come across any in this department who actually are studying race. I know some of them list race as one of their interests but I am not really sure, I think typically race just becomes another variable in most of their models.

Six (6) of the fifteen (15) participants discussed that race is reproduced empirically but not theoretically in their departments. So for example, the participants differentiated between scholars that study race as opposed to scholars that study inequality and stratification. As William detailed,

And the community of scholars that is identified as the race sociology group is largely comprised of people that do inequality and stratification research. But they are not race theorists, so they don't do any race relations or systems of racism. So we went from a department where there were four or five of us that do that work, to where there is only two of us that do that kind of work

And Grace affirmed, "I think generally the researchers in my department do not study race very much. There are quite a few people studying inequality, but not race."

Additionally, seven (7) participants discussed the limited reproduction of race theory in their department. For example William described,

I see a lot of what I do as very intentional and in strong contrast to what other folks are doing, there are certainly folks that continue to study race in terms of disparities, health and income disparities, what have you. But I am one of the few that looks at theories of race and racism, that kind of stuff.

And Anna affirmed, "There is really no wrestling over racial theory in this department, so there is not any real presentation of race theory, except where I do it, to my knowledge."

Even further five (5) of the fifteen (15) scholars discussed that race theory was particularly limited within their own sub-specialty. For example, one participant stated that "a lot of the critical race theorists, like Bonilla-Silva, are not either widely read or widely cited by the work family literature" while another participant pondered,

I am trying to even think about how demographers address the race question...I mean demographers look at fertility rates among racial and ethnic minorities, they look at mortality....I mean that is the ultimate stratifier, Blacks or minorities die at a younger age or don't live as long. But you know that is all.

Four (4) of the fifteen (15) participants discussed the perceptions of legitimacy in the realm of publishing. Three (3) participants discussed the legitimacy of theory, while one participant discussed the perceptions of legitimate methods in the realm of publishing. The three (3) participants discussed that within the realm of publishing theory is deemed legit as long as it connects to some classical or contemporary theorist from the canon.

Mary illustrated that based on their experiences revising and resubmitting articles, critical race and feminist theory *itself*, without a connection to the canon, is not “recognized as important enough theory for it to merit the pages in AJS or ASR.” In the realm of legitimate methods participant Arthur asserted

Sociology generally, and this top department in particular, really doesn’t value the kind of work that I do....My primary focus is looking at populations of color and I am really not that interested in whites [as a comparison group]. The field, in my experience, has trouble with that... Any kind of curious look at the literature and you will see that there is a whole lot of studies that look only whites...and there are many fewer studies, especially in the kind of ASR and AJS that only look at people of color. So that tells us something about their interests. They are only interested in us when issues approach the border of their particular group. In other words, only they are relevant.

As a result,

“[scholars] that take my perspective find it much more difficult to publish in ASR, AJS, and places like that...So given that, then if you are doing non-traditional work that doesn’t follow a mainstream sociological track then it becomes much more difficult to get those articles accepted in AJS and ASR. So it’s a catch-21.”

The Sociological Canon and Race

The participants were informed of a preliminary analysis of theory course syllabi that illustrated the dominance of Marx, Weber, and Durkheim in required P.D.-level theory courses. When asked how they thought this theoretical canon influences students’ sociological imagination, eight (8) participants discussed how the theoretical canon reproduces the discipline’s history of thought as whiteness. For example, participant Edith stated that “among whites generally and white scholars specifically, there is a tendency to think that the subjects of history are white.” James furthered most of the “theorists that you mentioned are long dead white guys who really didn’t address or address systematically race or racism. They’re long dead and they are white and they

really didn't look at gender either and the effects of gender discrimination in their research."

In that same vein, six (6) of the fifteen (15) participants discussed the fact that such a theoretical canon affects graduate student thinking, including making irrelevant concepts of race and gender, as well as reinforcing one particular world-view. For example, Jane discussed how the theoretical canon constrains understanding the social world,

It is very important to read [scholars of color's] original works and their views on epistemology. They don't treat knowledge in the same way, it's not just a logical, rational linear way of thinking. The white, European model is only one way [of think]...It's so limited...The impression I got as a graduate student, that I had to unlearn, was "this is the one right way to think."... Working with Navajo scholars, the Navajo way of thinking is radically different. I didn't trust it at first and then I realized it was my problem, I was trained to think there was only one right way. And I think those readings really reinforce that, cuz they are not diverse. And so people don't think, "oh I could study this from a very different point of view, circular or woven," ya know, that is NOT part of the thinking of any of those people. That...I think is a serious problem...that is the kind of thing that really bugs me about sociology.

Four (4) of the fifteen (15) scholars specifically discussed the fact that the theoretical canon reinforces race and gender irrelevant as theoretical concepts.

Teaching Race

Seven (7) of the fifteen (15) participants discussed that they teach race theory in their courses, while one participant explained they did not teach about race theory. Of those seven (7) participant's that do teach race theory in their courses, four (4) stated they teach race theoretically as a social construction. Anna stated that for graduate students "the challenge is to get them to interrogate the concept of race and not just use it as a variable." Five (5) of the fifteen (15) participants discussed the importance of creating

the classroom environment a safe space of respect in order to teach and learn about race.

Anna illustrated how she creates a safe space,

I demand respect in the classroom whereby, as I explain, all of us are victims of racism and all of us are perpetrators of racism at some level. And I try not to set up a victim versus predator kind of environment. I try to get students to understand that racism and sexism and classism are systems...that are insidious and are engrained in our culture and therefore, all of us find ourselves on either end of the oppressor/oppressed sort of continuum. At the same time, I am very clear that there are certain groups that have overwhelmingly been the target of such oppression and it is important that this privilege be understood.

Additionally, six (6) of the fifteen (15) participants discussed importance dialogue in teaching and learning about race. Grace conferred

I have taught race and ethnicity and it's become one of my very favorite courses to teach, because I feel like having dialogue, where there is this safe space for everybody to have a voice, is incredibly important.

Charles furthered,

In the course itself, I mean students here are pretty hotshot, especially in seminars, and we have some very interesting, extremely valuable discussions. And sometimes both white, Black, Hispanic, and Others bring experiences of their own and their interpretation of the literature into the seminar

V. Discussion/Conclusion

This study drew on semi-structured interviews with scholars who study race at the top-20 U.S. sociology departments in order to understand American Sociology's contemporary knowledge reproduction process and how race structures that process. The analysis of scholar's lived experiences reveals that, in accordance with standpoint literature, scholars of color see race as evident through everyday lived experiences and as such race integral to the sociological imagination. For scholars socialized into whiteness, the use of race in their sociological imagination is likely to come from academics and particularly for white women scholars, it was academic work related to gender and Feminist scholarship that informed their sociological imagination of race. The fact that

white women knower's predominately identified Feminist theory and Women's Studies associations as central to their sociological imaginations of race highlights the importance of 1) feminist theory to empowering sociological imaginations and 2) intersectionality for more fully understanding social reality. With this in mind, the fact that Waagenaar's (2014) survey on the "core of sociology" found that "Feminist Theory" was the lowest ranked item of importance to American Sociology is extremely problematic. Future research should explore the reproduction of feminist theory within American Sociology's institutional-structure? Even further age for these participants is important since some of the participants discussed how their living memory of the Civil Rights Movement was important to their sociological imagination of race.

The participants illustrated that within the institutional-structure of American Sociology, race is dominantly reproduced as a variable, discussed through empirical research as opposed to theoretical orientation, and that there exists limited reproduction of race theory. Meaning the cognitive socialization of American Sociology makes race theory irrelevant. However, reproducing race as an atheoretical variable is problematic in that it makes white methods and white logic invisible. If race theory is rendered irrelevant and American sociologists' learn to think of race as a variable, then how does this effect the production of knowledge about our social reality and reproduce racialized and gendered structural inequalities of knowledge. Future research should explore how race and race theory are utilized to produce new knowledge by professionalized sociologists.

This study sought to explore race scholar's situated knowledge of the reproduction of knowledge at the top-20 U.S. sociology departments. This study

importantly illustrates the need for more research on the reproduction of American Sociology's institutionalized knowledge in order to better understand racialized and gendered power-relations and structural inequalities of knowledge. Future research needs to explore 1) race scholarship disseminated within the discipline's prominent journals, 2) how professionalized and cognitively socialized graduate students think and learn about race, and 3) the discourse of "mainstream" in order to better understand racialized and gendered power-relations of knowledge and the reproduction of structural inequalities of knowledge.

References

- Abdi, Ali A. 2005. "African Philosophies of Education: Counter-Colonial Criticisms." Pp. 25-42 in *Issues in African Education: Sociological Perspectives* edited by A. Abdi and A. Cleghorn. New York: Palgrave MacMillian.
- Better, Shirley. 2008. *Institutional Racism: A Primer on Theory and Strategies for Social Change*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. "Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction." Pp. 487-511, in *Power and Ideology in Education*, edited by J. Karabel and A.H. Halsey. New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2010. *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism & Racial Inequality in Contemporary America*, 3rd Edition. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Burris, Val. 2004. "The Academic Caste System: Prestige Hierarchies in PhD Exchange Networks." *American Sociological Review* 69: 239-264.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 1990. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. Boston, MA: Unwin Hyman.
—. 2007. "Pushing the Boundaries or Business as Usual? Race, Class, and Gender Studies and Sociological Inquiry." Pp. 427-437 in *Sociology in America A History*, edited by Craig Calhoun. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Davis, Angela. 1981. *Women, Class, and Race*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Douglas, Mary. 1986. *How Institutions Think*. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press.
- Du Bois, W.E.B. 1935. *Black Reconstruction in America 1860-1880*. New York: Free Press.
- Fanon, Frantz. 1965. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press.
- Feagin, Joe. 2006. *Systemic Racism: A Theory of Oppression*. New York: Routledge.
- Freire, Paulo and Myra Bergman Ramos. 1970. *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Fuller, Steve. 1993. "Disciplinary Boundaries and the Rhetoric of the Social Sciences." Pp. 125-149 in *Knowledges: Historical and Critical Studies in Disciplinarity*, edited by Ellen Messer-Davidow, David R. Shumway, and David J Sylvan. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.
- Garrison, Charles E. 1999. "Sociology without Knowledge: The Atrophy of a Concept." *The American Sociologist*. 30(3):67-80.
- Glenn, Evelyn N. 1999. "The Social Construction and Institutionalization of Gender and Race." Pp. 3-43 in *Revisioning Gender*, edited by Mara Marx Ferree, Judith Lorber, and Beth B. Hess. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Harris, C.I. 1993. "Whiteness as property." *Harvard Law Review*. 106(8):1709–1795, 1710–1712.
- Higginbothom, Evelyn Brooks. 1995. "African-American Women's History and the Metalanguage of Race," In Darlene Clark Hine, Wilma King, and Linda Reed (eds.), *We Specialize in the Wholly Impossible: A Reader in Black Women's History*: pp. 3-24. Brooklyn, N.Y.: Carlson Publishing, Inc.
- James, Angela. 2008. "Making Sense of Race and Racial Classification." Pp. 31-45 in *White Methods, White Logic: Racism and Methodology*, edited by Tukufu Zuberi and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

- Kaba, Lansine. 2007. "Historical Consciousness and Politics of Africa." Pp. 58-69 in *Africana Studies: Philosophical Perspectives and Theoretical Paradigms*, edited by Delores P. Aldridge and E. Lincoln James. Pullman, WA: Washington State University Press.
- Ladson-Billings, G.J. and Tate, W.F. 1994. "Toward a theory of Critical Race Theory in education." *Teachers College Record*. 97:47–68.
- Lenski, Gerhard E. 1966. *Power and Privilege: a theory of social stratification*. New York: McGraw-Hill, esp. chapters 3-4 and 10-13.
- Margolis, Eric and Mary Romero. [1998]2000. "The Department is Very Male, Very White, Very Old, and Very Conservative': The Functioning of the Hidden Curriculum in Graduate Sociology Departments." Pp. 1276-1311 in *The Sociology of Education Volume III*, edited by Stephen J. Ball. London: Routledge.
- Marquez, Stephanie Amedeo. 1994. "Distorting the Image of 'Hispanic' Women in Sociology. Problematic Strategies of Presentation in Introductory Textbooks." *Teaching Sociology* 22(3):231-236.
- Marx, Karl. 2008. "Ideology and Class." Pp 89-90 in *Social Stratification: Class, Race, and Gender in Sociological Perspective*, edited by D. B. Grusky. Philadelphia: Westview Press.
- Memmi, Albert. 1965. *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. New York: Orion Press.
- Mills, Charles. 1997. *The Racial Contract*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. 1986. *Racial formation in the United States: from the 1960s to the 1980s*. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Pillow, Wanda. 2003. "Race-Based Methodologies: Multicultural Methods or Epistemological Shifts." In *Interrogating Racism in Qualitative Research Methodology*, edited by Gerardo R. Lopez and Laurence Parker, pp. 181-202. New York: Peter Lang.
- Rabaka, Reiland. 2010. *Against Epistemic Apartheid: W.E.B. Du Bois and the Disciplinary Decadence of Sociology*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Robinson, Cedric J. 1983. *Black Marxism: the making of the black radical tradition*. London: Zed.
- Rodney, Walter. 1972. *How Europe underdeveloped Africa*. London: Bogle-L'Ouverture Publications.
- Sica, Alan. 2007. "Defining Disciplinary Identity: The Historiography of U.S. Sociology." Pp. 713-731 in *Sociology in America A History*, edited by Craig Calhoun.
- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 2012. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, 2nd Edition. New York: Zed Books.
- de Sousa Santos, Boaventura, João Arriscado Nunes, and Maria Paula Meneses. 2007. "Introduction: Opening Up the Canon of Knowledge and Recognition of Difference" in *Another Knowledge is Possible: Beyond Northern Epistemologies*, edited by Boaventura de Sousa Santos, pp. xvivx-lxii.
- Sprague, Joey. 2005. *Feminist methodologies for critical researchers: bridging differences*. Walnut Creek, CA: Lanham, MD.

- Stanfield II, John H. 2011. *Black Reflective Sociology: Epistemology, Theory, and Methodology*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Stone, Pamela. 1996. "Ghettoized and Marginalized: The Coverage of Racial and Ethnic Groups in Introductory Textbooks." *Teaching Sociology* 24(4):356-363.
- Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. 1995. *Silencing the past: power and the production of history*. Boston, Mass: Beacon Press.
- Wagenaar, Theodore C. 2004. "Is there a Core in Sociology? Results from a Survey." *Teaching Sociology* 32(1):1-18.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2007. "The Culture of Sociology in Disarray: The Impact of 1968 on U.S. Sociologists," In Craig Calhoun (ed.), *Sociology in America A History*: pp. 427-437. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Weakliem, David L., Gordon Gauchat and R.E. Bradley. 2011. "Sociological Stratification: Change and Continuity in the Distribution of Departmental Prestige, 1965–2007." DOI 10.1007/s12108-011-9133-2.
- Weeber, Stan. 2006. *Sociology of Sociology: How the Discipline is Being Taught Today*. Lewiston, N.Y.: The Edwin Mellen Press.
- Zuberi, Tukufu and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva. 2008. *White Logic, White Methods: Racism and Methodology*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Zuberi, Tukufu and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva. 2008. "Telling the Real Tale of the Hunt: Toward a Race Conscious Sociology of Racial Stratification." Pp. 329-341 in *White Methods, White Logic: Racism and Methodology*, edited by Tukufu Zuberi and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Zerubavel, Eviatar. 1997. *Social Mindscapes: An Invitation to Cognitive Sociology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Table 1: Top-20 U.S. Sociology Department, Per Burris (2004) sample.

Rank	PhD-granting Sociology Department
1	Wisconsin
2	Chicago
3	Michigan
4	UC Berkeley
5	Harvard
6	Columbia
7	Stanford
8	North Carolina
9	Indiana
10	Washington
11	Yale
12	Texas
13	Pennsylvania
14	Northwestern
15	Cornell
16	Princeton
17	Minnesota
18	Ohio State
19	Duke
20	Johns Hopkins

Appendix 1: Interview Protocol for Faculty that Study Race at the Top-20 U.S. Sociology Departments

- 1) Tell me about your current research projects
- 2) Describe your personal and/or professional lived experiences which led you to study race in academia.
- 3) Describe what it has been like studying race in academia, particularly in a prestigious department?

Chapter 4: The Reproduction of Race in American Sociology: Ph.D. Candidate Reflections

I. Introduction

This paper explores American Sociology's contemporary reproduction of institutionalized knowledge and how race structures that process through the situated knowledges of graduate students studying at prestigious U.S. sociology departments. In order to explore the knowledge reproduction process and to understand the reproduction of race therein, this paper utilizes structured interviews with Ph.D. candidates studying at top-20 U.S. sociology departments. As such, this paper 1) critically utilizes the sociology of knowledge to conceptualize American Sociology as an “institutional-structure” of Western formal education, 2) theoretically conceptualizes racialized power-relations of knowledge as part of the “global politics of knowledge,” 3) reviews literature on how racialized power-relations of knowledge shape American Sociology’s institutional-structure, and 4) methodologically analyzes structured interviews with Ph.D. candidates studying at the top-20 U.S. sociology departments from a critical race, feminist standpoint in order to understand American Sociology’s contemporary institutionalized knowledge reproduction process, and specifically the reproduction of the sociological concept of race, as the reproduction of racialized structural inequalities of knowledge.

II. Literature Review

Cognitive Style, Institutionalized Knowledge, and Organized Education

Knowledge is a socio-historical process of meaning-making that is cultivated within political-economic processes by human groups; a cultural process that is both subjective and objective (Bourdieu 1977; Du Bois 1933; Pascal 2011; Stanfield 2011a). Epistemology is the study of knowledge, which can be divided into a trifecta of the

knower, the known, and the process of knowing (Sprague 2005). For Feminist standpoint theorists, the role of power in the social process of knowing is particularly important; as Feminist standpoint methodology explores how power-relations affect “who is [seen] a legitimate creator of knowledge and what kind of knowledge is created” (Sprague 2005:53).

Human groups “facilitate ways of ‘seeing’ and ‘knowing’ our social [and natural] world[s that] construct” how groups *think* about social reality; a social mechanism Stanfield (2011:20) conceptualizes as “cognitive style.” Cognitive styles are cultural representations of human groups that are read in cultural scripts of thought communities (Zerubavel 1997). Thought communities practice “cognitive socialization,” or socializes members into particular ways of thinking/knowing that “allow us to enter [the thought community’s] social, intersubjective world” (Zerubavel 1997:15). Cognitive socialization occurs at both primary (i.e. the family) and secondary levels (i.e. specialized professions) (Zerubavel 1997). Through cognitive socialization, thought communities reproduce “cognitive norms” that 1) “affect and constrain ways of thinking,” 2) determine mental and moral horizons, and 3) reinforce aspects of social reality as relevant and irrelevant (Zerubavel 1997). For example, thought communities, through cognitive socialization, reproduce institutional “mental horizons” that “[clos[e] [thought community members’] minds” and, as such, re-enforce a process of “moral focusing” that, as Zerubavel (1997:39) says, “focus[es] on the ‘figure’ but not the ‘ground.’ The practice of moral focusing, reinforced by mental horizons, in practice “decontextualizes the perception” (Zerubavel 1997:39). Making certain knowledges of social reality relevant

and irrelevant, reproducing mental horizons and moral focusing, are social acts of power (Zerubavel 1997).

Simply put, institutions socialize members into roles and ways of thinking and acting, that, “by the very fact of their existence, control human conduct by setting up pre-defined patterns of conduct” (Berger and Luckman 1966:393). In order to fully understand the “figure” of institutions, it is imperative to understand the “ground” of the “historical process in which [institutions were] produced;” meaning that history contextualizes our perception of institutions (Berger and Luckman 1966:389). As a vestige of colonialism, knowledge in our contemporary social world is relationally dichotomized into Western and Indigenous “cognitive styles” that are institutionalized as Western Education and Indigenous Knowledge(s). Knowledge of Western Education is compartmentalized into formal education (i.e. schooling), informal education (i.e. deliberate learning occasions) and non-formal education (i.e. lived experiences); where schooling, formal education, requires political-economic funding (Abdi 2005; Stanfield 2011a). Knowledge compartmentalized into formal education is classified in various “subjects” (i.e. sociology, history, and psychology) that are then institutionalized into “disciplinary boundaries” (Fuller 1993). Disciplinary boundaries segregate social knowledge and reinforce institutionally dominant paradigms as *the* “valid” assumptions, rules, practices, and behaviors for creating knowledge (Kuhn 1970). That valid path, or the dominant paradigm is the discipline’s “thought style” (Fuller 1993). So, for example, knowledge classified as sociology is institutionalized into a bounded “thought style” that disciplines the “valid” creation of sociological knowledge as “value-free” and “objective” science. However, to be sure, disciplinary boundaries are fluid; in motion, they are both

maintained and revolutionized (Fuller 1993). Gatekeepers of institutionalized knowledge, those with institutional power, maintain disciplinary boundaries through the dissemination of knowledge, making certain knowledge relevant and irrelevant, as well as reproducing mental and moral horizons (Zerubavel 1997; Rabaka 2010).

Critical theorists argue organized education reproduces dominant power-relations. The institutionalization and organization of knowledge requires political-economic power and as such institutionalized knowledge reflects the cultural knowledge of “ruling classes and elite members of dominant groups” (Stanfield 2011a:33). In Bourdieu’s (1974:446&448) analysis, institutions reproduce through the practice of habitus, which “ensures the active presence past experiences, deposited...in the form of schemes of perception, thought, and action” that socializes knower’s into embodying dominant power-relations and “functions as accumulated capital.” Just as Bourdieu (1974: Xx) stated, “the dialectic between habitus and institutions” is particularly important to understanding power-relations.

In the case of specialized professions that are secondary thought communities, “cognitive socialization” is read in cultural scripts of professionalization. Professionalization is the process in which thought communities of a specialized professions socialize their members into knowing and being in/of the profession/thought community (both thought and action) (Margolis and Romero 1998). So, for example, the institutional thought community of American Sociology actively disciplines, and cognitively socializes knower’s, that sociology’s “valid” knowledge is “objective” and “value-free;” where the habitus of thinking and acting “objective” and “value-free” functions as accumulated capital for sociologists. However a critical gaze sociologically

imagines how objectivity and value-free knowledges and practices reproduce dominant power-relations of knowledge; both in theory and practice.

Institutionalized knowledge of Western formal education is organized into primary, secondary, and higher education schools and universities. The socio-historical political-economic process of organizing institutionalized knowledge into universities of higher education has resulted in the structuring of universities and departments by prestige; meaning institutionalized and organized knowledges are “institutional-structures” (Stanfield 2011a; Wallenstein 2007). American Sociology, for example, is institutionalized knowledge that is structured by departmental prestige in universities of higher education, where the top-20 U.S. sociology departments enact social closure and have disciplinary power (Burris 2004; Lenski 1966; Weakliem et al 2001).

Within the sociology of higher education, scholars sociologically analyze academic professions and thought communities, social inequality in higher education, as well as educational policies practices and outcomes (Gumpert 2007; McDonough 2007). While the sociology of higher education is a growing subfield, scholars emphasize that the sociology of knowledge is “among lines of inquiry that for some time have been underdeveloped in the field” (Clark 2007:349). Specifically, Clark (2007:350) explains that “placing knowledge at the center of higher education is a significant conceptual departure from most social science frameworks used in the study of higher education” where “some categories are so embedded in our cognitive constructs that they go unnoticed, and yet their continuity and the processes whereby they change are eminently worthy of study.”

In total, knowledge is a social product of the knower, the known and the process of knowing, that is also institutionalized, organized, disciplined, and structured. An example of which is the “institutional-structure” of American Sociology. However, just as Berger and Luckmann (1966) argued, historicizing institutions is particularly important to understanding institutions; therefore in order to fully understand the figure of American Sociology’s institutionalized knowledge reproduction process, we must historically ground the discipline within the colonial, capitalist world-system and theoretically contextualize racialized power-relations of the “Global Politics of Knowledge” (Bhabra 2014a)

The Global Politics of Knowledge and Racialized Power-Relations

In order to explore American Sociology’s contemporary reproduction of knowledge nad how race structures that process, American Sociology’s institutional-structure must be grounded within the history of the colonial, capitalist world-system and theoretically contextualized within racialized power-relations of the Global Politics of Knowledge. Therefore, this section historicizes the colonial, capitalist world-system, theorizes the global politics of knowledge as reflexive of the political-economic structure, and theoretically contextualizes racialized power-relations.

The political-economic colonial, capitalist world-system alienates human groups where Western nation-states and Bourgeoisie exploit Indigenous-- periphery -- nations, lands, and peoples in order to accumulate private property and wealth (Wallerstein, 2004). Though colonialism has ended, the vestiges of colonialism’s power-relations remain embedded in the political-economic capitalist world-system, or colonality, that “define(s) culture, labour, intersubjective relations, and knowledge production”

(Maldonad-Torres 2007:243 cited in Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2013:38). Just as Marx (2008) theorized that the structure is the superstructure, the political-economic structure of the capitalist world-system and continued coloniaity is reflected in the superstructure of knowledge that is conceptualized as the “global politics of knowledge” (Marx in Grusky 2008; Bhambra 2014)

The global politics of knowledge globally situates and sociologically imagines the role of knowledge, power and coloniaity (Bhambra 2014a; de Sousa Santos et. al. 2007). The colonial, capitalist world-system superstructures a “coloniaity of knowledge” that reflects of the “coloniaity of power;” where power is garnered through the ownership of political-economic forces (de Sousa Santos 2014; Kaba 2007; de Sousa Santos et. al. 2007). Reflecting the coloniaity of [political-economic] power, the coloniaity of knowledge is the Eurocentric monopolization of knowledge that reproduces monocultural, and ethnocentric, ways of knowing and being in our social and natural worlds (de Sousa Santos et. al. 2007). The coloniaity of knowledge denies and invalidates Indigenous and colonized peoples’ knowledges’, a process that dehumanizes and alienates human groups (Smith 2012; de Sousa Santos et. al. 2007; Stanfield 2011). However, in order to fully understand the global politics of knowledge it is imperative to theoretically conceptualize racialized power-relations and explore how racialized power-relations structure the superstructure of knowledge.

The colonial, capitalist world-system was an explicitly racialized system that cultivated race, racialized human groups, and that has real consequences for our social world and human groups today. Analytically, race is a 1) social structure of white supremacy that 2) relationally structures human relations and 3) that is read in cultural

scripts as cultural representations (Glenn 1999; Bonilla-Silva 1997). The social structure of race as white supremacy is historically rooted in the colonial, capitalist world-system, is saliently centered on political-economic power and exploitation that invisibly privileges the property of whiteness and oppresses people of color through racism (Memmi 1965; Mills 1997). To be sure, whiteness is “not a color but a set of power-relations” that emerges from a “system of dominance” that acts as “institutionalized privilege” (Mills 1997:127; Dei 2000:29).

The historical development of the colonial, capitalist world-system, in praxis, enacts relationality, or what Fanon (1965:44, 45) conceptualized as the Manichaen Structure” (Glenn1999). Fanon (1965:44, 45) argued that colonialism (today colonality) enforces a “Manichaen Structure” that dichotomizes social reality into perpetual conflict of being and having. As such, social reality is created as a binary, where one needs the other to exist. So, for example, Black/white, woman/man, colonized/colonizer, etc. This relationality enforced through colonality is so salient that human groups “are interconnected, even without face to face” interactions (Glenn 1999:9). The social structure of white supremacy, cultivated from the ground of the colonial capitalist world-system, organizes human groups into propertied relationships of being and having whiteness.

The relational social structure of race as white supremacy manifests as cultural representations, or “symbols, language, and images meant to express and convey meanings of race” (Bonilla-Silva 2014; Glenn 1999:9). As such, race, as a cultural representation can be read in cultural scripts that include language, “institutionalized rituals, written history, school curricula, [and] mass media” (Blauner 1972:31; Moore

2007). Reading racialized cultural representations in cultural scripts of institutionalized knowledge allows for an analysis of the social structure of white supremacy, the dialectic between structure and action; the reproduction of racialized power-relations of knowledge (Collins 2007; Du Bois 1935; Wright II 2012;).

Sociology of education literature reveals that schools reproduced racialized inequality are reproduced in a myriad of ways that includes tracking, disciplining patterns, and microaggressions of whiteness (Margolis and Romero [1998]2000; Oakes 1985; Skiba et. al. 2002; Yosso, Smith, Ceja et. al 2009). More specifically, scholars have investigated how race structures school knowledge by exploring the concept of race and gender in textbooks, the (mis)representation of people of color in textbooks, as well as the reproduction of racialized and colonized knowledge in research methods (Hordge-Freeman, Mayorga, and Bonilla-Silva 2011; Marks 2008; Morning 2008; Smith 2012; Stone 1996). Being that the institutionalization of knowledge is a historical process, scholars have explored the ways in which race and gender structure the institutionalization of knowledge, institutional historical memory, and the history of racialized segregation of knowledge (Rabaka 2010; Stanfield, II 2011a). While sociology of education explores social inequality in education through a variety of avenues, scholars illuminate the need for studies on the reproduction of social inequalities specifically in higher education through “professional socialization” processes of learning and knowledge reproduction (Gumpert 2007:358). Specifically, there exists a gap in the sociology of education literature on how socialization processes of knowledge reproduction within graduate departments, or professionalization, reproduce racialized social inequalities (Gumpert 2007:358; Margolis and Romero [1998]2000).

American Sociology and Racialized Power-Relations of Knowledge

American Sociology is an “institutional-structure;” a historic product of the colonial capitalist world-system that reflects the “Global Politics of Knowledge” and embodies cultivated racialized power-relations. Situating the figure of American Sociology’s institutionalized knowledge on the ground of the historical development of the colonial, capitalist world-system and contextualized as part of the “Global Politics of Knowledge,” makes visible how racialized power-relations of knowledge structures American Sociology. This section explores literature on how racialized power-relations structure American Sociology including the discipline’s historical memory, the racialized segregation of knowledge, the racial structure of American Sociology’s epistemology that includes both theory and methods, as well as the representation of race and people of color in the discipline.

Since the institutional-structure of American Sociology is grounded within a racialized history, race structures American Sociology’s institutional historical memory (Rabaka 2010; Wright II 2002a; Wright II 2002b; Wright II 2012a). Rabaka (2010) argues that sociology enacts epistemic violence and epistemic apartheid; where epistemic apartheid is the:

the processes of institutional racism or rather academic racial colonization and conceptual quarantining of knowledge, anti-imperial thought, and/or radical political praxis produced and presented by non-white –especially Black—intellectual activists.

It is epistemic apartheid that Rabaka (2010) argues results in historical amnesia, whereby whiteness propertied knowledge is privileged as remembered and non-whiteness propertied knowledge is forgotten. For example, sociologists study the role of racialized

power-relations and American Sociology's institutionalized historical amnesia of W.E.B. Du Bois and the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory (Rabaka 2010:22; Wright II 2002a; Wright II 2002b; Wright II 2009; Wright II 2012a; Wright II 2012b).

Recent scholarship explores the various ways in which racialized power-relations structure American Sociology's epistemology that includes theory and methods. Bonilla-Silva and Zuberi (2008:17) articulate that white supremacy epistemologically structures American Sociology, where "white logic" defines "the techniques and processes of reasoning about social facts" (Bonilla-Silva and Zuberi 2008:17). "White logic" reproduces monocultural, Eurocentric knowledge and ethnocentric ways of knowing that "is not objective" (Zuberi and Bonilla-Silva 2008:332). With white logic, "white methods" are employed to "manufacture empirical data and analysis [that]...support the racial stratification of society" (Bonilla-Silva and Zuberi 2008:18; Stanfield 2011). Together "white logic" and "white methods" are a process of knowing and doing sociology that "create[s] racial knowledge," reproduces racialized structural inequalities of knowledge, and enacts institutionalized racism (Zuberi and Bonilla-Silva 2008:17).

Scholars have also explored the way in which race and racialized groups are represented in the teaching and learning of American Sociology. Scholars have explored the ways in which race and racialized groups are "ghettoized and marginalized" into chapters on "race" in introductory textbooks, ethnic women are excluded from introductory textbooks, and discussions of people of color emphasize disadvantage (Stone 1996:361; Marquez 1994).

Scholars argue that American Sociology needs to "urgently address its own knowledge claims in light of hierarchies and exclusions" and critically explore the

“treatment of race in the curriculum and validation of paradigms as “mainstream;” especially within professionalization processes of higher education (Bhambra 2014a:454; Margolis and Romero 1998:1306). Bhambra (2014b:477) noted that currently there is limited “discussion of the way that race structures and continues to structure the sociological enterprise,” particularly in the United States; and instead the discipline continues to segregate race “as a topic within sociology.” This study explores American Sociology’s contemporary reproduction of knowledge within the sociology departments of higher education and how race structures that process. Therefore this study analyzes thirty one (31) interviews with Ph.D. candidates about the sociology graduate school learning process and the reproduction of race theory in the process.

III. Methods

This study explores American Sociology’s contemporary social and cultural reproduction of institutionalized knowledge, as well as how race structures this process. In order to do so, this study utilizes qualitative data that includes semi-structured interviews with Ph.D. candidates studying at the top-20 U.S. sociology departments. Recent literature demonstrates that American Sociology is both institutionalized knowledge and structured departments of prestige, or an “institutional-structure” (Wallerstein 2007). Prestige structures American Sociology such that the top-20 U.S. sociology departments enact social closure and thus represent an element of power within the reproduction of institutionalized knowledge (Burris 2004; Lenski 1966; Weeber 2006; Weakliem et al 2011).

In order to recruit Ph.D. candidates at the top-20 U.S. sociology departments, I emailed the department to ask that my call for participation be sent to their graduate students via the graduate student listersev. Some departments never responded to the

inquiry, some departments would not send the call for participation over their listserv, and some departments passed the call for participation along to the graduate student listservs. In all, the sample includes a total of thirty one (31) Ph.D. candidates, representing nine (9) of the top-20 departments (45%). Pseudonyms were created using names from the American Sociological Association's publication, the *Centennial Bibliography on the History of American Sociology*. Nine Ph.D. candidate represented one department, six participants represented another department, five represented another department, one department had three participants, three departments had two participants each, and lastly, two departments had one participant. The sample of thirty one (1) Ph.D. candidates includes eighteen (18) women and thirteen (13) men. The participants had been learning sociology in their respective departments for between three and nine years, respectively, however six years was the participants' average time learning at their respective departments. Of the thirty one (31) interviewees, fifteen (15) participants, or 48%, majored in sociology for their undergraduate degree, nine (9) participants, or 29%, majored in disciplines other than sociology for their undergraduate degrees, three (3) participants, or 10%, majored in discipline other than sociology but minored in sociology in undergraduate school, and four (4) participants, or 13%, came to sociology graduate school after earning a non-sociology graduate degree. Twelve (12) participants, or 39%, were in the workforce for at least one year before entering graduate school. The participants were interviewed between September and November 2012 over the phone and using Skype. The interviews were audio-recorded and then transcribed. To maintain participant confidentiality, the specific departments represented will not be identified, however the Ph.D. candidates study at the top-20 U.S. sociology departments.

As such, their collective experiences reflect the contemporary reproduction of American Sociology's institutionalized knowledge at prestigious U.S. sociology departments that through social closure practices maintain disciplinary power. Theoretically, the knowledge reproduction process at the top-20 U.S. sociology departments, with their disciplinary power garnered through social closure, is representative of the knowledge reproduction process of the discipline of sociology.

This study utilizes critical race and Feminist standpoint methodological approaches to analyze interviews with Ph.D. candidates in order to both understand the process of knowledge production and how race theory is encountered in American Sociology's professionalization process. Critical race theory "approaches to education...[center on] the intersection of race and property;" where institutionalized knowledge is "a form of intellectual property" and the "construction of whiteness [is] the ultimate property" that intersect to form cultural capital of whiteness and institutionalized knowledge (Ladson-Billings and Tate 1994:54&58; Harris 1993). Pillow (2003:183) furthers that race-based methodologies "contribute to a decentralization of Eurocentric thought" that theoretically allows for an analysis of racialized power-relations of knowledge.

For Feminist standpoint theorists the process of knowing is an important part of the interconnected triad of epistemology (Sprague and Kobrynowicz 1999; Sprague 2005:31). Standpoint theory illustrates that "standpoint structures epistemology" (Hartsock 2004). Feminist standpoint theory is methodologically employed to "understand patriarchal institutions and ideologies as perverse inversions of more human social relations;" rather a tool to analyze power-relations in institutions and ideologies of

knowledge (Hartsock 2004:36). For example, utilizing standpoint methodologies within disciplines, as Harding (2004:12) explains,

is a crucial task since a main objective of standpoint theory and research is precisely to map the conceptual practices through which particular institutions, such as disciplines, serve oppressive forms of power.

Ph.D. candidates at the top-20 U.S. sociology departments 1) provide important insight into American Sociology's contemporary process of knowledge reproduction since they are being cognitively socialized and professionalized into American Sociology and 2) have situated knowledge of this process within prestigious departments. A couple of analytic techniques were used to break down the data garnered from the Ph.D. candidates' interviews. The interviews were coded for emerging themes based on the specific questions asked. Once those themes were identified, the interviews were them coded to see if those themes emerged from the interviews overall.

IV. Analysis

Utilizing the various analytic techniques described above, the thirty one (31) participants' interviewed were coded to understand the knowledge reproduction process, how race theory is reproduced, what can be done to augment the understanding of race theory at the top-20 U.S. sociology departments.

Learning Process in Prestigious Sociology Graduate Departments

According to the participants, the process of learning at the top-20 U.S. sociology departments includes coursework, but more profoundly occurs through informal learning opportunities that include colloquia, seminars, and workshops put on by the sociology department and various centers either within the department or the university more broadly. Participation in these informal learning opportunities is not required, unless graduate students are funded through the various centers or workshops. However,

attendance is encouraged and represents an important aspect of graduate students' professionalization. Twelve (12) participants from six (6) departments discussed the importance of funding, including the ability of their departments to provide five years of funding, as well as the accessibility of funding through various Centers and workshops associated with the department and university.

Eighteen (18) participants from all nine (9) departments discussed that through the entire process of their graduate program they learn, or are professionalized, to become independent scholars. Joyce illustrated,

[Being independent] is one of the things that I have been taught, certainly not in a class but through this whole process. If someone asked me what would it take to be a PhD student at this department...I would say you have to do independent work...if you don't know something you have to find out.

Leta explained,

Our program requires that you write two papers on your own before your generals in order to get your masters...That is sculpting us to be independent scholars and being productive is a key goal of our program.

Stanley discussed,

So the transition that is difficult for a lot of students is moving from somebody's project to coming up with their own dissertation topic. And so some of our students feel like that is a difficult transition because you really have to move from being a research assistant to being an independent scholar...The faculty support you from behind, but the faculty do not tell you what you need to be studying. And that for a lot of people is where they tend to slow down.

Four (4) of the eighteen (18) participants related the independent process of learning to other disciplines that utilize an apprenticeship model, but distinguished this process within sociology based on methods. For example, Perry discussed,

Some schools...offer more of shop model, especially if you are more quantitatively oriented where you join a certain professors research project...In part because [my work] was qualitative...it seemed to be very much up to me to kind of chart my own direction and find out what I was interested in.

To illustrate this process of learning and becoming an independent scholar, seven (7) graduate students discussed that their respective department have few required courses.

Henry stated, “I guess my point is, because they don’t take classes very seriously, they figure you are going to learn it while you are researching it, which is fairly true actually.” Ultimately, learning is not centered on required courses, but instead encouraged through in the process of research, colloquia, workshops, and seminars.

In discussing the professionalization process, ten (10) participants discussed that professionalization includes required knowledge of quantitative methods, however not qualitative methods. For example, Florence emphasized,

There is definitely a ranking where qualitative research is not considered to be as serious or as sexy or something as quantitative research...and I think that it’s true of the sociology.

And Charlotte reaffirmed that in her department,

[They] want you to be literate in quant methods, there is not the same thing for qual. There is almost like this sort of, well qual methods are easy to understand so you don’t have to take a class on that...[Laughs]...Quant methods are hard and you need to become literate in that.

Another aspect of professionalization in the top-20 departments is the push for publication and the importance of becoming a producer of knowledge, as opposed to just a consumer of knowledge. Sixteen (16) participants discussed that their department encourages graduate students to publish and the same number of participants explained that the need to publish in order to do well on the job market is taken-for-granted knowledge in their respective departments. Fifteen (15) participants discussed the role of collaborating with faculty as a means of learning the publication process and their own experiences doing so.

Learning Race and Race Theory

The participants were asked, “In what ways have you learned about race in grad school?” Twenty five (25) participants from all nine (9) departments represented discussed that they did not learn the concept of race in their departments’ required theory course(s). As Lucile reflected,

In graduate school....it's certainly not mandatory. I think that is mostly because our social theory class, like our required social theory class our first year, just does not require it [race theory].

However five (5) participants from three (3) different departments stated they did learn the concept of race in their departments' required theory course(s); meaning three departments had some Ph.D. candidates who learned about the concept of race in their required theory course(s) and some Ph.D. candidates who did not. This may be explained by the fact that these Ph.D. candidates were of different cohorts and that the required theory course syllabus is particular to the faculty member teaching it. One participant did not discuss learning race in required courses.

Seven (7) participants reflected on the sociology curricula as reproducing whiteness. For example, Lucile illustrated,

I always remember when I took my social theory course in undergrad, my professor, who was a graduate student at the time, was like, "so I included Du Bois in here in the syllabus, but that is really rare for a social theory course." And I didn't really think anything of it until I went to grad school and realized, yea it is really rare for a social theory course to have prolific African American authors being studied because mostly all we do is study old white guys who are dead, or lived in Germany, or in England.

Charlotte also reflected on sociology's curricula whiteness,

I can't help but think when I was taking that Race and Ethnic Studies class, that it is curious that the people who were developing these theories were white men, you know and privileged white men. Not to say that their contributions weren't valid, but thinking about race has definitely been influenced by their work, thinking about race in sociology, and in terms of my department in sociology has definitely been influenced by that kind of work.

Twenty seven (27) participants representing all nine (9) departments reflected that they did not systematically learn race theory in their graduate sociology department. Joyce discussed,

The departmental strength have not historically been in race studies [but] race now is more of a component...So I don't know anything. And [race] has been instrumental to my own research...but I haven't learned about race systematically in my graduate career.

However, twenty one (21) participants from seven (7) departments discussed that race comes up in sociology classes. Annie stated, "I do think that people in sociology are very cognizant of race and racial inequality and it is certainly something that is fairly openly discussed in courses" and George confirmed, "In sociology, at least every class had a book on race in it." Florence furthered,

So I would say that most of the classes I have taken have gone over it a little bit. Like the inequality class had some articles that were about segregation and differences in incarceration rates, that kind of thing."

Lastly Perry described how race comes up in methods classes,

When I'm learning statistics or something like that it is often the example that is used; you know, thinking about race, how do we categorize race, how do people categorize themselves, are we going to use it to analyze things. It's a variable you have to consider.

With regards to learning race theory, eleven (11) participants discussed their independent learning of race theory, including two (2) participants that discussed this independent process of learning in relation to their qualifying exams and four (4) participants that discussed it in relation to graduate student organized reading groups. For example, Ida discussed the process of learning race through independent graduate reading groups:

Students...created their own reading group, and this was a various racial background group, not just like oh the Black students trying to get together, but just students in general from our department who couldn't understand why this type of literature wasn't being discussed and to try and figure out a way to incorporate it in our learning.

Eleven (11) participants discussed learning the concept of race through their own teaching experiences. Stanley illustrated that while there was no systematic learning of race through coursework, TA'ing offered such an opportunity;

when I then had to teach [race] as a TA leading a section in our intro to sociology course for freshman, and I had to teach others, what does it mean when we say the social construction of race, that provided an opportunity for me to rethink how I approach that topic and how I would communicate it to somebody who is really sort of a novice in the field.

Ten (10) participants discussed learning race through dialogue with colleagues, where seven (7) participants specified non-classroom dialogue and relationships with graduate students as a means of learning about race. Eight (8) participants discussed learning race through attending various workshops and colloquia within the university. Lastly, eight (8) participants discussed learning race theory in undergrad as opposed to graduate school. Mabel stated “I had more rigorous theoretical training in my undergraduate. I learned theory as an undergraduate and it was harder than my theory course here” and Lucile confirmed “I had more race theory in the theory course I took as an undergrad.” Wilbur furthered,

I would say I probably got a better background in race from my undergraduate theory courses where we actually read W.E.B. Du Bois and, you know, that was probably the only time I ever read Du Bois.

Sixteen (16) participants representing seven (7) departments discussed the fact there is little to no discussion of race theory, or the conceptualization of race, in their respective departments. Ruth explained,

So I think in our department thinking about race doesn't happen so much as, here let's have these conversations about race, I think it's more the way race plays out in employment...hiring...incarceration...education. So I think race as a category is less focused on than sort of how race plays a role in these other social spheres that people have interest in...There are probably other theoretical ways that sociologists think about theory around race. And I think that happens less here.

Florence furthered,

I would say the vast majority of what we have talked about race in the class is not talking about race in a theoretical way, it's assuming...there are Black people, white people, like the commonsense American shorthand.

At the same time, twelve (12) participants discussed that in their departments race is learned empirically. Leta detailed "that my graduate training...allowed me to have a more empirical understanding of [race]. To expose [race] to the actual research that connects it to stratification." Seven (7) participants discussed how race is learned differently within the field of sociology based on method. Theresa reflected,

We talk in sociology about how, what does it mean to get African Americans in your sample, you know, things like that. And then a lot of the qualitative sociologists in my department talk about race in an alternatively different way...I think the concept of race in different subfields of sociology is interesting to me.

Wilbur furthered,

You can rely on census data [that] just kind of gives you these essentialized statistics...I think different sub-fields have kind of different approaches to how they field questions they raise...I have taken a lot of classes in health sociology they also pretty much just give you numbers...It's like African Americans have this characteristic and whites have this characteristic. It's not at all theorized.

Eight (8) participants discussed that the discussion around race in their departments' and the sociology field in general is problematic including reproducing commonsense knowledge about race and the atheoretical use of race. Wilbur described,

In the class on urban sociology that I took, it dealt a lot with race and the actual makeup of [the race concept] was not considered at all...It was just pretty much known there was Black people, there was white people. There was an argument about that.

Florence furthered,

I have talked about [sociology's problematic use of race] a little bit with the guy who is the most interested in race in this department...So sometimes I bring it up in class, well this is not an adequate way of using race when they did this

statistical analysis. I *think* people know what I mean, but I am not sure that they do, given that we have never had sort of a theoretical discussion about race in any of the required classes.

Mildred conveyed,

I was disappointed when I came here in sociology in general because I thought man these sociologists are supposed to believe that race is socially constructed and move beyond and they don't! So I think I understand sociology as being very trapped and limited right now...the field is not always as forward thinking as I had assumed it would be.

Nine (9) participants representing six (6) departments discussed that the graduate students want a more theoretical and systematic engagement with race. Ida described,

I think just in general, it's something that we, along with other students, caught on very quickly that [race] wasn't an area that is really talked about much in our department and it was really disturbing.

Gwendolyn affirmed, "I know there are students who want to learn more about race," while Perry suggested "There is a lot of interest [in race] certainly among the students, it is something that is talked about a lot."

In total, eighteen (18) participants stated that they understand race to be a central aspect of the field of sociology. Earle reflect on the centrality of race in the field and his own sociology graduate experience;

And so there is kind of a feeling of a fault structure in terms of if the grad program doesn't seem to be emphasizing [race] yet, I think on the whole, anyway, the field of sociology certainly recognizes it as an important part of the way that sociology has been done and it certainly is...very central...to the field.

The participants were also asked, "Is there anything that could have augmented your understanding or knowledge of race?" Fourteen (14) participants discussed the need for more formalized teaching and learning of race theory, including learning race in the required theory course and offering race courses. Gwendolyn illustrated,

I think that race could be better integrated into how other topics such as theory were taught. When I took theory here, we do not any readings by women. We did not do any readings by W.E.B. Du Bois. And so I think that many things they could have non-controversially been incorporated into our curricula that would have increased our understanding were eliminated.

Wilbur further discussed,

There is a lot that can be done. [The theory class]...is probably the best place to go because that is the class that everyone has to take... It's kind of difficult because you can't really mandate what people teach in a theory class, or it might not be such a good idea, but I think that it would be a good idea. It would have been in a place where I would have read [about race] naturally. Because maybe it wasn't an issue that has come up that much in my work.

Andrew discussed the need for offering courses on race theory,

I would have loved to have a graduate seminar on race alone...I am sure that at larger departments there's a more wider variety of courses, but I think that is one of the gaps, [not] having a seminar focused on race theory...

Henry states that "They probably should have had a required course on [race]...I think there are just some core concepts that probably everybody should have to take."

At the same time four (4) participants specifically discussed the need for more dialogue around race theory in their respective departments. Florence affirmed a more formalized dialogue around race in the curricula would be beneficial, stating, "But it definitely seems to me that [race] could be talked about more in a serious way than it is, you know. We know the Black people and white people part, that kind of thing." At the same time, six (6) participants stated there was nothing that could be done to augment their understanding of race. Stanley explained,

I think it's pretty sufficient. The metric that I would use to say its sufficient is, if I got a job somewhere and they asked me to teach a course on race...I would feel fully confident saying that I can teach a course on [race]...Most of our students bill themselves that way...that...because of their education research...they can teach courses on gender, race, and class. So yea, I would say that there isn't much that I would need to augment. But you know, you always have to prepare for a class.

Ultimately, incorporating race theory into required courses, or requiring race theory, and offering race theory courses was the major theme that emerged from the Ph.D. candidates' discussion of how to augment the learning of race in their departments. At the same time, incorporating race theory into the curricula as a more formalized way of learning about race would also increase departments' critical dialogue around race theory, which some of the Ph.D. candidates specifically identified as important.

V. Discussion

In all this paper sought to explore American Sociology's contemporary process of knowledge reproduction and how race structures that process. American Sociology is an institutional-structure of both institutionalized knowledge and structured prestige, therefore this study methodically interviewed Ph.D. candidates from the top-20 U.S. sociology departments in order to gain insight into this process of knowledge reproduction. The Ph.D. candidates revealed that the process of learning in the top-20 sociology departments I geared toward developing, or professionalizing, graduate students to become independent scholars. In that case learning occurs less in formal settings such as courses, and more in informal settings such as workshops, colloquia, and seminars.

A majority of the participants, twenty seven (27) out of thirty one (31) participants from all nine (9) departments, revealed that their graduate training consisted of no systematic learning of race theory and sixteen (16) participants from seven (7) departments illustrated there is no discussion of race theory in their respective departments. In this sense, American Sociology cognitively socializes sociologists to not see race theory, a cognitive norm that "affect[s] and constrain[s] ways of thinking" about race. Instead, American Sociology makes race theory irrelevant, a "social act" of power

that consequently privileges institutionalized whiteness, illustrates racialized power-relations of knowledge, and ultimately reproduces racialized structural inequalities of knowledge, that in total shapes how sociologists see and know our social reality. Just as Zerubavel (1997:39) argued that cognitive socialization creates “mental horizons” that “clos[e] our minds” and reproduces a process of “moral focusing [that] focus[es] on the ‘figure’ but not the ‘ground,’” or instead “decontextualizes...perception,” American Sociology’s cognitive socialization does the same around race. Twenty one (21) participants stated that race comes up in their learning, whether in various classes or seminars and eighteen (18) participants vocalized that race is a central part of the field of sociology. At the same time, twelve (12) participants emphasized that their departments reproduce an empirical learning of race with little race theory dialogue. As such, American Sociology cognitively socializes sociologists’ to see the empirical “figure” of race but not the theoretical “ground” of race, which decontextualizes our understanding of race and our social world. This process was essentially discussed by the eight (8) participants who emphasized that the discussion around race was problematic in that it reproduces atheoretical understandings of race and sustains an American commonsense knowledge of race. In reality, the entire process of making race theory irrelevant, reproducing atheoretical discussions of race illuminates the reproduction of racialized power-relations of knowledge and racialized structural inequalities of knowledge.

The findings from this exploration into the process of American Sociology’s knowledge reproduction were theoretically expected, but still very problematic. Various scholars have shown, whether it be through surveys or textbook analyses, that race is considered a central aspect of American Sociology, however, just as one of the

participants specifically voiced, the fact that graduate sociology students do not systematically learn race theory is extremely problematic. One could hypothesize that if sociology graduate students are not cognitively socialized to see and know race theory, then the habitus of sociology graduate students would be to produce knowledge that does not theorize race, in praxis reproduce “white logic” and “white methods.” An exploration of knowledge production by graduate students would determine if this hypothesis is true.

Appendix 1: Interview Protocol for PhD candidates

- 1) To start with, tell me about some of your reasons for wanting to study Sociology in grad school. [knowledge from lived experiences]
- 2) Having completed a few years of grad school, how does what you've learned frame or re-frame your understanding of your own social location? [visibility/invisibility of privilege]
- 3) In what ways have you learned about race in grad school? [institutional sources of knowledge]
 - a. Probe: Respondent may discuss diverse sources, such as coursework, prelims, brownbags, discussions with faculty and other students, etc., and will follow their lead on this.
- 4) How does this knowledge about race influence or inform your understanding of the discipline of sociology? [articulated racialized knowledge of discipline]
- 5) Describe the intellectual traditions or theoretical orientations of the faculty in your department. [institutional influences on knowledge (re)production]
- 6) Describe your theoretical orientation or the intellectual tradition you identify with. [process of production/reproduction when compared with question above]
 - a. Probe: If response differs from content in Q5, ask respondent: So your intellectual identity seems to differ from those of your faculty members. Can you tell me more about how you developed this orientation to your work or scholarly identity. [process of production vs reproduction]
- 7) Is there anything else you would like to tell me about the process of knowledge production you have experienced related to race in grad school?
 - a. Probe: Is there anything that could have augmented your understanding or knowledge of race? [what has been invisible]

References

- Abdi, Ali A. 2005. "African Philosophies of Education: Counter-Colonial Criticisms." Pp. 25-42 in *Issues in African Education: Sociological Perspectives* edited by A. Abdi and A. Cleghorn. New York: Palgrave MacMillian.
- Bhambra, Gurminder K. 2014a. "Introduction: Knowledge Production in Global Context: Power and Coloniality." *Current Sociology* 6(2):452-454.
- Bhambra, Gurminder K. 201b. "A Sociological Dilemma: Race, Segregation, and U.S. Sociology." *Current Sociology* 6(2): 474-486.
- Blauner, Robert. 1972. *Racial Oppression in America*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2010. *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism & Racial Inequality in Contemporary America*, 3rd Edition. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 1997. "Rethinking Racism: Towards a Structural Interpretation." *American Sociological Review* 62:465-480.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo and Tukufu Zuberi. 2008. "Toward a Definition of White Logic and White Methods." Pp. 3-30 in *White Logic, White Methods: Racism and Methodology*, edited by Tukufu Zuberi and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. "Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction." Pp. 487-511 in *Power and Ideology in Education*, edited by J. Karabel and A.H. Halsey. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Berger and Luckmann. 1966.
- Burris, Val. 2004. "The Academic Caste System: Prestige Hierarchies in PhD Exchange Networks." *American Sociological Review* 69:239-264.
- Clark, Burton R. 2007. "Development of the Sociology of Higher Education." Pp. 3-16 in *Sociology of Higher Education: Contributions and Their Contexts*, edited by Patricia J. Gumpert. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 2007. "Pushing the Boundaries or Business as Usual? Race, Class, and Gender Studies and Sociological Inquiry." Pp. 427-437 in *Sociology in America A History*, edited by Craig Calhoun. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Dei, George J Sefa. 2000. "Towards An Anti-Racism Discursive Framework." *Power, Knowledge, and Anti-Racism Education: A Critical Reader*, edited by George J Sefa Dei and Agnes Calliste. Halifax Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishers.
- Du Bois, W.E.B. 1935. *Black Reconstruction in America 1860-1880*. New York: Free Press.
- Fanon, Frantz. 1965. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press.
- Fuller, Steve. 1993. "Disciplinary Boundaries and the Rhetoric of the Social Sciences." Pp. 125-149 in *Knowledges: Historical and Critical Studies in Disciplinarity*, edited by Ellen Messer-Davidow, David R. Shumway, and David J Sylvan. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.
- Glenn, Evelyn Nakano. 1999. "The Social Construction and Institutionalization of Gender and Race." Pp. 3-43 in *Revisioning Gender*, edited by Mara Marx Ferree, Judith Lorber, and Beth B. Hess. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gumpert, Patricia J. 2007. "Reflections on a Hybrid Field: Growth and Prospects for the Sociology of Higher Education." Pp. 325-362 in *Sociology of Higher Education: Contributions and Their Contexts*, edited by Patricia J. Gumpert. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Harding, Sandra. 2004. "Introduction: Standpoint Theory as a Site of Political, Philosophic, and Scientific Debate." Pp. 1-16 in *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies*, edited by Sandra Harding. New York: Routledge.
- Harris, Cheryl I. 1993. "Whiteness as Property." *Harvard Law Review*. 106(8):1709–1795, 1710–1712.
- Hartsock, Nancy C.M. 2004. "The Feminist Standpoint: Developing the Ground for a Specifically Feminist Historical Materialism." Pp. 35-54 in *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies*, edited by Sandra Harding. New York: Routledge.
- Hodge-Freeman, Elizabeth, Sarah Mayorga, and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva. 2011. "Exposing Whiteness Because We Are Free: Emancipation Methodological Practice in Identifying and Challenging Racial Practices in Sociology Departments." Pp. 95-122 in *Rethinking Race and Ethnicity Research Methods*, edited by John Stanfield II. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Kaba, Lansine. 2007. "Historical Consciousness and Politics of Africa." Pp. 58-69 in *Africana Studies: Philosophical Perspectives and Theoretical Paradigms*, edited by Delores P. Aldridge and E. Lincoln James. Pullman, WA: Washington State University Press.

- Kuhn, Thomas S. 1970. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Ladson-Billings, Gloria J. and William F. Tate IV. 1994. "Toward a theory of Critical Race Theory in education." *Teachers College Record* 97:47–68.
- Lenski, Gerhard E. 1966. *Power and Privilege: a Theory of Social Stratification*. New York: McGraw-Hill, esp. chapters 3-4 and 10-13.
- Maldonad-Terres. 2007. “
- Margolis, Eric and Mary Romero. [1998]2000. "The Department is Very Male, Very White, Very Old, and Very Conservative': The Functioning of the Hidden Curriculum in Graduate Sociology Departments." Pp. 1276-1311 in *The Sociology of Education* Vol. III, edited by Stephen Ball. London: Routledge.
- Marks, Carole. 2008. "Methodologically Eliminating Race and Racism." Pp. 47-62 in *White Methods, White Logic: Racism and Methodology*, edited by Tukufu Zuberi and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva. New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Marquez, Stephanie Amedeo. 1994. "Distorting the Image of 'Hispanic' Women in Sociology. Problematic Strategies of Presentation in Introductory Textbooks." *Teaching Sociology* 22(3):231-236.
- Marx, Karl. 2008. "Ideology and Class." Pp 89-90 in *Social Stratification: Class, Race, and Gender in Sociological Perspective*, edited by D. B. Grusky. Philadelphia: Westview Press.
- McDonough, Patricia M. and Amy J. Fann. 2007. "The Study of Inequality." Pp. 53-93 in *Sociology of Higher Education: Contributions and Their Contexts*, ed. Patricia J. Gumpert. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Memmi, Albert. 1965. *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. New York: Orion Press.
- Mills, Charles. 1999. *The Racial Contract*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- Moore, Robert B. 2007. "Racist Stereotyping in the English Language." Pp. 365-376 in *Race, Class, and Gender: An Anthology*, edited by Margaret L. Andersen and Patricia Hill Collins. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.
- Morning, Ann. 2008. "Reconstructing Race in Science and Society: Biology Textbooks, 1952-2002." *American Journal of Sociology* 114(1):106-137.
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni. 2013. "Coloniality of Power in Postcolonial Africa: Myths of Decolonization." pp. 37-63.

- Oakes, Jeannie. 1985. *Keeping Track: How Schools Structure Inequality*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Pillow, Wanda. 2003. "Race-Based Methodologies: Multicultural Methods or Epistemological Shifts." Pp. 181-202 in *Interrogating Racism in Qualitative Research Methodology*, edited by Gerardo R. Lopez and Laurence Parker. New York: Peter Lang.
- Rabaka, Reiland. 2010. *Against Epistemic Apartheid: W.E.B. Du Bois and the Disciplinary Decadence of Sociology*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Skiba, Russell J., Robert S. Michael, Abra Caroll Nardo, and Reese L. Peterson. "The Color of Discipline: Sources of Racial and Gender Disproportionality in School Punishment." *Urban Review* 34(4):317-342.
- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 2012. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, 2nd Edition. New York: Zed Books.
- de Sousa Santos, Boaventura, João Arriscado Nunes, and Maria Paula Meneses. 2007. "Introduction: Opening Up the Canon of Knowledge and Recognition of Difference" in *Another Knowledge is Possible: Beyond Northern Epistemologies*, edited by Boaventura de Sousa Santos, pp. xvivx-lxii.
- Sprague, Joey. 2005. *Feminist Methodologies for Critical Researchers: Bridging Differences*. New York: AltaMira Press.
- Sprague, Joey and Diane Kobrynowicz. 1999. "A Feminist Epistemology." In *The Handbook of the Sociology of Gender*, edited by Janet Saltzman Chafetz. New York: Kluwer Academic/ Plenum Publishers.
- Stanfield II, John H. 2011a. *Black Reflective Sociology: Epistemology, Theory, and Methodology*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Stanfield II, John H. 2011b. *Rethinking Race and Ethnicity in Research Methods*, edited by John H. Stanfield. Walnut Creek, C.A.: Left Coast Press.
- Stone, Pamela. 1996. "Ghettoized and Marginalized: The Coverage of Racial and Ethnic Groups in Introductory Textbooks." *Teaching Sociology* 24(4):356-363.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2007. "The Culture of Sociology in Disarray: The Impact of 1968 on U.S. Sociologists," In Craig Calhoun (ed.), *Sociology in America A History*: pp. 427-437. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2004. *World-systems Analysis: An Introduction*. Durham: Duke University Press.

- Weakliem, David L., Gauchat, Gordon and Bradley R. E. Wright. 2011. "Sociological Stratification: Change and Continuity in the Distribution of Departmental Prestige, 1965–2007." DOI 10.1007/s12108-011-9133-2.
- Weeber, Stan. 2006. *Sociology of Sociology: How the Discipline is Being Taught Today*. Lewiston, N.Y.: The Edwin Mellen Press.
- Wright II, Earl. 2002a. "The Atlanta Sociological Laboratory 1896-1924: A Historical Account of the First American School of Sociology." *The Western Journal of Black Studies* 26(3):165-174.
- Wright II, Earl. 2009. "Beyond W.E.B. Du Bois: A Note on Some of the Little Known Members of the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory." *Sociological Spectrum* 29:6:700-717.
- Wright II, Earl. 2012a. "Using the Master's Tools: The Atlanta Sociological Laboratory and American Sociology, 1896-1924." *Sociological Spectrum* 22(1):15-39.
- Wright II, Earl. 2002b. "Why Black People Tend To Shout!: An Earnest Attempt To Explain the Sociological Negation of the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory Despite Its Possible Unpleasantness." *Sociological Spectrum* 22(3):325-361.
- Wright II, Earl. 2012b. "Why, Where, and How to Infuse the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory into the Sociology Curriculum." *Teaching Sociology* 40(3):257-270.
- Yosso, Tara J., William A. Smith, Miguel Seja, and Daniel G. Solórzano. 2009. "Critical Race Theory, Racial Microaggressions and Campus Racial Climate for Latina/o Undergraduates." *Harvard Educational Review* 79(4):659-690.
- Zerubavel, Eviatar. 1997. *Social Mindscapes: An Invitation to Cognitive Sociology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Chapter 5: American Sociology: Race, Gender, and the Production of Knowledge

Abstract: This study explores American Sociology's contemporary reproduction of knowledge and how race and gender structure that process. American Sociology is an "institutional-structure" of both institutionalized knowledge and structured departments of prestige (Wallerstein 2007). The top-20 U.S. sociology departments enact social closure through interdepartmental hiring and as such represent power within American Sociology (Burris 2004; Lenski 1966). Academic departments enact a professionalization process that serves to make knower's embody, and thereby reproduce, the discipline's hegemonic institutionalized knowledge. In order to explore how American Sociology contemporarily reproduces knowledge, as well as how race and gender structure that process, this study utilizes dissertations published in 2011 out of the top-20 U.S. sociology departments that are read as cultural representations of the reproduction of institutionalized knowledge, race, and gender. This study has implications for understanding racially gendered structural inequalities of knowledge, the sociology of sociology, and the practice of teaching sociology.

Keywords:

Knowledge reproduction, race, gender, epistemology, American Sociology

I. Introduction

The paper explores American Sociology's contemporary (re)production of sociological knowledge, as well as how race and gender structure that process. In order to do so, this paper 1) utilizes a sociology of knowledge perspective to situate American Sociology as an "institutional-structure" within Western "cognitive style," 2) theoretically frames race and gender as relational structures of white supremacy and patriarchy, respectively, that as cultural representations are read in the reproduction of knowledge, 3) illustrate the historical reproduction of racially gendered knowledge within American Sociology, and lastly 4) methodologically analyzes dissertations defended in 2011 at the top-20 U.S. sociology departments from a critical structuralist, feminist epistemological standpoint in order to understand American Sociology's contemporary knowledge reproduction and too the reproduction of racially gendered structural inequalities of knowledge.

II. Literature Review

Cognitive style, Institutionalized Knowledge, and Structured Departments

Knowledge is a socio-historical construction, reflective of political-economic processes as well as cultural meaning-making processes (Bourdieu, 1977; Du Bois, 1933; Foucault, 1972; Pascal, 2011; Friere 1970; Zerubavel 1997). Epistemology is the social scientific study of knowledge creation, and according to feminist scholarship, epistemology is broken down into three elements; the knower, the known, and the process of knowing (Sprague, 2005:31).

Implicit in the social creation of knowledge, and the process of knowing, is power (Foucault 1972). Knowing is not an objective process, instead producing and reproducing knowledge is a political act, reflective of economic processes, that makes meaning for human groups; where knowledge is the cultural representation of collective political-economic and social conflicts (Sprague 2005:33; Friere 1970; Pascal 2011). Knowledge is thus specific to societies, communities, and cultural groups (Zeruvabel 1997).

Stanfield (2011:20) operationalized “cognitive style” as a mechanism that “facilitates ‘seeing’ and ‘knowing’ our social world” that “constructs our social reality” and is specific to cultural groups. The socio-historical contemporary reality of “‘seeing’ and ‘knowing’ our social world” is such that knowledge creation is relationally dichotomized into Western and Indigenous “cognitive styles” that are real in the institutional consequences of Western Education and Indigenous Knowledge(s). This superstructure of knowledge reflects the structure of political power-economic material relations of the capitalist world-system (Marx in Grusky 2008; Stanfield 2011). Western “cognitive style” dominates knowledge creation through monopolizing “valid” ways of

“‘knowing’ the social world and...our social reality” in order to perpetuate exploitation, alienation and dehumanization (Stanfield 2011:20). The domination of Western “cognitive style,” a “globalized localism,” is what de Sousa Santos et al. (2007:xlvii, xxxix) conceptualized as the “coloniality of knowledge,” which reflects the “coloniality of power” of the total capitalist world-system (Rodney 1972).

Western “cognitive style” socially constructs and knows the social world and natural earth through a “monocultural” objectivity and positivism where knowledge is used as a tool to predict and control to perpetuate the capitalist world-system (Stanfield 2011;de Sousa Santos et al 2007:xlvii, xxxix). Knowledge within Western cognitive style is compartmentalized, classified, and institutionalized into disciplined boundaries of knowledge (de Sousa Santos et al 2007; Douglas 1986; Fuller 1993). Western “cognitive style” compartmentalizes knowledge into non-formal education (lived experiences), informal education (deliberate learning occasions) and formal education (schooling) (Abdi 2005). Compartmentalized knowledge is further classified within formal education, or schooling, into different “subjects” of knowledge that are institutionalized into *disciplinary boundaries* (Fuller 1993). Within disciplinary boundaries of institutionalized knowledge are “thought styles” or specific paths of “valid” knowledge creation based on assumptions, rules, and expectations (Fuller 1993). Disciplinary boundaries, however, are fluid, revolutionized, and maintained (Fuller 1993). Gatekeepers’ discipline bounded knowledge and “thought style(s)” therein, including through dissemination of knowledge (i.e. dissertation committees, journal editors, etc.) (Rabaka 2010).

Institutionalized knowledge is further organized into academic departments at schools and universities that as socio-historical constructs are structured by prestige; holistically as “institutional-structures” (Wallerstein 2007). The institutionalization of knowledge requires political and economic support and as a result represents the cultural knowledge of “ruling classes and elite members of dominant groups” (Stanfield 2011:33). As such “knowledge is...differentiated through institution building and development,” that has real consequences for institutional-structures (Stanfield 2011:31). For example, the institutional-structure of American Sociology is such that the top -20 U.S. sociology departments enact social closure through interdepartmental hiring practices that results in a monopolization of power within the discipline (Lenski 1966; Burris 2004; Weakliem et al 2011; Weeber 2006).

Institutional-structures, as a whole, are sites of 1) knowledge reproduction and 2) cognitive socialization, 3) professionalization, and 4) collective memory (Bourdieu 1977; Margolis and Romero 1998; Douglas 1986). From a critical perspective, the power-elite maintain power by controlling ideology through the manipulation of knowledge and utilization of formal education (schooling) to reinforce and reproduce dehumanizing power-relations, where elite knowledge is hegemonic and emphasized as normal (Marx in Grusky 2008; Friere 1970; Collins 2007). Further, critical theorists argue the socialization process of knowing reproduced within organized formal education (schools, universities) is a tool by the power-elite to make knowers embody power-relations and as such reproduce them; or what Bourdieu (1977) operationalized as “habitus.”

Zerubavel (1997) conceptualizes a “cognitive sociology,” or a “sociology of thinking,” that is evidenced in “culturally specific cognitive traditions,” “cognitive

norms” that “affect and constrain ways of thinking,” and “cognitive socialization.” Cognitive socialization “allows us to enter the social, institutional world” of specific thought communities (Zerubavel 1997:15). Cognitive socialization occurs on a primary (i.e. family) and secondary (i.e. discipline specialization) cognitive development (Zerubavel 1997:18). For example, professions are specialized thought communities where cognitive socialization occurs. These thought communities socialize knowers to determine “mental horizons [of knowledge],” what we see and know in our social world and natural earth (Zerubavel 1997). This socialization of thought communities results in “separating what is relevant from the irrelevant,” a “social act” by members of thought communities (Zerubavel 1997). To be sure, the process of remembering and forgetting, making knowledge irrelevant and invisible, and too reproducing knowledge as relevant and visible, is “an important aspect of power” (Zerubavel 1997:51).

The socialization process of institutional-structures is jargonized as “professionalization” (Margolis and Romero 1998). Professionalization is the process whereby knower’s are socialized to learn the institutionalized known, institutionalized knowers and the process of knowing within the profession as a whole (Margolis and Romero 1998). Part of this professionalization process includes seeing and knowing the memory of the institutional-structure. Within boundaries of institutionalized scientific knowledge, Gieryn (2010) states that scientific remembering and forgetting that validates and invalidates knowledge is both a cooperative and competitive process. Specifically, Merton emphasized the validation of scientific knowledge is a functional cooperative process, while Bourdieu argued knowledge validation represents a “struggle for dominance and power” (Gieryn 2010). Professionalized knowers are socialized to know

and embody the memory of the institutionalized knowledge, and power-relations thereof; or what Bergson operationalized as “habit memory” (Kansteiner 2002:190). Thus, the collective memory of institutional-structures is an “effective marker of social differentiation” (Olick and Robbins 1998:112). Institutional-structures are sites of cultural representations of institutionalized knowledge reproduction, cognitive socialization, professionalization, and collective memory that too are cultural scripts of power-relations. As such, cultural representations of institutional-structures are also cultural scripts of how race and gender structure institutionalized knowledge reproduction, professionalization, and collective memory. In order to use intersectionality as a heuristic device to read the reproduction of knowledge, this paper frames race and gender as relational, structural processes of white supremacy and patriarchy, respectively, that are too read as cultural representations.

Racially Gendered Classed Power-Relations

Race and gender are “intersecting and interlocking” social constructions historically rooted in the development of the total capitalist world-system that together reflect classed material relations and have real consequences for human groups including male/white privilege and domination (Collins 1990; Higginbothom 1995; Glenn 1999:8). Together, race and gender share three analytic elements (Glenn 1999). First, race and gender are social structures that organize human groups through power to perpetuate exploitation, alienation, and privilege; where power comes from ownership of political and economic property (Glenn 1999; Kaba 2007). The social structure of race, or the racial structure is white supremacy, where the property of whiteness is privileged and “Otherness” is oppressed (Bonilla-Silva 2010:9; Mills 1999). Interlocking with race is the gendered structure of patriarchy, centered on the sexual division of labor, where men

are privileged and women are oppressed (Eisenstein 1977; Collins 1990; Davis 1981).

Together race and gender “interlock and intersect” to create matrices of domination where race and gender cannot be separated, as race is gendered and gender is racialized (Glenn 1999:8; Collins 1990).

Second, race and gender are relational, meaning, that require each other (Glenn 1999). Western “cognitive style” dichotomizes knowing the social world as “perpetual conflict” (white/Other, man/woman, rich/poor, etc.); a process Fanon (1967:44) conceptualized as the Manichaean structure (Stanfield 2011; Glenn 1999). The relational meanings of race (whiteness/Otherness) and gender (manhood/womanhood) are so salient that human groups do not need to be “face to face” for these relational meanings to have real consequences (Glenn 1999). Even further, the racial structure of white supremacy and the gendered structure of patriarchy make invisible hegemonic power-relations such that whiteness and manhood are rendered invisible (Glenn 1999).

Lastly, race and gender, as relational structures, are also cultural representations that can be read in language, “institutionalized rituals, written history, school curricula, [and] mass media” (Blauner 1972:31; Moore 2007). For example, institutionalized knowledge is cultural scripts that too reads as representations of race and gender, and as such reflects and reproduce dominant political-economic power-relations, as well as reproducing structured inequalities of knowledge and schooling (Arnot and Dillabough 1999; Bourdieu 1977; Dillabough 2003; Foucault 1983; Oakes 1985). With this theoretical conceptualization of race and gender, this paper will now utilize intersectionality as a heuristic device to explore American Sociology’s reproduction of institutionalized knowledge.

American Sociology: Race, Gender, and Knowledge Reproduction

American Sociology is an institutional-structure and as such consists of sites of knowledge reproduction, professionalization and collective memory. Though literature on American Sociology as an institutional-structure is limited, there is research that explores the discipline's departmental prestige, the reproduction of knowledge, as well as how race and gender structure knowledge production and collective memory. Burris (2004) found that the top-20 U.S. sociology departments enact social closure and thus are representative of power within the discipline. Race structures prestige, a socio-historical product, such that none of the top-20 U.S. sociology departments are at Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

Further research on the reproduction of knowledge within American Sociology, as an institutional-structure explores how textbooks and journal publications reproduce disciplinary knowledge, how race and gender structure knowledge reproduction and collective memory (Manza, Sauder, and Wright 2010; Hamilton 2003; Zuberi and Bonilla-Silva 2008; O'Brien 1981; Rabaka 2010). Recent research illustrates how American Sociology textbooks universally reproduce the theoretical core of the discipline as structural-functionalism, conflict theory, and symbolic-interactionism (Manza, Sauder, and Wright 2010). Historically the sociology of knowledge was an important aspect of American Sociology that seeks to understand social forces shaping the creation of knowledge or epistemology (Du Bois 1933; Weber 1922; Collins 1990). The classification, institutionalization, and reproduction of knowledge have been important subjects of sociological inquiry (Sica 2010; Douglas 1986; Fuller 1993).

American Sociology is an institutional-structure historically situated within Western “cognitive style” and as such reflects racially gendered classed power-relations of the capitalist world-system. The reproduction of racially gendered knowledge within American Sociology became visible in the 1970’s when paradigmatic revolutions rocked the U.S. social science. The history of American Sociology is such that race and gender structure the historical memory and reproduction of institutionalized knowledge. Rabaka (2010) argues how American Sociology enacts “epistemic apartheid” as a “process of institutionalized racism [that is read in the] racial colonization and conceptual quarantining of knowledge, anti-imperial thought, and/or radical praxis produced and presented by non-white---and especially Black—intellectual activists.”

As a result of knowledge segregation, sociologists who studied race, from a non-white privileged epistemic center, have been forgotten from the institutional memory of American Sociology; for example W.E.B. Du Bois, Anna Julia Cooper, and Oliver C. Cox (Zuberi and Bonilla-Silva 2008:279; Rabaka 2010; Wright II 2005; Collins 2007).

Further white supremacy structures American Sociology’s institutionalized knowledge such that “race relations” was a central aspect of social inquiry in the U.S.. However hegemonic knowledge of the sociology of race relations was such that “people of color became “abnormal, objects” of study; where objectivity is a white privilege (Steinberg 2007). Steinberg (2007) argues the sociology of race relations is grounded in an “epistemology of ignorance” that is undergirded by an “ethnocentric objectivity.” “Ethnocentric objectivity’ informed by Eurocentric “white logic[;]...the epistemological arm of white supremacy” that “grants centrality of knowledge, history, science, and culture to whites” (Zuberi and Bonilla-Silva 2008:17,332). In sociology this reproduction of racially structured inequalities of knowledge, white logic, is paired with

the practice of “white methods” whereby analyses of race are ahistorical, acontextual, and atheoretical (Zuberi and Bonilla-Silva 2008). Specifically “white methods” are “tools to manufacture empirical data and analysis to support the racial stratification of society” and thus reproducing racialized knowledge (Zuberi and Bonilla-Silva 2008:18; Marks 2008; James 2008).

In total American Sociology is an institutional-structure that consists of sites of knowledge reproduction, professionalization and collective memory. However empirical research on American Sociology as an institutional-structure is limited. Research illustrates ways in which American Sociology reproduces knowledge as well as how race and gender structure knowledge reproduction, both in theory, methods, and collective memory. However there is limited research on how the institutional-structure of American Sociology contemporarily reproduces knowledge and how race and gender structure that process. Therefore this study methodologically analyzes dissertations defended in 2011 at the top-20 U.S. sociology departments from a critical race and feminist epistemological standpoint in order to understand how American Sociology, as an institutional-structure, contemporarily reproduces knowledge, as well as how racially gendered structural inequalities of knowledge are reproduced therein.

III. Methods

This study explores American Sociology’s contemporary knowledge reproduction, as well as how race and gender structure this process. In order to do so, this study purposefully utilizes dissertations defended in 2011 at the top-20 U.S. sociology departments (see Figure 1). Recent sociology of sociology studies illustrate that prestige structures sociology departments at respective U.S. universities, organizing American

Sociology into prestigious (elite) and non-prestigious (non-elite) departments (Burris 2004; Weakliem et al 2001; Wallerstein 2007). Prestige in American Sociology is important because the top-20 departments enact social closure through interdepartmental hiring; social closure is illustrative of power (Burris 2004; Weeber 2006; Lenski 1966). Furthermore, since graduate departments are sites of institutionalized knowledge reproduction, professionalization, and collective memory, dissertations can be considered cultural scripts thereof. If dissertations are cultural representations, then they can be read as representative of 1) the reproduction of institutionalized knowledge, 2) the reproduction racially gendered knowledge, as well as 3) the reproduction of racialized and gendered structural inequalities of knowledge and agency thereof.

The dissertations are purposefully sampled from the top-20 U.S. sociology departments, per Burris's (2004) sample of prestigious departments, between January 1, 2011 and December 31, 2011 using the "ProQuest Dissertation and Theses" database. ProQuest is an online archival database of dissertations and theses from various institutionalized knowledges and structured departments. A total of 90 dissertation abstracts were located representing 13 of the top-20 departments, or 65%. The second column of Table 1 illustrates the number of dissertation abstracts defended in 2011 at top-20 U.S. sociology departments that were accessible in ProQuest.

[Insert Table 1 here]

The dissertations were methodologically analyzed from a feminist epistemological standpoint and critical race theoretical perspective in order to see American Sociology's contemporary knowledge reproduction, as well as how race and gender structure this process of knowledge reproduction. Feminist standpoint epistemology makes social

knowledge visible as the knower, the known, and the process of knowing (Sprague 2005).

Even more so, as Harding (2004:12) argues,

carrying out standpoint projects within disciplines is a crucial task since a main objective of standpoint theory and research is precisely to map the conceptual practices through which particular institutions, such as disciplines, serve oppressive forms of power.

In addition, critical race methodology allows for an analysis of racialized gendered classed power-relations and hegemonic knowledge, where “race-based[,] methodologies make visible what is often invisible, taken for granted, or assumed in our knowledge and practice, and do this work out of necessity” (Pillow 2003:183; Hesse-Biber and Leavy 2006). Together these methodological approaches decenter Eurocentric thought and hegemonic knowledge, and, as such, allow for an investigation in the reproduction of racialized and gendered structural inequalities of knowledge reproduction (Pillow 2003:183; Foucault 1976; Hesse-Biber and Leavy 2006).

In order to read the cultural representations of institutionalized knowledge reproduction and production as well as the reproduction of racialized and gendered structural inequalities of knowledge, the dissertations were coded in a number of ways. First, the dissertation abstracts were coded by the ProQuest classification of “subject” and “keyword/identifier.” ProQuest provides a “comprehensive list of subject codes” from which authors of dissertations are to choose that “best describe the content of” the knowledge produced (ProQuest 2013). Additionally, ProQuest encourages authors to suggest key words that represent the knowledge produced. If the authors don’t provide keywords, then ProQuest determines keywords based on “terms and phrases drawn from the title, index, abstract, and full text fields” (ProQuest 2013). Keywords and subject indexes complement each other, as they carve out “islands of knowledge” that classifies

knowledge and thinking, and as such an archival of meaning. In total, the 90 dissertation abstracts had 256 “subject” and 624 “keyword” classifications.

Of the 90 dissertation abstracts available on ProQuest 67 were downloadable, which was required for the next step of analysis. The 67 dissertations, representing 13 (65%) of the top-20 departments, were first coded for if the dissertation included race and/or gender in the analysis. Of the 67 downloadable dissertations, 24 dissertations (or 35.8%) did not engage race and/or gender in their analyses. Fourteen (14) dissertations (or 20.8%) included only race in the analyses, nine (9) dissertations (or 13.4%) included only gender, two (2) dissertations (or .03%) included gender and ethnicity in the analyses, and eighteen (18) dissertations (or 26.8%) included both race and gender in the analyses. Next, if the downloadable dissertations did use race and/or gender in the analyses, then they were coded for how race and/or gender were operationalized or measured. The dissertations that used race and/or gender in the analyses were then coded for how race and/or gender were theoretically conceptualized and historicized. Lastly, if the dissertations used race and gender as an intersectional or interactive measurement, then the dissertations were coded for how that intersection or interaction was theoretically conceptualized. Such an analysis allows for understanding how American Sociology contemporarily reproduces knowledge and how race and gender structure this process, or more succinctly, this empirical analysis allows for understanding racialized and gendered structural inequalities of institutionalized knowledge reproduction.

IV. Analysis/Findings

Classification of Knowledge Production

The 90 dissertations abstracts were coded based on ProQuest's keyword/identifiers and subject classification, respectively, which is intended to reflect the content of knowledge reproduced. The most common keyword was "social sciences" that classified 85 and "education" that classified 19 dissertations abstracts. The most common subject of knowledge was "social structure" that classified 26 dissertations (or 28.9%), next was "Individual and Family Studies" classifying 17 dissertations (or 26.2%), "organizational behavior" that classified 12 dissertations (or 18.9%), and eleven dissertations (or 12.2%) that were classified as "public policy." All other "subjects" classified at most nine dissertations.

In terms of knowledge classified as racially gendered "Othered" disciplines, or "Studies" (i.e. Women Studies, Black Studies, Hispanic American Studies, etc.), fifteen (15) out of the 90 dissertations were classified as "African American Studies/Black Studies,"³ twelve (12) dissertations (or 18.9%) were classified as producing "Ethnic Studies" knowledge/content, seven (7) (or 16.7%) "Asian American Studies/Asian Studies,"⁴ six (6) out of 90 dissertations (or 7%) were classified as "Hispanic American Studies/Latin American Studies,"⁵ and two (2) (or 2%) were classified as "Native American Studies." Six of the dissertations classified as "African American Studies" were also classified as "Ethnic Studies," whereas three (3) dissertations were specifically classified as "Black Studies," "African American Studies," and "Ethnic Studies." None of the "Asian Studies" or "Hispanic American Studies" classified dissertations was also classified as "Ethnic Studies." six (6) dissertations classified as "Black Studies" that were

³ African American Studies and Black Studies were thematically coded as "Africana Studies" in the analysis.

⁴ Asian American Studies and Asian Studies were thematically coded as "Asian diaspora" in the analysis.

⁵ Hispanic American Studies and Latin American Studies were thematically coded as "Latino/a Studies" in the analysis.

also classified as “African American Studies,” respectively. Three (3) of the dissertations classified as “Black Studies” and “African American Studies” were also classified as “Ethnic Studies.”

Of the 90 dissertations five (5) (or 5%) were classified as “Women Studies.” Three (3) dissertations were classified as “Women’s Studies” only, whereas one dissertation was classified as both “Women’s Studies” and “Hispanic American Studies.” The other dissertation classified as “Women’s Studies” and “Gender Studies.”

Race, Gender, and Knowledge Reproduction

Of the 90 dissertation abstracts, 67 were downloadable which was required for this level of analysis. Of the 67 downloadable dissertations, 24 dissertations (or approx. 36%) did not engage race, ethnicity, and/or gender in their analyses. Fourteen (14) dissertations (or approx. 21%) included only race in the analyses, nine (9) dissertations (or 13.4%) included only gender, two (2) dissertations (or 3%) included only gender and ethnicity in the analyses, and eighteen (18) dissertations (or approx. 27 %) included both race and gender in the analyses. Said another way, a total of 32 out of 67 dissertations (or 47.7%) included race in the analyses and a total of 29 out of 67 dissertations (or 43.3%) included gender in the analyses.

Of the 32 dissertations that used race in the analyses, thirteen (13) (or 41%) operationalized race only quantitatively and thirteen (13) (or 41%) operationalized race only qualitatively, while six (6) (or 18%) operationalized race both quantitatively and qualitatively. In each of the nineteen (19) dissertations that quantitatively measured race, race was operationalized as a demographic variable in all 19. Fifteen (15) (or 79%) of those dissertations operationalized “Hispanic” or “Latino” as a race exclusive of other

racial demographics. Of the nineteen (19) dissertations that operationalized race as a demographic variable, nine (9) dissertations (or 47.4%) controlled race, the variable, in the analyses. On the other hand, of the nineteen (19) dissertations that qualitatively measured race, race was most often operationalized as “identity” (which includes identity formation, experiences based on identity, etc.) in nine (9) (or 47.3%) and as “boundary work” in six (6) (or 31.6%) of the dissertations.

Of the 32 dissertations that used race in the analyses, twelve (12) dissertations (or 37.5%) did not theoretically conceptualize race and twenty (20) (or 62.5%) did. Of those twenty (20) dissertations that did, the most common conceptualization was “collective identity” in eight (8) dissertations, “social construction” in seven (7) dissertations, a “social structure” in six (6) dissertations, “culture” in five (5) dissertations, four (4) conceptualized race as an “ascribed status,” four (4) conceptualized race as a “social system,” and lastly, four (4) conceptualized race as a social process of racial formation. To be sure these conceptualizations are not independent of each other. For example, each of the four (4) dissertations that conceptualized race as a social process of racial formation also conceptualized race as a social structure. Most specifically, of the nine (9) dissertations that used race as a control variable, five (5) (or 55.5%) did not theoretically conceptualize race.

The 32 dissertations that used race in the analyses were also coded for if, and how, race was historicized. In total, eighteen (18) of the dissertations (or 56.2%) did not historicize race and fourteen (14) (or 43.7%) did. Of the eighteen (18) dissertations that did not historicize race, eleven (11) did not conceptualize race either; meaning that eleven (11) dissertations out of the total 32 dissertations, or 34.4%, that used race in the analyses

but did not theoretically explain or historicize the concept of race. For the other seven (7) dissertations that did not historicize race but did theoretically explain the concept, the most common theoretical conceptualization of race was collective identity in three (3), social construction in two (2), and ascribed status in two (2). Of the fourteen (14) dissertations that did historicize race, the most common historical contextualization of race was historicizing segregation in six (6) dissertations, historicizing slavery in four (4) dissertations, historicizing race and capitalism in two (2) dissertations, and historicizing colonialism in two (2) dissertations. An analysis of the fourteen (14) dissertations that did historicize race reveals that the dissertations most likely to do so conceptualized race as a social structure and the dissertations least likely to historicize race were those that did not conceptualize race.

Of the 29 dissertations that used gender in the analyses, nineteen (19) (or 65.6%) operationalized gender only quantitatively, six (6) (or 21%) operationalized gender only qualitatively, and two (2) (or 10.5%) operationalized gender both quantitatively and qualitatively. In all of the twenty one (21) dissertations that quantitatively measured gender, gender was operationalized as a demographic variable measured by sex (female/male). Additionally, in eighteen (18) of the dissertations (or 86%) the terms gender (women/men) and sex (female/male) were used interchangeably when discussing the variables and the analyses. Of the twenty one (21) dissertations that operationalized gender as a demographic variable, ten (10) dissertations (or 48%) controlled the gender variable in the analyses. On the other hand, of the eight (8) dissertations that qualitatively measured gender, gender was most often operationalized as “identity” in

order to explore identity maintenance, gender roles and identity, etc. in six (6) of the dissertations.

Of the 29 dissertations that used gender in the analyses, eighteen (18) dissertations (or 62.1%) did not theoretically conceptualize gender and eleven (11) (or 38%) did. Of those eleven (11) dissertations that did, five (5) dissertations conceptualized gender as “identity,” four (4) conceptualized gender as a “social structure,” four (4) conceptualized gender as “performance,” three (3) conceptualized gender as a “social construction,” and three (3) conceptualized gender as a “status.” To be sure these conceptualizations are not independent of each other. For example, each of the three (3) dissertations that conceptualized gender as a social construction also conceptualized gender as “performance.” Most specifically, of the ten (10) dissertations that used gender as a control variable, nine (9) (or 90%) did not conceptualize gender.

The 29 dissertations that used gender in the analyses were also coded for if, and how, gender was historicized. In total, twenty one (21) dissertations (or 72.4%) did not historicize gender and eight (8) (or 27.6%) did. Of the twenty one (21) dissertations that did not historicize gender, fifteen (15) did not conceptualize gender either; meaning that fifteen (15) dissertations out of 29 (or 52%) used gender in the analyses but did not theoretically explain or historicize the concept of gender. Of the eight (8) dissertations that did historicize gender, the most common historical contextualization of gender was through a discussion of the gendered division of labor in six (6) dissertations. An analysis of the eight (8) dissertations that did historicize gender reveals that the dissertations most likely to do so conceptualized gender as “performance” and the

dissertations least likely to historicize gender were those that did not conceptualize gender.

Knowledge Classification, Race, Gender, and Knowledge (Re)Production

Of the fifteen (15) dissertations thematically coded as “Africana Studies,” four (4) were downloadable. An analysis of the four (4) “Africana Studies” dissertations showed that none (0) operationalized race solely quantitatively, one (1) operationalized race qualitatively, and three (3) operationalized race both quantitatively and qualitatively. All four (4) “Africana Studies” dissertations conceptualized race, where race was most commonly conceptualized as a “social construction” in three (3) dissertations. Additionally, of the four (4) “Africana Studies” dissertations, race was not historicized in three (3) of the dissertations and the one (1) “Africana Studies” dissertation that did historicize race did so through the history of segregation.

Of the twelve (12) dissertations classified as “Ethnic Studies,” eight (8) were downloadable. An analysis of the eight (8) “Ethnic Studies” dissertations showed that none (0) operationalized race solely quantitatively, five (5) operationalized race qualitatively, and three (3) operationalized race both quantitatively and qualitatively. Of the five (5) dissertations that operationalized race qualitatively, most did so as an exploration of “identity and of the three (3) dissertations that operationalized race both quantitatively and qualitatively, all operationalized race as a quantitative variable; two (2) of those three (3) dissertations also controlled for race. Of the eight (8) “Ethnic Studies” dissertations, race was most commonly conceptualized as “collective identity” in four (4) and as a “political process” in three (3) dissertations; two (2) dissertations did not conceptualize race. Additionally, of the eight (8) “Ethnic Studies” dissertations, race was

not historicized in four (4) of the dissertations, while three (3) dissertations historicized race through slavery and two (2) through segregation. To be sure these are not independent of each other, as one dissertation historicized race by discussing both the history of slavery and segregation.

Of the five (5) dissertations that were classified under the ProQuest subject of “Women’s Studies,” only three (3) were downloadable. An analysis of the three (3) “Women’s Studies” dissertations revealed one dissertation conceptualized gender as a social structure, one conceptualized gender as “performance” and a “social construction,” and one did not conceptualize gender. The dissertations classified as “Women’s Studies” that did not conceptualize gender also included race in the analysis and did not conceptualize race.

Agency: Breaking the Habit

While analyzing the dissertations for how race and/or gender were operationalized and conceptualized, it became apparent that sometimes the dissertations author’s spoke to exactly what I was exploring. For example, in one dissertation the author states that the lack of literature debating the importance of race theory and racial methodologies in education is problematic. The author goes on to specifically state,

Many education scholars have looked at race either as the central focus of their study or as an important factor that must be taken into account, but few have actually attempted to define race or explain how they conceptualize race beyond presenting the traditional race categories commonly used“

Instead, race is often presented without definition and in a way that assumes no discussion exists regarding the meaning and measurement of race.“ In this very dissertation the author *thoroughly* conceptualized and operationalized race. The author goes on to state the problematics of not conceptualizing or operationalizing race:

Consequently, when researchers fail to define race and provide a framework and justification for how race is operationalized, they perpetuate the myth that race is static and absolute. Furthermore, researchers frequently confound race for ethnicity or use racial and ethnic terms interchangeably, when they are in fact very different concepts (Bashi and McDaniel, 1997).

Two dissertation authors also spoke about the fact that race and ethnicity are often conflated in sociological research (i.e. race/ethnicity) and one dissertation author specifically argued for the importance of conceptualizing the two distinctly:

Typically, ethnicity is defined as “cultural attributes” (Waters 1999; Pilkington 2003) and “chosen” (Waters 1990; Alba 1990; Nagel 1994). This is not to say that racial groups do not hold these characteristics, rather instead of conflating the two we need to study “race” as structurally separate from culture, as a process that individuals are subjected to.

Similarly one dissertation author specifically discusses the difference between gender and sex and discussed the importance of not conflating the two by conceptualizing gender as performance, stating that, a more performance based perspective suggests that gender is not determined by the biological component of sex.“

In another dissertation that primarily used gender in the analysis, the author specifically noted that:

While the study presented here does not analyze the racialized dimensions of the retail service labor process, it acknowledges the insights of critical race theory (e.g. Delgado and Stefancic 2001; Omi and Winant 1994; Roediger 1991), and understand the Happy Homes retail setting as a specific site for the reproduction of whiteness and white privilege.

And thus making whiteness visible in a study where race was not an analytical factor of analysis. On the other hand in a dissertation that included race as part of an ethnographic analysis, the dissertation author noted that one of the committee members encouraged a

future analysis using gender and the dissertation author acknowledge that not including a gendered analysis was a “gaping and analytical hole currently in the dissertation.”

V. Discussion/ Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to empirically explore American Sociology’s contemporary knowledge (re)production, as well as how race and gender structure that process. In order to do so, dissertations that were defended in 2011 at the top-20 sociology departments and were also available on ProQuest were utilized as the data source. Theoretically, dissertations are cultural scripts that can be read as the 1) (re)production of knowledge, 2) the reproduction of racialized and gendered knowledge, and 3) the reproduction of racialized and gendered structural inequalities of knowledge. Specifically using dissertations from the top-20 U.S. sociology departments allows for this empirical study to explore American Sociology as an institutional-structure, where the top 20 departments are representative of disciplinary power.

Analyzing dissertations for if, and how, race and/or gender were operationalized and conceptualized, allowed for an exploratory investigation into what is “normal,” or as Zerubavel (1997) stated, the “cognitive norms” in terms of producing knowledge and knowledge reproduction within American Sociology’s “thought community;” in total it allows for an insight into “cognitive socialization” which create the “mental horizons of knowledge,” “what is relevant and not relevant.” As illustrated, of the 67 downloadable dissertations 47.7% included race in the analysis (meaning approx.. 52% did not) and 43.3% included gender in the analysis (meaning approx.. 56% did not). In this way we see that it is normal to produce knowledge that does not include race and/or gender or

professionalized sociologists are not cognitively socialized that race and gender are central components of understanding the social world.

More insights into the “cognitive norms” and “cognitive socialization” of sociologists professionalized sociologists and thus the reproduction of American Sociology’s contemporary knowledge reproduction process is exemplified by the operationalized and conceptualization of race and gender. The fact that of the nineteen (19) dissertations that quantitatively operationalized race, 79% (or 15) operationalized Hispanic/Latino as a race exclusive of other racial demographics is problematic. How would one differentiate between the experiences of whitened Latinos and Black Latinos using the operationalization of race that conflates with ethnicity?

The fact that 37.5% of dissertations that used race in the analyses did not theoretically conceptualize race and 62.1% of dissertations that used gender in the analyses did not theoretically conceptualize gender, means that within American Sociology’s contemporary reproduction of knowledge, professionalized sociologists are “cognitively socialized” to think the theoretical conceptualization of race and gender is not required or relevant. Even more pressing is the fact that 55.5% of the dissertations that used race as a control variable did not theoretically conceptualize race and 90% of the dissertations that used gender as a control variable did not theoretically conceptualize gender. This data illustrates that within American Sociology’s contemporary process of knowledge reproduction theoretically conceptualizing race and/or gender when using the concepts as control variables is considered irrelevant. For example, critical race scholars illustrate it is problematic to “interpret results of statistical analysis” without that interpretation being “connected to underlying theory;” for example interpreting racialized

outcomes without theoretically explaining and historicizing the concept of race (James 2008; Marks 2008; Zuberi and Bonilla-Silva 2008:9). For example, the lack of theoretically conceptualizing gender may help to explain why the majority (86%) of dissertations conflated the language, and meaning, of gender and sex.

Being that defending a dissertation requires passing through gatekeepers (aka the dissertation committee), the perceived irrelevance of race and gender theory as informing empirical research, especially when using race and/or gender as a control variable, can be read as a racialized and gendered institutionalized process of knowledge reproduction (or “cognitive socialization) rather than just an individual social actor’s actions that produces knowledge. Within “cognitive socialization,” learning what is relevant to know and what is irrelevant to know is an important aspect of power, and, as such, relevance within the process of knowledge reproduction, and professionalization, illustrates power-relations of racialized and gendered structural inequalities of knowledge (Zerubavel 1997).

Interpretatively, atheoretical and ahistorical analyses of race and gender perpetuates the epistemological arm of white supremacy, or “white methods” where “empirical data...supports the racial stratification of society” by making race theoretically invisible, using “white logic.” As such, professionalized knower’s that produce white methods and white logic embody racialized and gendered “habitus,” or white male habitus, of racialized and gendered structural inequalities of institutionalized knowledge and too reproduce the “epistemology of ignorance” to which they are cognitively socialized into. The subjugation of race and gender theory, as well as the invisibility of white methods, white logic, and the white habitus of knowledge reveals a

process of institutionalized racism and sexism read in American Sociology's contemporary knowledge reproduction process.

This empirical study innovatively uses dissertations as cultural scripts to make visible racialized and gendered power-relations and structural inequalities of institutions knowledge and power-relations thereof; it also allows for insight into agency, the dialectic of structure. So, for example, though extremely limited in terms of the number of dissertation authors that did so, some professionalized knowers used their agency to speak to some of the issues (conflating sex and gender, not conceptualizing race, conflating race and ethnicity) that this empirical analysis found is a contemporary social fact in American Sociology's contemporary reproduction of knowledge process.

This empirical exploration of American Sociology's contemporary process of knowledge reproduction innovatively uses dissertations from the top-20 U.S. sociology departments as cultural scripts to read racialized and gendered structural inequalities of knowledge. This study contributes to 1) understanding American Sociology as an institutional-structure, 2) sociologically imagining the reproduction of racialized and gendered structural inequalities of knowledge, and 3) understanding how American Sociology contemporarily reproduces racialized and gendered structural inequalities of knowledge by utilizing critical race and feminist standpoint methodologies. Empirically confirming that racialized and gendered structural inequalities of knowledge are contemporarily reproduced in American Sociology yields many questions, and areas for future research. Future research can explore racialized and gendered structural inequalities in other arenas of "cognitive socialization" (i.e. how race and gender theory are taught within the American Sociology graduate departments or how professionalized

gatekeepers see the reproduction of race and gender within the professionalization process), how other aspects of the discipline reproduce racialized and gendered structural inequalities of knowledge (i.e. how do top American Sociology journals reproduce racialized and gendered structural inequalities of knowledge or does the theoretical conceptualization or operationalization of race and/or gender affect proposal funding). Understanding the ways in which American Sociology reproduces racialized and gendered structural inequalities of knowledge is important for one main reason, because knowing the problem exists provides a space for indicating if our actions will change.

Appendix

Table 1: Top-20 PhD-granting U.S. Sociology Departments, Number of 2011 Dissertations on ProQuest, and Number of Dissertations that use Race, Ethnicity, and/or Gender in the Analyses.

Prestige Rank	U.S. sociology departments	# of diss. Abstracts on ProQuest	# of down-loadable diss. on ProQuest	# of diss. no race, ethnicity, and/or gender	# of diss. only race and/or ethnicity	# of diss. only gender	# of diss. gender and ethnicity only	# of diss. race and/or ethnicity and gender
1	Wisconsin	Ø	Ø	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
2	Chicago	9	9	6	1	Ø	Ø	2
3	Michigan	Ø	Ø	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
4	UC Berkeley	3	3	Ø	Ø	2	1	Ø
5	Harvard	10	8	3	3	1	Ø	1
6	Columbia	4	3	3	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø
7	Stanford	Ø	Ø	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
8	North Carolina	12	12	3	1	1	Ø	7
9	Indiana	4	4	1	1	Ø	Ø	2
10	Washington	1	1	1	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø
11	Yale	Ø	Ø	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
12	Texas	Ø	Ø	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
13	Pennsylvania	1	1	Ø	1	Ø	Ø	Ø
14	Northwestern	11	6	2	Ø	Ø	Ø	4
15	Cornell	Ø	Ø	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

16	Princeton	3	2	Ø	1	Ø	Ø	1
17	Minnesota	11	11	4	3	3	1	Ø
18	Ohio State	11	2	1	Ø	1	Ø	Ø
19	Duke	10	5	Ø	3	1	Ø	1
20	Johns Hopkins	Ø	Ø	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
		Total: 90	Total: 67	Total: 24	Total: 14	Total: 9	Total: 2	Total: 18

References

- Abdi, Ali A. 2005. "African Philosophies of Education: Counter-Colonial Criticisms." Pp. 25-42 in *Issues in African Education: Sociological Perspectives* edited by A. Abdi and A. Cleghorn. New York: Palgrave MacMillian.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. "Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction." Pp. 487-511, in *Power and Ideology in Education*, edited by J. Karabel and A.H. Halsey. New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press.
- Burris, Val. 2004. "The Academic Caste System: Prestige Hierarchies in PhD Exchange Networks." *American Sociological Review* 69:239-264.
- Camic, Charles. 2010. "How Merton Sociologizes the History of Ideas." Pp. 273-295 in *Robert K. Merton: Sociology of Science and Sociology as Science*, edited by Craig Calhoun. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 2000. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Thought*, 2nd edition. New York: Routledge.
 _____. 2007. "Pushing the Boundaries or Business as Usual? Race, Class, and Gender Studies and Sociological Inquiry." Pp. 427-437 in *Sociology in America A History*, edited by Craig Calhoun. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Davis, Angela. 1981. *Women, Class, and Race*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Douglas, Mary. 1986. *How Institutions Think*. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press.
- DuBois, W.E.B. 1935. *Black Reconstruction in America 1860-1880*. New York: Free Press.
- Fanon, Frantz. 1965. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press.
- Friere, Paulo. 1970. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York, N.Y: Seabury Press.
- Fuller, Steve. 1993. "Disciplinary Boundaries and the Rhetoric of the Social Sciences." Pp. 125-149 in *Knowledges: Historical and Critical Studies in Disciplinarity*,

edited by Ellen Messer-Davidow, David R. Shumway, and David J Sylvan.
Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.

Gieryn, Thomas F. 2010. "Paradigm for the Sociology of Science." Pp. 113-139 in *Robert K Merton: Sociology of Science and Sociology as Science*, edited by Craig Calhoun. New York: Columbia University Press.

Glenn, Evelyn N. 1999. "The Social Construction and Institutionalization of Gender and Race." Pp. 3-43 in *Revisioning Gender*, edited by Mara Marx Ferree, Judith Lorber, and Beth B. Hess. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hesser-Biber, Sharlene Nagy and Patricia Leavy. 2006. *The Practice of Qualitative Research*. London: Sage Publications.

James, Angela. 2008. "Making Sense of Race and Racial Classification." Pp. 31-45 in *White Methods, White Logic: Racism and Methodology*, edited by Tukufu Zuberi and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Kaba, Lansine. 2007. "Historical Consciousness and Politics of Africa." Pp. 58-69 in *Africana Studies: Philosophical Perspectives and Theoretical Paradigms*, edited by Delores P. Aldridge and E. Lincoln James. Pullman, WA: Washington State University Press.

Kansteiner, Wulf. YEAR. "Finding Memory in Meaning: A Methodological Critique of Collective Memory Studies." *History and Theory* 41(2):179-197.

Lenski, Gerhard E. 1966. *Power and Privilege: a Theory of Social Stratification*. New York: McGraw-Hill, esp. chapters 3-4 and 10-13.

Manza, J., Sauder, M., and Wright, N. 2010. "Producing Textbook Sociology." *Archives Européennes de Sociologie* 51(2):271-304. Retrieved January 24, 2012, from ABI/INFORM Global. (Document ID: 2149874771).

Margolis, Eric and Mary Romero. [1998]2000. "The Department is Very Male, Very White, Very Old, and Very Conservative": The Functioning of the Hidden Curriculum in Graduate Sociology Departments." Pp. 1276-1311 in *The Sociology of Education Volume III*, edited by Stephen J. Ball. London: Routledge.

Marks, Carole. 2008. "Methodologically Eliminating Race and Racism." Pp. 47-62 in *White Methods, White Logic: Racism and Methodology*, edited by Tukufu Zuberi and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Moore, Robert B. 2007. "Racist Stereotyping in the English Language." Pp. 365-376 in *Race, Class, and Gender: An Anthology*, edited by Margaret L. Andersen and Patricia Hill Collins. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.

- O'Brien, Mary. 1981. *The Politics of Reproduction*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Olick, Jeffrey K. and Joyce Robbins. 1998. "Social Memory Studies: From Collective Memory to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24(1): 105-140.
- Pascale, Celine-Marie. 2010. "Epistemology and the Politics of Knowledge." *The Sociological Review* 48:154-165.
- ProQuest. 2013. "Support Center." Website Accessed July 2013
<http://support.proquest.com/kb/?ArticleId=1563&source=article&c=12&cid=26#tab:homeTab:crumb:7:artId:1563>
- Rabaka, Reiland. 2010. *Against Epistemic Apartheid: W.E.B. Du Bois and the Disciplinary Decadence of Sociology*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Sica, Alan. 2007. "Defining Disciplinary Identity: The Historiography of U.S. Sociology." Pp. 713-731 in *Sociology in America A History*, edited by Craig Calhoun. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- de Sousa Santos, Boaventura. 2007. "Human Rights as an Emancipatory Script?: Cultural and Political Conditions." Pp. 3-40 in *Another Knowledge is Possible: Beyond Northern Epistemologies*, edited by Boaventura de Sousa Santos. New York: Verso.
- de Sousa Santos, Boaventura, João Arriscado Nunes, and Maria Paula Meneses. 2007. "Introduction: Opening Up the Canon of Knowledge and Recognition of Difference." Pp. xvivx-lxii in *Another Knowledge is Possible: Beyond Northern Epistemologies*, edited by Boaventura de Sousa Santos. New York: Verso.
- Sprague, Joey. 2005. *Feminist Methodologies for Critical Researchers: Bridging Differences*. New York: AltaMira Press.
- Stanfield II, John H. 2011. *Black Reflective Sociology: Epistemology, Theory, and Methodology*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Steinberg, Stephen. 2007. *Race Relations: A Critique*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Social Sciences.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2007. "The Culture of Sociology in Disarray: The Impact of 1968 on U.S. Sociologists." Pp. 427-437 in *Sociology in America A History*, edited by Craig Calhoun. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Weakliem, David L., Gauchat, Gordon and Bradley R. E. Wright. 2011. "Sociological Stratification: Change and Continuity in the Distribution of Departmental Prestige, 1965–2007." DOI 10.1007/s12108-011-9133-2.
- Weeber, Stan. 2006. *Sociology of Sociology: How the Discipline is Being Taught Today*. Lewiston, N.Y.: The Edwin Mellen Press.
- Wright II, Earl. 2005. "W.E.B. Du Bois and the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory." *Sociation Today* 3(1). Retrieved Oct. 5 2012.
- Zuberi, Tukufu and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva. 2008. "Telling the Real Tale of the Hunt: Toward a Race Conscious Sociology of Racial Stratification." Pp. 329-341 in *White Methods, White Logic: Racism and Methodology*, edited by Tukufu Zuberi and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Zerubavel, Eviatar. 1997. *Social Mindscapes: An Invitation to Cognitive Sociology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Conclusion: American Sociology: Contemporary Reproduction of Racialized Structural Inequalities of Knowledge

Introduction

Scholars have argued the need for, and the importance of, American Sociology, as a discipline, to engage in critical reflexivity of how power-relations shape contemporary social processes of knowledge reproduction, as well as the need to situate analyses of knowledge within a global framework of the “Global Politics of Knowledge” that seeks to understand the role of race, power, and colonality in social processes of knowledge (Bhambra 2014b; Stanfield 2011; Bhambra 2014a; Collins 2007). Historically the sociology of knowledge has been an important line of study in American Sociology, though contemporarily this is not the case (Curtis and Petras 1972; Garrison 1999). As part of American Sociology, Black sociology constitutes a legacy of using the sociology of knowledge to conduct critical reflexive analyses of the discipline’s racialized power-relations of knowledge (Bhambra 2014; Rabaka 2010; Stanfield 2011; Steinberg 2007; Wright II 2002).

In the 1960’s and 1970’s American Sociology experienced a racialized paradigmatic shift that made hegemonic whiteness sociology visible through the qualitative materialization of Black sociology within American Sociology (Staples 1973; Staples 1976; Wyse Forthcoming). Since the 1960’s and 1970’s race, gender, and class, separately as concepts, as well as Race, Gender, Class Studies collectively, has been and is being implemented within sociology graduate departments (Collins 2007). As a result, some scholars argue that American Sociology responded to this paradigmatic shift and as such contemporarily incorporates race and gender into the theoretical canon; or that the theoretical canon is deracialized and degendered (Wallerstein 2007). However scholars

have called for a critical reflexive analysis of the social processes of American Sociology's contemporary reproduction of knowledge to understand the role of race in contemporary curricula in graduate schools and how racialized social inequalities of knowledge are reproduced within professionalization processes. That said, though we can hypothesize the role of race, power, and colonality in American Sociology's contemporary knowledge reproduction, we do not have empirical observations of this contemporary institutionalized knowledge reproduction process as it plays out in sociology graduate departments and professionalization processes.

Therefore, this study situates American Sociology as an institutional-structure of institutionalized knowledge and structured prestige within the "Global Politics of Knowledge" in order to understand the role of race, power, and colonality in the contemporary knowledge reproduction process within U.S. sociology graduate departments (Bhambra 2014b; Wallerstein 2007). The purpose of this study is to critically reflexively analyze racialized power-relations of knowledge in American Sociology's reproduction of knowledge and professionalization processes. This study hypothesizes that if racialized power-relations of knowledge privilege whiteness propertied knowledge and enact institutionalized racism, then American Sociology's contemporary institutionalized knowledge reproduction process embodies these racialized power-relations. From that hypothesis, this study explores American Sociology's contemporary knowledge reproduction process by asking: 1) What is the process of knowing race in sociology graduate departments? And 2) what is the practice of knowing race in sociology graduate departments?

This study was conducted between August 2012 and November 2013. The sample of the study included faculty that study race at top-20 sociology graduate departments, Ph.D. candidate, graduate students that study sociology in general at top-20 sociology graduate departments, required Ph.D.-level theory syllabi from top-20 sociology graduate departments, and dissertation defended in 2011 at top-20 sociology graduate departments. Furthermore, this study assumes that the top-20 sociology graduate departments theoretically represent an element of American Sociology's disciplinary power since the top-20 sociology graduate departments, through interdepartmental hiring, enact social closure; where social closure is illustrative of power (Lenski 1966; Burris 2004). As such, the results of this study are generalizable and representative of American Sociology as a discipline.

In total, this paper explores American Sociology's contemporary reproduction of knowledge, as well as how race structures that process. In order to do so, this paper 1) historicizes the historical development of the political-economic world-system and the "Global Politics of Knowledge," as well as theorizes racialized gendered classed power-relations of knowledge, 2) utilizes the sociology of knowledge to critically situate American Sociology as an "institutional-structure" of Western formal education, 3) employs intersectionality to analyze racialized gendered classed power-relations of knowledge within American Sociology, and 4) methodologically analyzes a triangulation of data that includes syllabi, interviews with faculty that study race at the top-20, Ph.D. candidates that study sociology generally at the top-20, and dissertations published out of the top-20 U.S. sociology departments from a critical race and feminist standpoint in

order to understand American Sociology's contemporary reproduction of institutionalized knowledge and racialized gendered structural inequalities of knowledge.

The Global Politics of Knowledge and Racialized Power-Relations of Knowledge

The historical development of the colonial, capitalist world-system makes real a political-economic global reality, centered on exploitative material relations, where Bourgeoisie and Euro-American core nation-states exploit Indigenous and “Othered” periphery nations, peoples, and lands for the purpose of accumulating private property and wealth (Wallerstein 2004). The political-economic structure of the colonial capitalist world-system centers on power determined by who own the political-economic forces of societies (Kaba 2007). At the same time, the political-economic structure is reflected in the superstructure of knowledge ideology; where the structure is the superstructure (Marx in Grusky 2008). Therefore political-economic power-relations are read in the cultural scripts of knowledge and ideology. The “Global Politics of Knowledge” conceptualizes the colonial, capitalist world-system superstructure the “politics of knowledge production” and specifically the role of race, power, and colonality (Bhambra 2014:452).

To be sure,

Coloniality...refers to long-standing patterns of [political-economic] power that emerged as a result of colonialism...[and] define[s] culture, labour, intersubjective relations, and knowledge production well beyond the strict limits of colonial administrations. Thus coloniality survives colonialism (Maldonado-Torres 2007:243 cited in Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2013:38).

Colonialism was a political-economic, social, cultural, total world-system where Bourgeois and European and American nation-states exploited and dominated Indigenous nations, peoples, and lands. Colonialism exploits, alienates, and dehumanizes human groups'. Fanon (1965:44, 45) argued that colonialism creates social reality into a

“Manichaean structure,” whereby our social world is dichotomized into binaries of “perpetual conflict” of being and having (I.E. us v. them, colonizer v. colonized, European v. Indigenous). For example the social reality of race and the perpetual conflict of being and having whiteness.

The political-economic colonial, capitalist world-system was and is an inherently racialized system (Bonilla-Silva 1997; Cox 1948). Race is theoretically broken down into 1) a social structure of white supremacy that 2) shapes relations among human groups in time and space, or, practices relationality, that is 3) read as cultural representations (Glenn 1999; Bonilla-Silva 1997). The social structure of white supremacy endures from the political-economic power-relations of the slave trade, slavery, and colonialism; thus racialized power-relations are centered within capitalist exploitation and political-economic power (Cox 1948). White supremacy organizes human groups into racialized groups that saliently structures human groups’ lived experiences, and invisibly privileges whiteness. Colonaity and capitalism shape human groups relationships through racialized processes that exploits, “Others,” alienates, and dehumanizes. Therefore race reflects the (economic) material relations of class and (political) power-relations of the nation-state. Since the superstructure reflects political-economic colonial, capitalist world-system, race, power, and colonaity can be read as cultural representations within knowledge production (Bhambra 2014b; Fanon 1965; Rodney 1972). Hence, the “Global Politics of Knowledge” conceptualizes the superstructure as political-economic relations of race, power, and colonaity (Bhambra 2014b).

Historically colonialism and contemporarily colonality colonizes and monopolizes knowledge production; an important aspect of Western nation-states facility to “conquer vast portions of the world” (de Santos Sousa 2007; Smith 2012; Stanfield 2011:26). de Sousa Santos (2007:xlvii, xxxix) conceptualizes that the “colonality of knowledge,” in superstructural reality, reflects the political-economic power structure of capitalism and the nation-state. The “colonality of knowledge” monopolizes knowledge as Eurocentric that in practice is ethnocentric knowledge. In practice, colonality of knowledge denies and invalidates Indigenous knowledges through scientific “objectivity;” where the colonized are never afforded objectivity (Memmi 1965; Smith 2012; Stanfield 2011; Steinberg 2007). Stanfield (2011:19) affirms that “the objectification of knowledge is a matter of power and privilege.” As a result, Indigenous knowledges are confined to museums and Indigenous histories are silenced and forgotten (Smith 2012; Trouilliot 1995). Colonality monopolizes knowledge that employs the “globalized localism” of monocultural, Eurocentric knowledge as *the* way of producing valid knowledge (de Sousa Santos 2007:xlvii, xxxix; Stanfield 2011). Scholars note that certain disciplines, such as anthropology, and methods, such as ethnography, were born out of colonialism’s political-economic power-relations (Smith 2012). The “globalized localism” of monocultural, Eurocentric knowledge is ethnocentric in practice. Colonality affords only the dominant human groups objectivity; where objectivity denies colonized and Indigenous knowledges as valid (de Sousa Santos 2007). For example, in U.S. courts Black persons were not allowed to testify on juries because people of color are not afforded objectivity. Instead white supremacy denies the validity of people of colors’ testimonies and lived experiences.

With the global, historical perspective of the “Global Politics of Knowledge” and the theoretical conceptualization of racialized power-relations of knowledge, the next section utilizes the sociology of knowledge to situate American Sociology as an “institutional-structure” of institutionalized knowledge and structured prestige (Wallerstein 2007). Therefore, this next section utilizes the sociology of knowledge to critically situate American Sociology as an “institutional-structure” of formal education.

Epistemology, Institutionalized Knowledge, and Higher Education

Epistemology is the study of knowledge (Sprague 2005). Feminist standpoint theorists’ breakdown epistemology, or the study of knowledge, into a triad of the known, the knower, and the process of knowing (Sprague 2005). Feminist standpoint theorists contextualize with that triad the role of gendered power-relations of knowledge (Sprague 2005). Knowledge is a socio-historical process of meaning making that reflects political-economic material relations of capitalism and the nation-state. Utilizing Black reflexive epistemic sociology, Stanfield (2011:33) conceptualizes “cognitive style” as a mechanism that facilitates human groups’ “seeing and knowing” our social world and natural earth. For example, if we sociologically imagine the “Global Politics of Knowledge” we know the colonality of knowledge reproduces a Eurocentric cognitive style that colonizes and monopolizes valid knowledge production.

Knowledge is a social institution. Social institutions require human groups to know the expectations that shape behavior. Thought communities cognitively socialize members into seeing and knowing “the social, intersubjective world” (Zerubavel 1997). Social institutions cognitively socialize on primary and secondary levels, including family and professions, respectively (Zerubavel 1999). Berger and Luckmann (1966)

stated that social institutions inherently control the way human groups think, which Zerubavel (1999) sociologically imagines as a means of social control that illustrates power-relations.

The contemporary superstructure of knowledge reflects political-economic power-relations of colonialism and thus, the Manichaean structure, social reality as binary conflict, makes real the social institution of knowledge as dichotomized into Western Education and Indigenous Knowledges (Fanon 1965). Western knowledge is compartmentalized into formal education (i.e. schooling), non-formal education (i.e. lived experiences), and informal education (i.e. deliberate occasions) (Abdi 2005). The institution of formal education, schooling, classifies and institutionalizes knowledge into subjects, or “disciplinary boundaries” of knowledge that represent institutionalized thought communities and exist as “thought styles” (Fuller 1993). Disciplinary boundaries of institutionalized thought communities enforce thought styles that are specific assumptions, rules, and practices for valid knowledge production (Douglas 1986:13; Fuller 1993). For example, the discipline of sociology bounds a thought style of knowledge that scientifically studies human groups’ behavior and interactions, disciplines valid knowledge as assuming “objectivity,” rules knowledge is “value-free,” and, in turn, practices ethnocentrism (Sprague 2005).

Thought communities socialize members into a particular “cognitive style,” or to think as the thought community thinks; a process that Zerubavel (1997) conceptualizes as “cognitive socialization.” Cognitive socialization reproduces “cognitive norms” that “affect and constrain ways of thinking” and thus determine the mental horizons of thought communities (Zerubavel 1997:12). Cognitive norms that determine mental

horizons “close our minds” that practices a process of moral focusing (Zerubavel 1997:39). Mental horizons “focus on the “figure” but not the “ground;” and in practice decontextualize knowledge (Zerubavel 1997:39). It is through mental horizons and moral focusing that thought communities members learn to ignore certain aspects of social reality; determining aspects of social reality as relevant and irrelevant to knowing is a social act of power (Zerubavel 1997:47). Zerubavel (1997:10) contends that “the more we become aware of our cognitive differences as members of different thought communities, the less likely we are to follow the common ethnocentric tendency.”

Institutionalized knowledge segregates and stratifies knowledge such that ideas are ranked, rewarded, and stigmatized though a “logic of [knowledge] segregation” (Collins 2007). The practice of segregating knowledge results in the very real consequences of ideas losing holistic value (Collins 2007). Knowledge segregation is a “symbolic hierarchy of knowledge” that gatekeeps “symbolic and social boundaries...by excluding certain peoples and ideas” (Collins 2007:577). Thought community members with institutional disciplinary power, or gatekeepers, discipline knowledge through knowledge dissemination, collective memory, determining certain knowledges irrelevant and relevant, as well as reproducing mental horizons and moral focuses (Collins 2007; Douglas 1986; Rabaka 2010; Zerubavel 1997). This

Social institutions, and thought communities, are also sites of collective memory or “mnemonic communities” (Douglas 1986; Zerubavel 1997:86, 90). Mnemonic communities are thought communities that are sites of memory where the social institution has a history and how that institution remembers that history (Zerubavel 1997). Thought communities as mnemonic communities cognitively socialize “what we

should remember and what we cannot forget,” or mnemonic socialization; where thought/mnemonic communities have “mnemonic battles” about what should be remembered in the first place (Zerubavel 1997:98). Mnemonic communities have mnemonic traditions that shape what we remember and *how* we remember it (Zerubavel 1997:87). Thought communities that are too mnemonic communities determine the extent of the mental reach into the past by setting historical horizons beyond which past events are regarded as somehow irrelevant and as such are often forgotten altogether (Zerubavel 1997:84).

Bergson’s operationalization of “habit memory” is a methodological tool to analyze collective memory of institutions that is read in cultural scripts of cognitive and mnemonic socialization (Kansteiner 2002). “Habit memory” is “the physical being as an incarnation of all the possibilities of acting out the past in the present” (Kansteiner 2002:190).

Formal education, or schooling, includes institutionalized boundaries of knowledge, thought communities, that are organized within schools of education (primary, secondary, and higher education) as disciplines organized into departments. Institutionalized knowledge that is organized into departments of higher education reflect political-economic power-relations. Since fully understanding institutions requires recognizing the historical forces that shaped them, one way to read the history of departments is through prestige (Berger and Luckman 1966). When disciplinary departments of higher education are structured by prestige, they constitute “institutional-structures;” since prestige is salient (Wallerstein 2007). For example, the discipline of sociology in the United States is structured by prestige, where the top-20 sociology graduate departments enact social closure through interdepartmental hiring practices. As

such, American Sociology is an “institutional-structure” of institutionalized knowledge and structured departments of prestige (Burris 2004). To be sure, social closure illustrates of power and therefore the top-20 sociology graduate departments represent an element of disciplinary power within the institutional-structure, and discipline, of American Sociology (Burris 2004; Lenski 1966).

Disciplinary departments of higher education are sites of knowledge reproduction, collective memory, and professionalization. Professionalization cognitively socializes members into seeing and knowing the profession. Dorothy Smith (2004:24), in reference to sociology graduate departments, illustrated this process clearly:

as graduate students learning to become sociologists, we learn to think sociology as it is thought and to practice it as it is practiced. We learn that some topics are relevant and some are not...to confine or focus our insights within the conceptual frameworks and relevances which are given in the discipline...we learn a way of thinking about the work which is recognizable to it practitioners as *the* sociological way of thinking (own emphasis added).

Critical theorists of education argue that education, including institutionalized knowledge reproduction and schools, serves to reproduce dominant power-relations whereby knowers’ are cognitively socialized into embody dominant power-relations and cognitive style (Bourdieu 1977; Woodson [1933]1977). Instead knowledge reflects the “ruling classes and elite members of dominant groups” (Stanfield 2011:33). Bourdieu (1977:446) argues that education reproduces habitus or a “set of predispositions” that is “deposited in each organism in the form of scheme of perception, thought, and action.” As such, habitus is “embodied history, internalized as a second-nature and so forgotten as history...[it] is the active presence of the whole past of which it is the product” and, importantly, “functions as accumulated capital” (Bourdieu [1974]2010:448). For

example, the reproduction of a discipline's theoretical canon serves as a cultural script of the discipline's embodied history, where knowing and practicing the canon acts as accumulated capital within the profession. While Bourdieu was specifically theorizing the embodiment of class power-relations, Bonilla-Silva (2014) applies the social structure of race to understanding habitus and the practice of white supremacy. As such, Bonilla-Silva (2014) conceptualizes "white habitus" as a "collective practice that helps reinforce the racial order" through the uninterrupted socialization process of reproducing white perceptions, white tastes, etc.

Within the sociology of education, scholars have described various ways that schools reproduce racialized structural inequalities that includes through microaggressions, tracking, and disciplining patterns, as well as observations of how institutionalized knowledge reproduces racialized power-relations of knowing that includes the concept of race and gender in textbooks, the (mis)representation of people of color in textbooks, as well as the reproduction of racialized, colonized knowledge in research methods (Hodge-Freeman, Mayorga, and Bonilla-Silva 2011; Marks 2008; Morning 2008; Smith 2012; Stone 1996; Margolis and Romero [1998]2000; Oakes 1985; Skiba et. al. 2002; Yosso, Smith, Ceja et. al 2009). However, scholars illuminate that within the sociology of higher education, studies that utilize the sociology of knowledge to understand professionalization processes and the reproduction of social inequalities of knowledge are limited (Gumpert 2007). For example, scholars illustrate the need for American Sociology to critically reflexively engage how racialized power-relations contemporarily structure knowledge reproduction and professionalization processes within higher education graduate departments (Collins 2007; Bhambra 2014).

In total, American Sociology is an “institutional-structure,” of institutionalized knowledge and structured prestige of graduate departments, that cognitively socializes members into a thought community of seeing and knowing how to study human groups. Institutions remember and forget, embody the past and read as scripts of racialized power-relations of knowledge. The next section explores literature on how racialized power-relations are read in the cultural script of American Sociology.

American Sociology and Racialized Power-Relations of Knowledge

This section explores what we know about American Sociology and racialized power-relations of knowledge. American Sociology, as an institutional-structure, reflects the structural racialized political-economic historical forces from which it emerged. Therefore, American Sociology reflects racialized structural inequalities that are read as racialized power-relations on cultural scripts of knowledge. There is a rich literature, much of which comes from the Africana Studies tradition of critiquing of knowledge, on how race structures American Sociology including via collective memory that includes knowing the history of the discipline, knowledge (re)production and epistemology that includes theory, methods, as well as paradigmatic assumptions and practices for knowledge production.

American Sociology, as a site of collective memory that cognitively and mnemonically socializes members into knowing who and what to remember and forget that reflects power-relations. Collective memory is an area scholars have explored to under the social processes of racialized power-relations of knowledge. Rabaka (2010:24) argues that American Sociology perpetuates racialized “epistemic apartheid” whereby whiteness propertied knowledge is included into, and non-whiteness propertied

knowledge is segregated out of, the discipline's institutionalized knowledge. Epistemic apartheid is the:

process of institutionalized racism [that is read in the] racial colonization and conceptual quarantining of knowledge, anti-imperial thought, and/or radical praxis produced and presented by non-white---and especially Black---intellectual activists (Rabaka 2010:

That history of racialized “epistemic apartheid” is the reason for the discipline’s practice of racialized collective memory and historical amnesia, as exemplified in the historical amnesia of W.E.B. Du Bois, Ida B. Wells-Barnett, and Oliver Cromwell Cox, unless commemorated by names of awards (Rabaka 2010:24; Wright II 2005; Collins 2007). Wright II contextualizes racialized power-relations of knowledge and the exclusion of W.E.B. Du Bois within the discipline’s historical amnesia of the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory, which Du Bois chaired, that held early social science conferences (Wright II 2009; Wright II 2012). The exclusion and marginalization of knowers subjugates ideas, a process that reads racialized power-relations of knowledge. For example, scholars have discussed the historical exclusion of Black women in sociology graduate departments and the resulting subjugation of the concept of intersectionality, as well as the institutionalization of Race, Gender, and Class Studies in sociology graduate departments (Collins 2007; Wyse 2014).

Race, as a social structure of white supremacy underwrites epistemology (Mills 1999; Stanfield 2011). Recently, scholars have studies how American Sociology’s theory and methods practices reproduce racialized structural inequalities of knowledge in order to understand the “epistemological arm of white supremacy” (Steinberg 2007; Bonilla-Silva and Zuberi 2008; Marks 2008). Zuberi and Bonilla-Silva (2008:17) conceptualize “white logic” as how white supremacy “define[s] the techniques and processes of

reasoning about social facts” that reproduces a Eurocentric and “ethnocentric orientation [that] is not objective” (Zuberi and Bonilla-Silva 2008:332). With “white logic,” “white methods” are “tools [that] manufacture empirical data and analysis to support the racial stratification of society” (Stanfield 2011). Together “white logic” and white methods” illustrate white supremacy’s superstructure that “create[s] racial knowledge” and reproduce racialized structural inequalities of knowledge and institutionalized racism (Zuberi and Bonilla-Silva 2008:17). Scholars illustrate that using race as an “independent causal variable” without theoretically conceptualizing race reproduces “white logic” and “white methods” that flattens out the meaning of race and ahistoricized, racializing individuals rather than making racialized social systems visible (James 2008; Marks 2008; Bonilla-Silva and Zuberi 2008; Stanfield 2011). To deracialize sociologically knowing race requires “theoretical and historical” grounding of race that in practice “deracialize[es]” the sociological imagination of race since it requires the “privilege[ing of] the human over the racialized individual” (Stanfield 2011:40; Zuberi and Bonilla-Silva 2008:335&337).

Scholars have also explored how the concept of race reads and how people of color are represented in sociology textbooks, as well as how experiences of graduate departments are affected by race (Marquez 1994; Stone 1996; Margolis and Romero [1998]2000;). Bhambra (2014b:477) discussed that “race continues to be segregated as a topic within sociology and “there is little discussion of the way race structures and continues to structure the sociological enterprise;” adding to group of scholars who have called for the same critical reflexivity of the discipline (Collins 2007; Margolis and Romero [1998]2000).

Though scholars have explored how racialized power-relations of knowledge structure American Sociology, including through the discipline's collective memory, white logic and white methods, the discussion around how racialized power-relations of knowledge are contemporarily reproduced in practice in the field is limited (Bhambra 2014a; Collins 2007; Margolis and Romero [1998]2000). Bhambra (2014b:477, 486) states that "sociology needs to urgently address its own knowledge claims in light of hierarchies and exclusions that they may contain." Scholars argue that empirical observations of the process of knowing race within sociology and professionalization processes is an endeavor highly worthy of study (Bhambra 2014a; Margolis and Romero [1998]2000). Therefore, this study engages critical reflexivity in order to understand American Sociology's contemporary knowledge reproduction process within sociology graduate departments and how race structures that process of knowing.

Methods

This study critically reflexively explores how race structures American Sociology's contemporary knowledge reproduction and production process. American Sociology is operationalized as both institutionalized knowledge and structured prestige, or an "institutional-structure" (Wallerstein 2007:436). As such this study purposefully sampled and triangulated data from the top-20 U.S. sociology graduate departments are representative of, generalizable to, American Sociology.

Recent sociology of sociology studies illuminate that U.S. sociology graduate departments are structured by prestige, which creates elite and non-elite sociology graduate departments (Burris 2004; Weakliem et. al 2001; Wallerstein 2007). Burris (2004) found that the top-20 U.S. sociology departments enact social closure through interdepartmental hiring processes, a process that illustrates social power (Lenski 1966).

Elite power is “profound” in that scholars therein “develop, critique, and implement ideas through their connections with media, book publishers, elite newspapers, magazines, private foundations, government agencies, and foreign governments” (Stanfield II 2011b:287). In the case of American Sociology, this study assumes since the top-20 U.S. sociology graduate departments hold disciplinary power within the discipline and is illustrative of dominant power-relations within the institutional-structure (Lenski 1966; Stanfield 2011). This study uses Burris’s sample of prestigious departments (See Table 1).

Syllabi, dissertations, and personal testimonies are cultural scripts of knowledge of sociology graduate departments that represent sites of institutionalized knowledge reproduction, collective memory, and professionalization. Therefore, this study analyzes a triangulation of data that includes twenty (20) Ph.D.-level required theory course syllabi, 46 interviews, fifteen (15) with faculty that study race and 31 with Ph.D.-candidates studying sociology, and 67 dissertations defended in 2011, at the top-20 U.S. sociology graduate departments.

The Ph.D.-level required theory course syllabi data was collected by contacting the top-20 U.S. sociology departments via email to request copies of the required theory course syllabi from 2011-2012. Though the majority of the syllabi are from 2011-2012, some departments responded with syllabi dating back to 2000. In this case, I operationalized contemporary syllabi from what was collected as between 2002-2012; though 2004 is the oldest of the syllabi. In total twenty (20) syllabi from fourteen (14), or 70%, of the top-20 departments are included in this sample. Faculty participants were contacted via email after a search of the top-20 sociology graduate department webpages

for faculty that identified race, race/ethnicity, multiracial studies, ethnic studies, whiteness studies and/or critical race studies as one of their research interests. In all, fifteen (15) faculty members that study race participated in the study, who collectively represent twelve (12), or 60% of the top-20 departments. The fifteen (15) faculty that study race included eight (8) Full Professors, three (3) Associate Professors, three (3) Assistant Professors, one (1) Visiting Assistant Professor, and one (1) Professor Emeritus. With the larger number of Full Professors who participated in this study, it could be that having full-tenure affects willingness to participate in this study.

On the other hand, in order to solicit Ph.D. candidate participants, the top-20 sociology graduate departments were contacted to see if they call for participation would be forwarded to the graduate student listserv. In all 31 Ph.D. candidates that study sociology at the top-20 U.S. sociology graduate departments participated, representing nine (9), or 45%, of the departments in the sample. The dissertation data was collected using the “ProQuest Dissertation and Theses” database to obtain dissertations defended between January 1, 2011 and December 31, 2011 at the top-20 U.S. sociology departments. ProQuest is an online archival database of dissertations and theses from various disciplines and schools. The sample included 67 dissertations that represent 13, or 65%, of the top-20 U.S. sociology departments.

This study utilizes a methodological triangulation of data that includes, syllabi, dissertations, and personal testimonies which serve as cultural scripts on which racialized power-relations of knowledge can be read and thus too the meaning American Sociology’s contemporary knowledge reproduction process. Utilizing methodological triangulation strengthens the reliability and validity of the empirical observations in order

to garner a more robust understanding of the processes of racialized power-relations of knowledge and contemporary American Sociology (Denzin 1970; Yeasmin and Rahmin 2012). Both critical race and feminist standpoint theoretical perspectives were used critical reflexively to methodologically analyze and interpret the triangulated data. Critical reflexivity is a methodological tool to analyze power-relations of knowledge within disciplines. Critical race theory explains the “intersection of race and property” where “curriculum represents a form of intellectual property” and the “construction of whiteness [is] the ultimate property” that functions as cultural capital (Ladson-Billings and Tate 1994:54&58; Harris 1993). Critical race theory and race based methodologies “make visible what is often invisible, taken for granted, or assumed in our knowledge and practice...and do this out of necessity” (Pillow 2003:189). Specifically, race based methodologies challenge “Eurocentrism and racism in existing frameworks and epistemologies for doing and thinking about social science research” and, as such, “contributes to a decentralization of Eurocentric thought” (Pillow 2003:183&196).

Standpoint theory and “research...[seeks to] precisely to map the conceptual practices through which particular institutions, such as disciplines, serve oppressive forms of power” (Harding 2004:12). Feminist standpoint theorists explain that “standpoint structures epistemology,” where specially espitemology is analyzed through the knower, the known, and the process of knowing, as well as the role of [dominant] power-relations of knowledge (Sprague 2005; Hartsock 2004:36).

Together, critical race and feminist standpoint theories allows for a methodological analysis of knowledge production within disciplined boundaries of institutionalized knowledge, as well as a critical exploration of racialized power-relations

of knowledge and contemporary American Sociology's institutionalized knowledge reproduction process. Within this methodological frame, the data was broken down in order to read American Sociology's habit memory, habitus of knowledge, and the cognitive socialization around race within professionalization processes. As such, below details how this study analyzed each data source.

The syllabi data was analyzed a couple of ways. First, all the required readings listed on the syllabi were coded by author and the title of the required reading. Second, all required readings that originated from journal articles were coded by journal title. Lastly, the syllabi, were coded for if race and/or gender was engaged in the course content. The dissertations data was coded in a sequence. First, the dissertation sample was coded for if race was used in the analysis; if the dissertations did employ race in the analyses, then they were coded for how race was operationalized, or measured. The dissertations that used race in the analyses were then coded for how race was theoretically conceptualized.

The interviews with both the faculty and Ph.D. candidates were coded for themes. Specifically, the interviews were coded for themes that emerged in response to specific questions around knowing race in sociology graduate departments, as well as themes that emerged throughout the entire interview process across participants about knowledge reproduction. Together these data were methodologically triangulated to analyze habit memory, American Sociology's cognitive socialization around race within professionalization processes, and racialized power-relations of knowledge reproduction processes.

Analysis
Syllabi Analysis

All the required readings listed on the syllabi were coded by author and the title of the required reading. In total, the twenty (2) syllabi had 892 required readings, of which there were 452 authors. The most often required readings were authored by Marx, Weber, and Durkheim on 50% of the syllabi. Simmel was required reading on 50% of the syllabi and Bourdieu was required on 45% of the syllabi. However, the coding of required readings by author and title reveals another breakdown of this data. Specifically, six (6) authors (Marx, Weber, Durkheim, Engels, Simmel, and Bourdieu) out of the 452 authors represented on the syllabi wrote 241 of the 892. Meaning 1.3% of the authors represented on the syllabi wrote 27% of the required readings, whereas 98.6% of the authors represented on the syllabi wrote 73% of the required readings.

The syllabi data was broke down to see if race and gender were reproduced within Ph.D.-level required theory courses. Of the twenty (20) syllabi, ten (10) had required readings that engaged race in some way. The twenty (20) syllabi were split into groups based on the type of theory course, of which fourteen (14) syllabi fit into the classification “classical theory,” “contemporary theory,” or “general sociological theory.” These fourteen (14) syllabi were analyzed to see if race was part of the required readings. Of the five “classical theory” course syllabi, only one required readings that engaged race. Of the five “contemporary theory” syllabi, three syllabi engaged race and, lastly, of the four “sociological theory” course syllabi, three required readings that engaged race.

The twenty (2) syllabi were also coded for if they required readings that engage gender. Of the twenty (20) syllabi, twelve (12) required readings that engage gender. The fourteen (14) syllabi that were classified as “classical theory,” “contemporary theory,” or “general sociological theory” were analyzed to see the patterns of if gender

was engaged in the required readings. Of the five “classical theory” course syllabi, two required readings that engaged gender; both of which required reading Engels. Of the five “contemporary theory” syllabi, four syllabi engaged gender and, lastly, all four of the “general sociological theory” courses engaged gender.

Faculty Interviews Analysis

The interviews with faculty that study race at the top-20 U.S. sociology departments were analyzed through the emergence of themes and answers to questions that are specific to the knowledge reproduction of race. In connection with the analysis of the syllabi, the faculty participants were informed of the dominance of Marx, Weber, Durkheim, and Simmel in the required Ph.D.-level theory syllabi, and were asked how they thought this theoretical canon influences students’ sociological imaginations. Eight (8) participants discussed how the theoretical canon reproduces the discipline’s history of thought as whiteness. For example, Edith stated that “among whites generally and white scholars specifically, there is a tendency to think that the subjects of history are white.” In addition, in response to the syllabi analysis, six (6) of the fifteen (15) faculty participants also discussed that the theoretical canon of sociology reproduces the irrelevancy of race theory. As one faculty participant stated,

It is very important to read [scholars of color’s] original works and their views on epistemology. They don’t treat knowledge in the same way...The white, European model is only one way [of thinking]...It’s so limited...The impression I got as a graduate student, that I had to unlearn, was “this is the one right way to think.”...That..., I think, is a serious problem...that is the kind of thing that really bugs me about sociology.

Seven (7) of the fifteen (15) faculty participants discussed the limited reproduction of race theory in their respective departments; summed up in Anna’s

statement, “There is really no wrestling over racial theory in this department, so there is not any real presentation of race theory.” Seven (7) faculty participants out of fifteen (15) stated that race is reproduced as a variable and six (6) faculty participants discussed that dialogue around race is heavily empirical.

Seven (7) of the fifteen (15) participants discussed that they teach race theory in their courses. Of the seven (7) participant’s that discussed teaching race theory in their courses, four (4) stated that they teach race theoretically as a social construction.

Ph.D. Candidate Interviews Analysis

The Ph.D. candidate interviews were analyzed according to themes that emerged related to the learning process and the reproduction of race in U.S. sociology graduate departments. The Ph.D. candidate participants were specifically asked, “In what ways have you learned about race in grad school?” Twenty five (25) Ph.D. candidate participants, out of thirty one (31), from all nine (9) departments represented, discussed that they did not learn race theory in their departments’ required theory course(s). As Lucile reflected, “In graduate school....[race theory is] certainly not mandatory. I think that is mostly because our...required social theory class our first year just does not require it.”

Seven (7) Ph.D. candidate participants out of thirty one (31) reflected that the sociology theory curricula reproduces whiteness. For example, Lucile illustrated,

I always remember when I took my social theory course in undergrad, my professor, who was a graduate student at the time, was like, “so I included Du Bois in here in the syllabus, but that is really rare for a social theory course.” And I didn’t really think anything of it until I went to grad school and realized, yea it is really rare for a social theory course to have prolific African American authors

being studied because mostly all we do is study old white guys who are dead, or lived in Germany, or in England.

Charlotte also reflected on sociology's curricula whiteness,

I can't help but think when I was taking that Race and Ethnic Studies class, that it is curious that the people who were developing these theories were...privileged white men. Not to say that their contributions weren't valid, but thinking about race has definitely been influenced by their work, thinking about race in sociology, and in terms of my department in sociology has definitely been influenced by that kind of work.

Twenty one (21) Ph.D. candidate participants from seven (7) departments discussed that race comes up in sociology classes. Annie stated, "I do think that people in sociology are very cognizant of race and racial inequality and it is certainly something that is fairly openly discussed in courses" and Florence furthered, "I would say that most of the classes I have taken have gone over it a little bit. Like the inequality class had some articles that were about segregation and differences in incarceration rates." Perry described how race comes up in classes,

When I'm learning statistics or something like that, it is often the example that is used...thinking about race, how do we categorize race, how do people categorize themselves, are we going to use it to analyze things. It's a variable you have to consider.

Even more so, eighteen (18) Ph.D. candidate participants stated that they understand race as central to the field of sociology. As Earle reflected,

There is kind of a feeling of a fault structure in terms of [that] the grad program doesn't seem to be emphasizing [race theory] yet, I think on the whole, anyway, the field of sociology certainly recognizes it as an important part of the way that sociology has been done and it certainly is...very central...to the field.

However, twenty seven (27) Ph.D. candidate participants representing all nine (9) departments reflected that they did not systematically learn race theory in their graduate sociology department, including outside of the required theory course. Joyce discussed,

The departmental strength has not historically been in race studies [but] race now is more of a component...So I don't know anything. And [race] has been instrumental to my own research...but I haven't learned about race systematically in my graduate career.

And Ida affirmed,

I think just in general, it's something that [graduate students]...caught on very quickly that [race theory] wasn't an area that is really talked about much in our department and it was really disturbing.

Sixteen (16) Ph.D. candidate participants, that represented seven (7) departments, emphasized that there is little to no discussion of race theory in the professionalization process. Ruth explained,

So I think in our department thinking about race doesn't happen so much as...it's more the way race plays out in employment...hiring...incarceration...education...There are probably other theoretical ways that sociologists think about theory around race. And I think that happens less here.

Florence furthered,

I would say the vast majority of what we have talked about race in the class is not talking about race in a theoretical way, it's assuming...there are Black people, white people, like the commonsense American shorthand.

Twelve (12) Ph.D. participants discussed the empirical learning of race in their departments. Leta detailed "that my graduate training...allowed me to have a more empirical understanding of [race]. To expose [race] to the actual research that connects it to stratification." At the same time, seven (7) Ph.D. participants discussed how race is learned differently within the field of sociology based on method. Theresa reflected,

We talk in sociology about how, what does it mean to get African Americans in your sample, you know, things like that. And then a lot of the qualitative sociologists in my department talk about race in an alternatively different way...I think the concept of race in different subfields of sociology is interesting to me.

Wilbur furthered,

I think different sub-fields have kind of different approaches to how they field questions they raise...I have taken a lot of classes in health sociology they also pretty much just give you numbers...It's like African Americans have this characteristic and whites have this characteristic. It's not at all theorized.

Eleven (11) Ph.D. participants discussed their own teaching experiences as a means of learning the concept of race. For example, Stanley illustrated that while he was not systematically taught about race in his coursework, teaching was a space that allowed him to learn;

when I then had to teach [race] as a TA leading a section in our intro to sociology course for freshman, and I had to teach others, what does it mean when we say the social construction of race, that provided an opportunity for me to rethink how I approach that topic and how I would communicate it to somebody who is really sort of a novice in the field.

In that same vein, ten (10) Ph.D. participants discussed learning race through dialogue with colleagues, where seven (7) participants specified non-classroom dialogue and relationships with other graduate students as a means of learning about race. Eight (8) participants discussed learning race through attending various workshops and colloquia within the university. Lastly, eight (8) participants discussed learning race theory in undergrad as opposed to graduate school. Mabel stated “I had more rigorous theoretical training in my undergraduate” and Lucile confirmed “I had more race theory in the theory course I took as an undergrad.” Wilbur furthered,

I would say I probably got a better background in race from my undergraduate theory courses where we actually read W.E.B. Du Bois and, you know, that was probably the only time I ever read Du Bois.

Eight (8) Ph.D. participants noted that the discussion around race in their departments' and the field of sociology in general reproduces commonsense and atheoretical knowledge about race. Wilbur described,

In the class on urban sociology that I took, it dealt a lot with race and the actual makeup of [the race concept] was not considered at all...It was just pretty much known there was Black people, there was white people. There was an argument about that.

Florence furthered,

I have talked about [sociology's problematic use of race] a little bit with the guy who is the most interested in race in this department...So sometimes I bring it up in class, well this is not an adequate way of using race when they did this statistical analysis. I *think* people know what I mean, but I am not sure that they do, given that we have never had sort of a theoretical discussion about race in any of the required classes.

Mildred conveyed,

I was disappointed when I came here in sociology in general because I thought, man these sociologists are supposed to believe that race is socially constructed and move beyond [that], and they don't! So I think I understand sociology as being very trapped and limited right now...the field is not always as forward thinking as I had assumed it would be.

Conversely, eleven (11) Ph.D. candidate participants discussed that they independently learned race theory, including two (2) participants that learned race theory through their qualifying exams and four (4) participants that learned about race in graduate student organized reading groups. For example, Ida discussed the process of learning race theory through independent graduate reading groups:

Students...created their own reading group, and this was a various racial background group...just students in general from our department who couldn't

understand why this type of literature wasn't being discussed and to try and figure out a way to incorporate it in our learning.

Dissertations Analysis

Of the 67 dissertations, thirty three (33) dissertations, or 49%, did not include race and/or ethnicity in the analyses, thirty two (32) dissertations, or 48%, did include race in the analyses, and two (2) dissertations, or 3%, included ethnicity without race in the analyses. Of the thirty two (32) dissertations that used race in the analyses, thirteen (13), or 41%, quantitatively operationalized race, thirteen (13), or 41%, qualitatively operationalized race, and six (6), or 18%, operationalized race both quantitatively and qualitatively. Each of the nineteen (19) dissertations that quantitatively operationalized race, race was measured as a demographic variable. Of the nineteen (19) dissertations that quantitatively measured race, fifteen (15), or 79%, operationalized "Hispanic" or "Latino" as a race exclusive of other racial demographics. Additionally, nine (9), or approx. 47%, of the nineteen (19) dissertations that operationalized race as a demographic variable, controlled for race in the analyses. On the other hand, of the nineteen (19) dissertations that included qualitative measures of race, nine (9), or approx. 47%, operationalized race as "identity" (i.e. identity formation, experiences based on identity) and six (6), or approx. 32%, as "boundary work."

Of the 32 dissertations that used race in the analyses, twelve (12) dissertations, or 37.5%, did not theoretically conceptualize race and twenty (20), or 62.5%, did. Of the twenty (20) dissertations that did, the most common conceptualization was "collective identity" in eight (8) dissertations, "social construction" in seven (7) dissertations, a "social structure" in six (6) dissertations, "culture" in five (5) dissertations, four (4) conceptualized race as an "ascribed status," four (4) conceptualized race as a "social

system,” and lastly, four (4) conceptualized race as a social process of racial formation. To be sure these conceptualizations are not independent of each other. For example, each of the four (4) dissertations that conceptualized race as a social process of racial formation also conceptualized race as a social structure. Most specifically, of the nine (9) dissertations that used race as a control variable, five (5), or 55.5%, did not theoretically conceptualize race.

Discussion

This study engaged in a critical reflexive analysis of American Sociology’s contemporary institutionalized knowledge reproduction process in graduate departments in order to describe how racialized power-relations structure this process. This study empirically observes American Sociology’s, as an “institutional-structure,” knowledge reproduction process and how race structures that process through the use of the triangulated data of syllabi, interviews, and dissertation collected from the top-20 sociology graduate departments.

The purpose of this study was to explore American Sociology’s contemporary reproduction of institutionalized knowledge in sociology department of higher education, as well as understand how race structures that process. This study hypothesized that if racialized power-relations of knowledge privilege whiteness propertied knowledge and enact institutionalized racism, then American Sociology’s contemporary institutionalized knowledge reproduction process embodies these racialized power-relations. From that hypothesis, this study explores American Sociology’s contemporary knowledge reproduction process by asking: 1) What is the process of knowing race in sociology graduate departments? And 2) what is the practice of knowing race in sociology graduate departments?

Critical race theory and Feminist standpoint theory were used to methodologically sociologically imagine epistemology and the intersection of race and knowledge. In order to understand American Sociology's institutionalized knowledge process, this study also utilized Bergson's concept of "habit memory" to sociologically imagine the disciplines history of institutionalized knowledge in the present, which is a method that engages the discipline's collective memory and power-relations of knowledge. This study found that American Sociology contemporarily reproduces white habit memory and cognitive socializes the empirical figure of race relevant and the contextual ground of race theory irrelevant, and thus, in practice, reproduces a white habitus of knowledge that reinforces the racial order and reproduces racialized structural inequalities of knowledge.

American Sociology reproduces a "white habit memory" whereby sociologists are professionalized to embody whiteness propertied knowledge that "functions as accumulated capital." White habit memory, the "physical incarnation of the past in the present" serves as "dominant cultural capital[,]...[that] facilitate[s a] particular [style] of self-representation perceived consciously or implicitly by institutional gatekeepers to be markers of a superior student, endowed with sophistication and intelligence" (Bourdieu 1996:31 cited in Lizardo 2010:310). For example, professionalized sociologists' are expected to competently know Marx, Weber, Durkheim, Engels in required theory courses, however, there are no expectations to competently know W.E.B. Du Bois and Oliver C. Cox in required theory courses.

The profound dominance of Marx, Weber, Durkheim, Engels, Simmel, and Bourdieu, in the reproduction of American Sociology's required theory courses, and near amnesia of W.E.B. Du Bois and Jane Addams specifically, reads the narrative of

racialized gendered power-relations where whiteness propertied knowledge is privileged. The racialized power-relations that privilege whiteness propertied knowledge and contextualize the historical development of American Sociology structure the contemporary reproduction of the discipline's history of knowledge or theory. This is read perfectly in that of the five "classical theory" course syllabi, only one required readings that engaged race and two required readings that engaged gender; both of which required reading Engels for gender. Further, the faculty were informed of the dominant pattern of Marx, Weber, and Durkheim in the required Ph.D.-level theory syllabi and they were asked how they think this reproduction of knowledge influences students' sociological imaginations. Eight (8) of the fifteen participants reaffirmed that the theoretical canon reproduces the discipline's history of thought as privileging whiteness propertied knowledge. As one participant stated, "among whites generally and white scholars specifically, there is a tendency to think that the subjects of history are white."

American Sociology *cognitively socializes* sociologists as part of the professionalization process that race theory is irrelevant to understanding our social world, as illustrated in the triangulated data from the required Ph.D.-level theory syllabi, faculty interviews, Ph.D. candidate interviews, and defended dissertations. The limited engagement with race theory in the knowledge reproduction profess cognitively socializes professionalized sociologists to see race as empirically relevant but theoretically irrelevant. To see the "figure" of "race" but not "ground" of race theory is an act of social power that "decontextualizes perception" and reinforces a white habitus of knowledge. Since "habitus...is constituted in practice and is always oriented toward practical functions," the atheoretical reproduction of race reinforces white habitus of

knowledge that, in practice, reproduce racialized structural inequalities of knowledge (Bourdieu (1974:444). Therefore this study confirms the hypotheses and illustrates how, using white habit memory, American Sociology contemporarily reproduces and professionalizes a white habitus of knowledge in sociology graduate schools that reinforces structural inequalities of knowledge, or “the epistemological arm of white supremacy” through the use of white methods and white logic (Bonilla-Silva and Zuberi 2008).

This study relates adds to the literature in multiple ways including that it 1) analyzes American Sociology as an “institutional-structure,” 2) utilizes the sociology of knowledge to conduct a study within the realm of the sociology of higher education, 3) situates American Sociology within the “Global Politics of Knowledge” in order to explore the role of race, power, and colonality within the discipline, 4) employs critical reflexivity to sociologically imagine racialized structural inequalities of knowledge as reproduced within American Sociology, as well as 5) explores the contemporary reproduction of power-relations of knowledge within professionalization processes in sociology graduate departments (Wallerstein 2007; Gumpert 2007)

The findings of this study yield important implications for the discipline of American Sociology and the sociology of knowledge in general. Just as Garrison (1999:77) that the sociology of knowledge allows for us “to see beyond the created facades of organizations and institutions to the reality of their social processes,” this sociology of knowledge study makes visible the discipline’s contemporary practices of racialized power-relations of in institutionalized knowledge reproduction and professionalization processes. This empirical observation interpreted as the reproduction

of white habitus of knowledge urges American Sociology enact agency to deracialize knowledge reproduction and professionalization processes including both the discipline's institution and organizations of higher education. American Sociology's institutionalized reproduction of theory and the discipline's history should engage contextual racialized power-relations of knowledge in order to reproduce deracialized sociological imaginations and a more robust ability to understand the discipline of sociology; as Garrison (1999) noted, importantly, the sociology of knowledge allows for us to "see beyond the created facades of organizations and institutions to the reality of their social processes" where "without being alert to the social sources of knowledge, we have reduced the ability of our understanding." Engaging racialized power-relations of knowledges means in practice that the discipline reproducing knowing race theoretically to contextualize empirical analyses of race and understanding social reality. This process of knowing race decolonizes sociological imaginations and fights against the reproduction of white logic and white methods; the epistemological arm of white supremacy. More broadly, the discipline needs to professionalize and cognitively socialize thought communities members to see and know theory as central to the discipline, not reproduced as a subsection. Sociologists can actively deracialize and decolonize their own sociological imaginations so as to be racially conscious of racialized power-relations of knowledge.

There are many avenues of future research. This analyses of American Sociology's contemporary reproduction process of knowledge was situated within graduate schools, however there are other areas in which knowledge processes are reflected including, importantly, knowledge dissemination. Not only in terms of

curricula but also in terms of journals. How does racialized gendered structural inequalities of knowledge affect the reproduction of who's accepted, what theories are accepted, the role of journals, R&R's; especially because publication is so important to the professionalization processes both for graduate students and faculty. Future research could also look at the way sociology graduate departments try to actively reproduce social justice education and decolonized sociological imaginations that combats privileging whiteness propertied knowledge and institutionalized racism within their teaching and learning processes. Looking at the reproduction of knowledge within the top-20 U.S. sociology graduate departments is particularly important because how prestige enables influence in areas such as publishing, media, grants, committee work, etc. (Stanfield 2011).

The study helps us understand the problem of American Sociology's reproduction of racialized power-relations, and structural inequalities, of knowledge, with the hopes that knowing how the problem works lends itself to part of the solution. Knowledge is power, and knowledge is empowering. This study adds to a legacy of knowledge that attempts to understand American Sociology's reproduction of racialized power-relations of knowledge that, in practice, hopes to empower knower's. As Carter G. Woodson (Woodson [1933]1977:xix) equated, if we can deracialize a disciplines "thinking you [don't] have to worry about [the discipline's] actions."

References

- Abdi, Ali A. 2005. "African Philosophies of Education: Counter-Colonial Criticisms." Pp. 25-42 in *Issues in African Education: Sociological Perspectives* edited by A. Abdi and A. Cleghorn. New York: Palgrave MacMillian.
- Bhambra, Gurinder K. 2014a. "Introduction: Knowledge Production in Global Context: Power and Coloniality." *Current Sociology* 6(2):452-454.
_____. b. "A Sociological Dilemma: Race, Segregation, and U.S. Sociology." *Current Sociology* 6(2):474-486.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2014. *Racism without Racists: Color-blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States*, 3rd ed. Lanham, M.D.: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
_____. 1997. "Rethinking Racism: Towards a Structural Interpretation." *American Sociological Review* 62:465-480.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo and Tukufu Zuberi. 2008. "Toward a Definition of White Logic and White Methods." Pp. 3-30 in *White Logic, White Methods: Racism and Methodology*, edited by Tukufu Zuberi and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. "Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction." Pp. 487-511, in *Power and Ideology in Education*, edited by J. Karabel and A.H. Halsey. New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 2007. "Pushing the Boundaries or Business as Usual? Race, Class, and Gender Studies and Sociological Inquiry." In *Sociology in America A History*, edited by Craig Calhoun, pp. 572-604.
- Cox, Oliver C. 1948. *Caste, Class, & Race; A Study in Social Dynamics*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.
- Curtis, James E. and John W. Petras. 1972. "The Sociology of Knowledge in American Sociology: Origins, Development, and Future." *Kansas Journal of Sociology* 8(2):181-204.
- Fanon, Frantz. 1965. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press.
- Glenn, Evelyn N. 1999. "The Social Construction and Institutionalization of Gender and Race." Pp. 3-43 in *Revisioning Gender*, edited by Mara Marx Ferree, Judith Lorber, and Beth B. Hess. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gumpert, Patricia J. 2007. "Reflections on a Hybrid Field: Growth and Prospects for the Sociology of Higher Education." Pp. 325-362 in *Sociology of Higher Education*:

Contributions and Their Contexts, edited by Patricia J. Gumpert. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Harding, Sandra. 2004. "Introduction: Standpoint Theory as a Site of Political, Philosophic, and Scientific Debate." Pp. 1-16 in *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies*, edited by Sandra Harding. New York: Routledge.

James, Angela. 2008. "Making Sense of Race and Racial Classification." Pp. 31-45 in *White Logic, White Methods: Racism and Methodology*, edited by Tukufu Zuberi and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Margolis, Eric and Mary Romero. [1998]2000. "The Department is Very Male, Very White, Very Old, and Very Conservative': The Functioning of the Hidden Curriculum in Graduate Sociology Departments." Pp. 1276-1311 in *The Sociology of Education Volume III*, edited by Stephen J. Ball. London: Routledge.

Marks, Carole. 2008. "Methodologically Eliminating Race and Racism." Pp. 47-62 in *White Logic, White Methods: Racism and Methodology*, edited by Tukufu Zuberi and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Marquez, Stephanie Amedeo. 1994. "Distorting the Image of 'Hispanic' Women in Sociology. Problematic Strategies of Presentation in Introductory Textbooks." *Teaching Sociology* 22(3):231-236.

Marx, Karl. 2008. "Ideology and Class." Pp 89-90 in *Social Stratification: Class, Race, and Gender in Sociological Perspective*, edited by D. B. Grusky. Philadelphia: Westview Press.

Memmi, Albert. 1965. *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. New York: Orion Press.

Mills, Charles. 1999. *The Racial Contract*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Pillow, Wanda. 2003. "Race-Based Methodologies: Multicultural Methods or Epistemological Shifts." Pp. 181-202 in *Interrogating Racism in Qualitative Research Methodology*, edited by Gerardo R. Lopez and Laurence Parker. New York: Peter Lang.

Rabaka, Reiland. 2010. *Against Epistemic Apartheid: W.E.B. Du Bois and the Disciplinary Decadence of Sociology*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

- Rodney, Walter. 1972. *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. London: Bogle-L'Uverture Publications.
- Smith, Dorothy. 2004. "Women's Perspective as a Radical Critique of Sociology." In *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies*, edited by Sandra Harding. New York: Routledge.
- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 2012. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, 2nd Edition. New York: Zed Books.
- de Sousa Santos, Boaventura, João Arriscado Nunes, and Maria Paula Meneses. 2007. "Introduction: Opening Up the Canon of Knowledge and Recognition of Difference" in *Another Knowledge is Possible: Beyond Northern Epistemologies*, edited by Boaventura de Sousa Santos, pp. xvivx-lxii.
- Sprague, Joey. 2005. *Feminist Methodologies for Critical Researchers: Bridging Differences*. Walnut Creek, CA: Lanham, MD.
- Sprague, Joey and Diane Kobrynowicz. 1999. "A Feminist Epistemology." In *The Handbook of the Sociology of Gender*, edited by Janet Saltzman Chafetz. New York: Kluwer Academic/ Plenum Publishers.
- Stanfield II, John H. 2011a. *Black Reflective Sociology: Epistemology, Theory, and Methodology*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- _____. 2011b. *Rethinking Race and Ethnicity in Research Methods*, edited by John H. Stanfield. Walnut Creek, C.A.: Left Coast Press.
- Staples, Robert. 1976. *Introduction to Black sociology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- _____. 1973. "What is Black Sociology?" Pp. 161-172 in *The Death of White Sociology*, edited by Joyce Ladner. New York: Vintage Books, pp 161-172.
- Steinberg, Stephen. 2007. *Race Relations: A Critique*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Social Sciences.
- Stone, Pamela. 1996. "Ghettoized and Marginalized: The Coverage of Racial and Ethnic Groups in Introductory Textbooks." *Teaching Sociology* 24(4):356-363.
- Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. 1995. *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*. Boston, Mass: Beacon Press.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2007. "The Culture of Sociology in Disarray: The Impact of 1968 on U.S. Sociologists." In *Sociology in America A History*, edited by Craig Calhoun, pp. 427-437.

- Weakliem, David L., Gauchat, Gordon and Bradley R. E. Wright. 2011. "Sociological Stratification: Change and Continuity in the Distribution of Departmental Prestige, 1965–2007." DOI 10.1007/s12108-011-9133-2.
- Woodson, Carter G. [1933]1977. *The Mis-Education of the Negro*. New York: AMS Press.
- Wright II, Earl. 2009. "Beyond W.E.B. Du Bois: A Note on Some of the Little Known Members of the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory." *Sociological Spectrum* 29:6:700-717.
- _____. 2012a. "Using the Master's Tools: The Atlanta Sociological Laboratory and American Sociology, 1896-1924." *Sociological Spectrum* 22(1):15-39.
- _____. 2002. "Why Black People Tend To Shout!: An Earnest Attempt To Explain the Sociological Negation of the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory Despite Its Possible Unpleasantness." *Sociological Spectrum* 22(3):325-361.
- _____. 2012b. "Why, Where, and How to Infuse the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory into the Sociology Curriculum." *Teaching Sociology* 40(3):257-270.
- Wyse, Jennifer Padilla. 2014. "American Sociology: History and Racially Gendered Classed Knowledge Reproduction." *Journal of Historical Sociology* 27:49-74. Doi: 10.1111/johs.12032.
- _____. (Forthcoming). "Black Sociology: The Sociology of Knowledge, Racialized Power-Relations of Knowledge and Humanistic Liberation." In *Black Sociology: Contemporary Issues and Future Directions*. Ashgate Publishing.

Table 1: Top-20 U.S. Sociology Departments

Rank	PhD-granting Sociology Department
1	Wisconsin
2	Chicago
3	Michigan
4	UC Berkeley
5	Harvard
6	Columbia
7	Stanford
8	North Carolina
9	Indiana
10	Washington
11	Yale
12	Texas
13	Pennsylvania
14	Northwestern
15	Cornell
16	Princeton
17	Minnesota
18	Ohio State
19	Duke
20	Johns Hopkins

* Per Burris (2004) sample.

APPENDIX

The idea for this research project came out of my own experiences of graduate learning the Department of Sociology and the Program of Africana Studies. In the program of Africana Studies I would learn about Africana social theorists were never mentioned in my sociology studies and my colleagues did not know of them. I became interested in why this was the case, considering that race, which the Africana social theorists were theorizing, is a hot topic in sociology.

A little bit more about my sample recruitment. In order to recruit faculty members, I contacted every faculty member at the top-20 US sociology departments who were identified on the department's webpage as doing research on race. Some faculty did not respond, some responded but declined participation for various reasons, and 15 responded that they would like to participate. In order to recruit PhD candidates, I contacted the department via their contact information on the department website and asked if they could forward my call for participation over their listserv. Some departments never responded and some declined to send the call over the listserv.

Rapport with the PhD candidates came through our shared experiences as graduate students working toward a PhD. Many PhD candidate interviewees expressed that their participation was prompted by empathy for the research process; the challenge of getting participants and good research data. Participation also put out good research karma.

Interviewing the faculty candidates was intimidating. The actual act of interviewing the faculty participants was intimidating. However many of the faculty participants encouraged my research, stating that they found the topic to be interesting.

As far as member checks, the faculty participants were informed of the preliminary findings of the required Ph.D.-level theory syllabi analysis. No further member checks were implemented, however this is an avenue for future research.