Journal of Economy Culture and Society

Araştırma Makalesi / Research Article

The Second Sociology in Turkish Higher Education: A Quantitative Analysis of 30 Introductory Sociology Textbooks[*]

Türkiye'de Yükseköğretimde İkinci Sosyoloji: 30 Sosyolojiye Giriş Kitabının Nicel Bir Analizi

Hicabi KAYNAK[1] , Tuğça Poyraz TACOĞLU[2]

[1]Hacettepe University, Department of Sociology, Ankara, Turkey
[2]Hacettepe University, Department of Sociology, Ankara, Turkey

ORCID: H.K. XXXXXXXXXXXXXX
T.P.C. 0000-0003-3717-4728

Corresponding author:
Hicabi KAYNAK,
Hacettepe University, Department of Sociology, Ankara, Turkey
E-mail: hicabikaynak@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

There is a distinction between the literary forms of research-oriented scientific practice and those of scientific education, popularized in the early decades of the 20th century. This distinction emphasizes differences between "journal science", whose audiences are mostly specialists, and "popular science" or "textbook science", written for non-specialist public or students. In the early 2000's, the term "two sociologies" was coined by Hamilton and Form to mark a similar differentiation in sociology. However, the disciplinary attention to this distinction and its problems can be traced back to the 1920s, and with the help of the existing research on sociology textbooks, some important solutions has been produced in Western academies. By stressing the difference between "two sociologies", this research presents the findings of a quantitative content analysis on Turkish introductory sociology textbooks for higher education. The main objective of the study is to satisfy the need for such researches in Turkey and to describe the problems of the texts. The study results strengthen the argument that there is a link between standardization issues in the discipline and the textbook problems.

Keywords: Two sociologies, disciplinary problems, textbook sociology, teaching sociology

ÖZ

Araştırmacı bilimsel pratiğin doğrudan ifadesi olan yazın ile bilimsel disiplinlerin eğitim amaçlı yazın türleri arasında geçen yüz yılın erken dönemlerinden bu yana bilinen bir ayrım vardır. Bu ayrım doğrudan uzman kitlesine yönelik olan "mecmua bilimi" ile "popüler bilim" veya "ders kitabı bilimi" arasındaki farklılıkları vurgulamayı amaçlar. 2000'ler ile birlikte sosyolojideki benzer bir ayrım Hamilton ve Form tarafından "iki sosyoloji" biçiminde adlandırılmıştır. Ancak bu yazın türleri arasındaki farklar ve yarattıkları sorunlara yönelik ilgi 1920'lere kadar gitmektedir ve

mevcut araştırma birikiminin ışığında, Batı akademilerinde ders kitaplarındaki ciddi problemlerin çözümü ile ilgili halihazırda önemli adımlar atılmaya başlamıştır. Bu araştırma, "iki sosyoloji" ayrımını merkeze alarak Türkiye'de yükseköğretime yönelik yazılmış iki farklı döneme ait sosyoloji ders kitaplarının nicel bir içerik analizinin bulgularını ve karşılaştırmasını sunmaktadır. Bu sayede Türkiye'deki sosyoloji ders kitapları hakkında böylesi bir araştırmaya dönük ihtiyacı yanıtlamak ve sorunları belgelemek amaçlanmaktadır. Bulgular, ders kitaplarının içeriğindeki problemlerin disiplindeki standartlaşma sorunlarıyla ilişkili olduğu iddiasını güçlendirmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İki sosyoloji, disipliner sorunlar, ders kitabı sosyolojisi, sosyoloji öğretimi

EXTENDED ABSTRACT

The study of sociology textbooks has a long history today. Though most of the systematic works on introductory sociology texts had been published during the 80's and 90's (mostly in *Teaching Sociology*), the first one can be dated back to 1929 when Sorokin's paper on different developmental lines of history of the discipline in Europe and the US was published. In that paper, Sorokin explained how sociology's institutional development in the US led to the textbook authorship as a specialized vocation in the discipline and its "drawbacks" (Sorokin, 1929). However, the most significant contribution of the paper was to underline "a lack of the missing link between the textbook literature and that of special research" (p. 60). Although there have been many studies on sociology textbooks criticized this "disconnection", perhaps the most noteworthy contribution was a study which conceptualized the problem as "the gap between two sociologies" (Hamilton & Form, 2003). According to Hamilton and Form, the problem is nurtured by different incentives of the producers. As the academic products of research-oriented sociologists, "journals and monographs produce specialized and detailed knowledge". Contrarily, since the operating rule of writing textbook is simplicity, authors depend heavily on "the handed-down categorical usages, the avoidance of complexity, nuance and detail" (p. 708). The latter, textbook sociology, is what Hamilton and Form called "the second sociology".

With agreement on the importance of introductory texts in disciplinary education, almost all of the studies on textbook sociology have a critical standpoint in common, and the criticisms have been directed at poor or distorted presentations of sociology in introductory texts, and their educational and scientific implications for the discipline. Textbooks in social sciences seem to be structurally homologous meaning that they "share similar structures, including chapter headings, formatting, and a common pool of news stories, etc." (Keith & Ender, 2004, p. 21). This similarity in structure (especially in chapters), hasn't been determined directly by the disciplinary standards or consensus. This "textual isomorphism" (Best & Schweingruber, 2003) is actually a result of external forces, namely, the market politics (see Manza, Sauder, & Wright, 2010). While external forces are responsible for structural homology between texts, the discipline's structural incoherence causes problems, and great amount of variability, within the texts. The organization issues in sociology are not only the cause of different introductory texts or courses, but also it is responsible for the serious fragmentation within the discipline's knowledge and objectives, so that students from different sociology departments hold different views of the discipline. Becker once said: "sociology is now a discipline in name only" (1979, p. 24). Thus except some relatively recent attempts such as ASA's "task forces" (see Ferguson, 2016), in most countries there are no organizational guidelines for writing sociology textbooks depended on discipline's own knowledge and consensus. Hence, unlike texts from other centripetally organized sciences, sociology textbooks succumb to unstandardized, individual and inconvenient contents.

Given the long-standing debates about sociology's organizational problems and the criticisms of trends in the textbooks, it is necessary to examine whether similar idiosyncrasies can be found in Turkish texts. Although some previous studies were conducted to examine the history of, and the problems in, Turkish sociology textbooks (Anık, 2008; Bulut, 2008), they were either "bibliographical" or "crit-

ical" evaluations, and there is still a need for an empirical inquiry. Therefore, the present study attempts to fulfill this task by quantitatively analyzing and comparing contents of the texts from two different periods. Thus, it is important to move beyond the clichéd criticisms of so-called positivism and "westernisms" in Turkish textbooks, by emphasizing sociology's scientific identity and motivations.

1. Introduction

One of the most fundamental problems of sociology, according to Davis, is its incoherence (Davis, 1994, p. 179). This means the discipline is fragmented into the archipelago of disconnected subfields, differentiated vocabularies, theoretical twists and sets of problems. Different theoretical programs hold different perceptions of "what matters most" (Rule, 1997, p. 76). Similarly, there are diverse and competing "reputational systems" which institutionalize "varying standards of epistemic legitimacy", therefore there is a high level of "task uncertainty" which makes difficult to "distinguish between important and insignificant problems" in sociology (Fuchs & Turner, 1986, p. 147). This means that sociology hasn't been a unified discipline, and that there are crucial differences in the perception of sociology's meaning, purpose and method between departments.

The connection between sociology's incoherence and textbook sociology can clearly be found in presentations of the discipline in introductory chapters, especially in subchapters about science, its method and sociology's scientificity. Five decades ago, Kurtz and Maiolo compared textbooks from different sciences, including chemistry, economics and physics, and showed that the amount of "philosophy of science content" in opening chapters of introductory sociology texts was far more than those of the other disciplines (Kurtz & Maiolo, 1968); and this is still the case today, at least in sociology textbooks in Turkey. This means, on an introductory level, textbook sociology still gives an important attention to delineate the discipline's scientific existence. This effort includes two "tactics": *demarcation* and *unification*. By the former, the textbook authors distinguish sociology from other social sciences by its subject matters and problem areas. However, some sociologists reject the fact that sociology has a distinct set of problems and unique subject matters. For instance, Berger stated that unlike other social scientists "sociologists cannot claim a specific empirical territory as their own" (Berger, 1992, p. 18). By the latter, textbook authors give the impression that sociology is a unified discipline. Despite the disconnection and disagreement, different perspectives "coexist peacefully in the universe of textbook sociology" (Lynch & Bogen, 1997, p. 487). This is because sociology's scientific project is also closely related to its occupational ideology (Zald, 1991, p. 169), and it reveals itself in introductory texts as the demarcation of sociology's problem area from those of other social sciences, regardless whether or not it is possible, and in the unified view of the discipline.

Another place where reflections of the discipline's incoherence can be seen is the unstandardized language of sociology textbooks. At a conceptual level, the lack of standardization corresponds to 1) the scarcity of the "core" concepts of sociology and profusion of individual terms and concepts (Keith & Ender, 2004), and 2) the common use of "obsolete terminology" (Best & Schweingruber, 2003). Another sign of unstandardized language is at the discourse level. For example, Moore showed that *disciplinary participants* (i.e. generic scholars) in sociology textbooks are mostly referred to in third person ("some sociologists", "other sociologists"), while generic scholars in textbooks from economics or physics are usually referred to in first person ("We") (Moore, 2002). As Moore states: "nowhere in the sociology text is there an attempt to depict a single collective voice in the discipline" (p. 357).

Another related issue is the disagreement on what should be included in the content itself. Similar to unstandardized concept use, although most authors employ a common structural pattern, there are different "histories" of sociology with various lengths, different "key figures", topics and definitions among textbooks. As with unstandardized language use, there is the prevalence of individual and unique contents. Furthermore, unlike textbooks from other sciences, in-

troductory sociology texts don't arrange the topics about subject matter properly, namely, from basic knowledge to more complicated topics and findings of the discipline.

Finally, there are substantial disagreements over even basic definitions. Although, in most of the texts sociology is referred to as the science of society, chapters on the foundations and mechanisms of scientific knowledge and its production are still diverse among the texts. For instance, it is unlikely to find clear and agreed definitions of the discipline's subject matter. While some authors consider sociology as the study of "everything in society", some emphasize, for example, "social relations" or "social institutions". Similar discrepancies with regard to sociology's scientific identity (is it positivist or not), scientific laws, causality, experimentalism etc. can be found in all texts. These discrepancies and individualities in sociology education, and unfortunately, poor introductory texts as incoherent (sometimes conflicting) summaries of entire discipline and as reviews of outdated sources, altogether make good sociological research and knowledge invisible to sociology students and the public.

2. Method

2.1. Research Design

A quantitative content analysis was employed to measure some basic components of the content of sociology textbooks in Turkey, and to test hypotheses about changes in these components and overall content with time. Instead of a cursory look, the quantitative design of this study provides, first, tools for an in-depth analysis of the intertextual context of sociology textbooks with important details, and second, objectivity and repeatability. The research questions and hypotheses are founded on two main bases that are, first, to measure the in-group consistencies, and second, to identify the inter-group differences. The in-group consistency refers to the extent to which the texts in a period agree on a specific element of the content, while the inter-group differences refer to changes in variables from one period to the next. On these bases, this study aims to identify the structure of the texts, trends in reference usage, and variability in introductory language and basic knowledge. It is also intended to find evidence of a link between sociology's structural problems and textbook sociology.

2.2. Textbooks Analyzed

A convenience sampling which "relies on the selection of readily available units" (Neuendorf, 2002, p. 87) was used in order to obtain a sample which may not be comprehensive but quite representative. Having searched for key words in databases of four university libraries and internet bookshops, a list of 30 introductory sociology textbooks published since 1980 was acquired. Since one of the main objectives of this study was to understand the changes in structure and content of sociology textbooks through decades, the textbooks were grouped into two periods: the first group included the textbooks published between 1980 and 1999 (*n=16*), and the second group included those from 2000 to 2015 (*n=14*).

Table 1. List of Textbooks Analyzed

1980-1999	2000-2015
Altan Eserpek (1981). *Sosyoloji.* **Ankara: AÜ DTCF.**	M. Aksoy, *Sosyal Bilimlere ve Sosyolojiye Giriş* (2000). İstanbul: Alfa.
Mine Tan (1982). *Toplumbilimine Giriş.* **Ankara: AÜEF.**	G. İçli, *Sosyolojiye Giriş* (2002). Ankara: Anı.
M. Erkal (1982). *Sosyoloji.* **Trabzon: KÜ İİBF.**	İ. Sezal (ed.), *Sosyoloji* (2002). Ankara: Martı.
S. Meray (1982). *Toplumbilim Üzerine.* **İstanbul: Hil.**	F. Kocacık, *Sosyoloji Ders Notları* (2003). Sivas: Sivas: C.Ü. Yay.
A. Kurtkan Bilgiseven (1986). *Genel Sosyoloji.* **İstanbul: Filiz.**	C. Aslan, *Sosyolojiye Giriş: Kavramlar ve Kullanımları* (2005). Adana: Karahan.
S. Armağan, & İ. Armağan (1988). *Toplumbilim.* **İzmir: Barış.**	N. Demir, *Birey, Toplum, Bilim: Sosyoloji Temel Kavramlar* (2006). Ankara: Turhan.
Ö. Ozankaya (1991). *Toplumbilim.* **İstanbul: Cem.**	İ. Doğan, *Sosyoloji: Kavramlar, Sorunlar* (2008). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
E. Sanay (1991). *Genel Sosyoloji Dersleri.* **Ankara: GÜ BYYO.**	V. Bozkurt, *Değişen Dünyada Sosyoloji* (2008). Bursa: Ekin.
E. Özkalp (1993). *Sosyolojiye Giriş.* **Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi.**	Z. Arslantürk, & M. T. Amman, *Sosyoloji* (2009). İstanbul: Çamlıca.
B. Tolan, *Sosyoloji* **(1993). Ankara: Adım.**	H. i. Bahar, *Sosyoloji* (2009). Ankara: USAK.
S.Dönmezer, *Toplumbilim* **(1994). İstanbul: Beta.**	N. Suğur (ed.), *Sosyolojiye Giriş* (2009). Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi.
D. Ergil, *Toplum ve İnsan: Toplumbilimin Temelleri* **(1994). Ankara: Turhan.**	G. Topses, & M. D. Topses, *Toplumsal Olayların Bilimi* (2010). Ankara: Anı.
Ö. Sayın, *Sosyolojiye Giriş* **(1994). İzmir: EÜ Yay.**	M. Tuna (ed.), *Sosyolojiye Giriş* (2012). Ankara: Detay.
M. Tezcan, *Sosyolojiye Giriş* **(1995). Ankara: AÜEBF.**	M. Zencirkıran, *Sosyoloji* (2015). Bursa: Dora.
S. Şener, *Sosyoloji: Sosyal Bilimlere Alternatif Yaklaşım* **(1998). İstanbul: İnkılab.**	
S. Güven, *Toplumbilim* **(1999). Bursa: Ezgi.**	

2.3. The Data and Variables

It has been underscored that the construction of a textbook has two elements: a *structure* which is a pattern formed by mainly chapter headings, and a *content* including "the language used to introduce the discipline" (Keith & Ender, 2004, p. 28) and basic knowledge. In regard to structure, all chapter titles and subtitles in the textbooks were coded deductively with respect to a preliminary classification[1]. Concerning content, the present study focused on the opening chapters in the textbooks for two reasons. First, the opening chapters give a definition for subject matter of, and identify the approaches in, the discipline (Perrucci, 1980, p. 40). Thus, these chapters function as a guide for readers throughout the book. Second, as Kurtz and Maiolo (1968) pointed out long ago, the opening chapters are designed to function as legitimizing tools for sociology's scienticity as well.

The study also includes an analysis of references and citations. An author's references provide clue about the range of subjects included in his or her book. Especially in the context of the sociology textbooks reviewed here, for an author, other authors' introductory textbooks form an important set of reference which is responsible for what Best and Schweingruber called *textual isomorphism* (2003, p. 98). To examine both structure and content of the textbooks, the data were collected by means of a four-category coding process. Table 2 shows the coding categories and their respective units of analysis

---

1 Perrucci (1980) and Keith and Ender (2004) used similar chapter classifications in their respective studies. In this study, however, these classifications had to be extended (see table 5).

Table 2. Coding Categories, Units of Analysis and Attributes*

	Coding Categories			
	Subjects	**References and Citations**	**Language**	**Basic Knowledge**
Units of Analysis	Chapter titles, subtitles	All bibliographic entities in the reference lists and citations in the opening chapters	Concepts in the opening chapters	Definitions, names and statements in the opening chapters
Attributes	All First- and Second-level headings in the textbooks Key figures in introductory chapters	Publication forms, primary-secondary references and citations, "age" of the references	Conceptual framework and defined concepts	Theoretical and methodological "approaches".

All first- and second-level headings in the textbooks were coded in order to understand structural pattern and its change through time. Since the discipline lacks an agreement on what an introductory sociology textbook should look like, most authors follow a preset structure, which is a scheme borrowed from other textbooks and adapted by the author for his own project, that gives an idea of what subjects to be included and how to arrange them. However, to answer the question to what extent is there an agreement on specific components in intertextual context, specific subjects, i.e. the sociologists presented in opening chapters, were also coded. As for references and citations, the data were collected from reference lists and opening chapters, respectively. All units were coded with their respective attributes: type of the source (book, chapter, article, media etc.) and age of the publication[2], and an additional classification based on whether the cited source was an original work of a sociologist presented in the opening chapter (primary) or just another textbook (secondary).

The concepts in the opening chapters were also coded in order to show the variability in language use. However, since simply counting all concepts wouldn't be useful, an additional attribute, *definitions*, was defined. In this way, it is possible to get the proportion of defined concepts in the total number of concepts. Thus, the definitions coded can be considered as a subset of total conceptual framework. Finally, as manifest content of textbooks, some data about basic sociological knowledge were gathered. In fact, given the "greater degree of metaphenomenon" in introductory sociology textbooks (Moore, 2002), "basic knowledge" shows great variability among the texts analyzed here. Hence, the coding process was restricted to "theoretical and methodological approaches in sociology", and to statements about "sociology's scientificity" and its subject matter, for they are more likely to be *comparable* than elusive statements. Finally, table 3 shows the variables measured herein.

Table 3. Variables

Subjects	**References and Citations**	**Language***	**Basic Knowledge**
Core subjec headings Solitary subject headings	Total number of references and citations	Total concepts	Diversity in Theoretical Approaches
	Up-to-date references (0-5) and older references (+16)	Core concepts	Diversity in Methodological Approaches
	Primary and secondary references and citations	Solitary concepts	Diversity in Research Techniques

* These variables were used by Keith & Ender (2004).

2   These classifications were used by Spiegel-Rösing (1977) and Perrucci (1980).

In respect to subject headings, "commonly agreed" variables stand for the specific contents on which most of the texts agreed, while "individual" variables refer to the content included in only one textbook. Regarding introductory language of the textbooks, namely concepts, all variables are already defined by Keith and Ender in their 2004 study. "Core concepts", according to their definitions, "refers to the number of terms listed by 90 percent or more of the texts", while "solitary concepts" are those presented by only one text (2004, p. 23).

2.4. Hypotheses and Analyses

Since the analyses focused primarily on the inter-group differences, that range from chapter structure of texts to references and conceptual frameworks, the hypotheses had to be formed respectively. In testing hypotheses regarding time-dependent changes in the components of textbook content, whether significant or not, differences between two independent samples, that are the textbooks grouped according to their publication dates, will provide evidences about the time-dependent changes.

With respect to chapter headings, it has been emphasized that there is a clear resemblance between introductory sociology textbooks (Agger, 1989; Babchuk & Keith, 1995; Lynch & Bogen, 1997). However, concerning specific topics, it is highly probable that there is great variability among the texts. Due to the absence of disciplinary standards, sociology textbooks will continue to produce this individuality. To hypothesize and test this claim, it will be very helpful to use subject headings for "key figures in history of sociology" as independent variable.

Hypothesis 1a. There is no significant difference in the total number of individual subject headings for key figures between periods, therefore,

Hypothesis 1b. There is no significant difference in the diversity between periods.

With respect to references and citations the total number of references provides important information about range and currency of the content. It is obviously not to assert that the number of references determines the quality of the information. However, considering the enormous amount of variability in the total number of references, such presentations of the disciplinary knowledge may be problematic. Moreover, in the case of Anglo-American sociology textbooks, there is a significant increase in the total number of works consulted in recent textbooks. In other words, the number of references cited and consulted in more recent textbooks is far higher than those in the previous decades (thousands vs. a few hundred). This increase can be interpreted both as a sign of disciplinary knowledge accumulation and as an "enthusiasm" for more comprehensive coverage of disciplinary knowledge. For this reason, it is important to find out whether Turkish sociology textbooks respond similarly.

Hypothesis 2. There is a significant difference in the total number of references between periods. In other words, the more recent the textbooks, the greater the total number of references.

It can be stated that a similar development has occurred in terms of the up-to-dateness of references. Decades ago, for example, by reviewing opening chapters, Perrucci asserted that introductory sociology textbooks "do not seem to synthesize recent knowledge" (Perrucci, 1980, p. 46). However, a little more than a decade later, it was emphasized by Keith and Babchuk that today's successful texts were revised often (1995, p. 221). Regardless of whether a few oft-revised texts can provide information about prevailing trends, the demand side of the market will eventually force the others to imitate successful texts, a process that examined thoroughly by Manza, Sauder and Write (2010). Although it is hard to believe that the same market forces are effective in the context of Turkish sociology textbooks, since following recent scholarly works is now easier than previous decades, it is reasonable to

expect greater number of journal articles in bibliography sections. Finally, regarding both references and citations, it is equally important to assess the proportion of secondary sources, namely other sociology textbooks, in the total number of references and citations respectively. While the number of references to scholarly works increase, it can be expected to find a decreased number of secondary references and citations. On these observations and assumptions, following hypotheses are proposed:

Hypothesis 3. The more recent the textbooks, the greater the total number of scholarly journal articles.

Hypothesis 4. There will be greater number of references to up-to-date works in recent textbooks, while the total number of references to old publications will decrease.

Hypothesis 5. There is a significant difference in referring to, and citing, the primary and secondary sources between the texts in the first period and those in the second.

There is no reason to suppose that marked individuality only be found at subject level. Therefore, this individuality thesis can be extended to other content components such as concepts and basic knowledge. Analyzing concepts is much more complicated task, because it is unclear what should be inferred from conceptual patterns in the textbooks about sociology: its "conceptual core"? For example, by analyzing the textbook glossaries, Keith and Ender (2004) obtained a list consisting of a few dozen concepts which is supposed to represent sociology's core. However, as David Schweingruber pointed out, "they do not present evidence that their list is representative of the core of the discipline and not just an artifact of the processes that produce these books" (2005, p. 81). To deal with this ambiguity, the present study focused on the conceptual framework in the opening chapters, and all coded units were considered as components of the "introductory language" by which the discipline is presented, not necessarily as sociology's core. Since it is hard to observe the effects of knowledge accumulation in opening chapters, we can only hope to find more pedagogically attentive introductory language used in recent textbooks. Similarly, it can be expected that the introductory knowledge is now more standardized. Standardization in this sense, of course, doesn't mean uniformity, but there is no need to find inconsistent statements on the same issues. The criteria for a more pedagogically attentive introductory language can be defined, although too simply, as 1) a decreased total number of *solitary concepts* following an increase in the total number of *core concepts*, and 2) an increase in the total number of definitions.

Hypothesis 6. There is no significant difference in the total number of concepts. However, the total number of defined concepts is significantly higher in recent textbooks.

Hypothesis 7. In recent textbooks, the number of solitary concepts decreases as the number of core concepts increases.

Finally, the standardization of basic knowledge contained in the textbooks can be defined as decreased diversity in selected units of basic knowledge. In other words, if it is assumed that the basic knowledge is more organized and standardized in the textbooks from the recent period, then the variables in basic knowledge (such as theoretical and methodological approaches) should be almost evenly distributed among the texts.

Hypothesis 8. The more recent the textbooks, the less the diversity of the basic knowledge.

Mann-Whitney U tests for nonparametric data and independent samples *t*-tests were conducted to determine group differences. To test hypothesis 1b and 8, Simpson's Index of Diversity (Simpson's *D*) was used for determining the extent of in-group diversities of the basic knowledge units. This index provides a probability-based measure which represents the probability that two randomly selected units belong to different categories. The index can be calculated by the following formula (McDonald & Dimmick, 2003, p. 61):

$$D = 1 - \sum p_i^2$$

where p_i represents the proportion of each category in the total number of observations in the group. If there is different number of categories in groups, a standardized version of the index is as follows:

$$D_z = \frac{D}{\left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)}$$

where k is the number of categories in the group. The value ranges between 0 and 1, namely, the greater the value, the greater the diversity.

3. Results

3.1. Structure

According to the chapter classification used in this study, 63 first- and second-level headings were classified (table 5). With non-classifiable headings, the total number of different subject headings in the textbooks was 85. Approximately 71% of all headings (n=61) were found to be common in all texts. There were 67 different subject headings in 1980-99 period, and 61 in 2000-15 period. Table 4 shows the most common chapters in the respective periods.

Table 4. Most common chapters in the texts

1980-99 (*N*=16)			2000-2015 (*N*=14)		
Chapter	F	%	Chapter	F	%
Introduction	16	100	Introduction	14	100
Social change	14	87	Classification	13	93
Classification	12	75	Culture	12	86
Method	12	75	Method	11	79
Culture	11	69	Family	10	71
Socialization	11	69	Education	9	64
Family	10	62	Socialization	9	64

As expected, there was a clear agreement on introductory chapters in both periods, however, no other subject was found which at least 90% of all 30 texts had agreed on. Therefore, along with "social classification", there were only two chapters with 80% or more agreement among all texts. 28 headings (42%) in the texts from the first period and 26 (43%) in the texts from the second period were individual, namely, unique subject headings. While the chapter "social change" was the second most common chapter in the first period, it wasn't contained with the same agreement in the second period. Though there were slight changes in the percentages of some headings, chapters on classification, culture, family, and socialization seem to be the most important subjects in Turkish sociology textbooks. However, chapters on very important issues such as "social problems" or "inequality" could find a little place than they deserve. Only two texts from the second period, for example, contained chapters on poverty.

If we compare the percentages of subject categories, textual isomorphism can clearly be seen. Despite slight changes in the percentages, table 5 shows the structural pattern of Turkish sociolo-

gy textbooks. Given the proportions of subject categories, there is a scheme through which the texts can contain similar subjects with similar amounts. Relying on other textbooks is clearly responsible for this scheme.

Table 5. Proportions of subject categories in the texts

Category	1980-99	2000-15	TOTAL
Introduction	11,20	11,21	11,21
Social Processes	28,22	22,42	25,43
Change, Mobilization	15,35	15,70	15,30
Collectivity	2,07	3,59	2,80
Institutions	12,86	18,83	17,03
Social Problems	3,73	5,38	4,53
Types of Society	2,07	0,90	1,51
Social Life	4,15	4,93	4,74
Social Categories	7,05	4,93	6,03
Environment	1,24	1,79	1,51
Others	12,06	10,32	9,91
Total	100	100	100

While subjects and chapter arrangement patterns create textual isomorphism, these structural patterns don't exist in more specific content. It's easy to test this claim by using number of key figures presented in opening chapters. Total 26 texts (13 in each period) had subchapters for key figures in history of sociology, and there were total 85 figures presented under subheadings on their own, 65 names in the first period and 48 in the second. As criticized long ago, there are too many "famous names" in introductory sociology textbooks (McGee, Vaughan, & Baker, 1985, p. 23). These figures range from the philosophers in Ancient Greek, and European and Muslim philosophers in the middle ages to classical and contemporary sociologists. As can be seen in table 6, most of the names are unique, while a few of them commonly included in the texts.

Table 6. Percentages of textbook agreement on "key figures in history of sociology"

1980-99 (*N*=13)			2000-15 (*N*=13)		
Agreement	Number of Figures	Cumulative Percentage	Agreement	Number of Figures	Cumulative Percentage
100%	0	0	100%	3	6,25
90%	0	0	90%	2	10,42
80%	2	3,08	80%	0	10,42
70%	1	4,62	70%	0	10,42
60%	1	6,15	60%	2	14,58
50%	1	7,69	50%	1	16,67
40%	0	7,69	40%	0	16,67
30%	7	18,46	30%	4	25
20%	4	24,62	20%	4	33,33
10%	8	36,92	10%	8	50
< 10%	41	100	< 10%	24	100
Total	65		Total	48	

In the texts from the first period, there was no name with 90% agreement or more, and only two names (Comte and Durkheim) presented commonly in at least 80% of the texts. In the texts of 2000's, there were 5 "core" figures that included in at least 90% of the texts: Comte, Durkheim,

Saint-Simon, Marx and Weber. It seems that, as the total number of figures decreases, it's more likely to find "core" names in the recent texts. However, 41 figures (*Median*=0) in the first period and 24 figures (*Median*=1) in the second period were solitary names. Although the total number of solitary names decreased in the recent period, there wasn't a statistical difference in medians (Mann-Whitney; $U = 81.5$, $p = .869$). Accepting the null hypothesis means that there is a trend in prevalence of individual names in sociology texts. Because, it's totally up to the authors to decide how long will be the "history of sociology" and how many names will be presented.

All sociology textbooks analyzed here includes a chapter on the history of sociology, however, this "history" varies between the texts. Although, in general, this history contains narrations that emphasize the differences between social philosophy and sociology, some authors prefer an epic "human history". Presenting the discipline with special emphasize on its history is the long-term effect of French sociology textbooks. As Schrecker pointed out, French sociology textbooks "contain at least one chapter, often two or three" on the history of sociology (Schrecker, 2008, p. 203). To determine how the narrations of this history had been diversified, standardized Simpson's diversity indices (D_Z) were calculated for each group's "key figures". Thus, for the first group $D_Z = .98$, and for the second group $D_Z = .97$. That is to say, the probability that two randomly selected headings belong to different figures are 98% for one group, and 97% for the other. This indicates a tremendous diversity of the figures presented in introductory chapters, and also of the narrations. Moreover, two group had nearly identical diversity values. This means that hypothesis 1b was also supported.

3.2. References and Citations

Nearly all sociology textbooks analyzed here had attempted to provide a comprehensive look at the discipline's knowledge, which means that instead of simply defining the subject matter, and presenting the basic concepts and some exemplary works, they try to include most of the subjects and research areas. In this case, it wouldn't be surprising if there were tens of pages of bibliographies and thousands of entities within them. However, it would be a problem if one encountered a sociology textbook with a few dozen references. This is exactly the problem that can be found in some Turkish sociology textbooks. Thus, it's important to understand whether there was a significant difference in the total number of references between the periods. The following table summarizes the results for the reference types and their respective sizes.

Table 7. Means, medians and standard deviations for references

	Article	Book	Book Chapter	Thesis	Report	Media	Total
1980-1999 (*N*=16)							
F	278	2448	107	10	53	8	2904
%	9,57	84,30	3,68	0,34	1,83	0,28	100,00
Mean	17,38	153	6,7	0,63	3,31	0,5	181,5
Median	6,5	90,5	4	0	0,5	0	115
SD	23,885	121,534	8,292	1,31	5,313	0,632	138,114
2000-2015 (*N*=14)							
F	321	2586	430	48	98	111	3594
%	8,93	71,95	11,96	1,34	2,73	3,09	100,00
Mean	23,64	184,7	30,7	3,7	7,46	8,08	256,7
Median	22	169,5	27	1	5	4	227
SD	24,26	136,162	29,7	6,343	7,523	14,251	198,95

Hypothesis 2 predicted a growth in the total number of references, however, it wasn't supported (Mann-Whitney; $U = 97.5$, $p = .547$). Likewise, there was no sufficient evidence to support hypothesis 3 which predicted a significant growth in the total number of references to scholarly journal articles (Mann-Whitney; $U = 101.5$, $p = .662$). With regard to the age distribution of references, table 8 shows the results.

Table 8. Age distribution of references in the textbooks

Age		0-5		6-10		11-15		≥ 16	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1980-99	Books	40	1,63	140	5,72	344	14,06	1923	78,59
	Articles	11	3,96	28	10,07	89	32,01	150	53,96
	All references	65	2,24	178	6,13	462	15,91	2198	75,71
2000-15	Books	302	11,69	460	17,8	468	18,11	1354	52,4
	Articles	35	10,9	72	22,43	70	21,81	144	44,86
	All references	483	13,44	657	18,28	663	18,45	1786	49,69

Though total seven texts from both periods didn't refer to any source aged five years or less (the most recent references), as can be seen in the table 8, from the previous period (*Median*=2) to the next (*Median*=17.5) the total number of references to the latest works had increased markedly (Mann-Whitney; $U = 39.5$, $p = .002$). However, this growth had occurred mostly due to a significant increase in the number of references to the latest books ($p = .001$), while there was no significant difference in the total number of references to recent journal articles ($p = .166$). In 1980-99 period, nearly 76% of references were sources aged 16 years or more. Although the total number of "old references" had declined in the recent period, the difference in median values (106.5 against 99) wasn't significant (Mann-Whitney; $U = 107$, $p = .835$). Hence, hypothesis 4 was partly supported.

References and citations also give important information when it comes to the relation between the authors' sources and the texts' content. One way to look at this relation is to find whether the texts rely on original works of sociologists that they present or on other sociology textbooks. The texts in either period had references to the works of 33 sociologists presented in the introductory chapters. In the texts from both period, no sociologist was referenced with 70% agreement or more. Works of five sociologists in the first period, and of only one in the second period were listed in 60% of the texts. For example, while total 22 texts presented Marx in the introductory chapters, only 13 texts had listed his works. 20 texts presented Saint-Simon, and his works were listed in only one text. In 1980-99 period, there were 337 references to the works of 33 sociologists (*Median*=12) and 156 secondary references to 68 textbooks (*Median*=13). In the 2000-15 period, 263 references listed were primary references (*Median*=16) and there were 207 secondary references to 90 textbooks (*Median*=8). These primary and secondary references were cited 497 times in the opening chapters of 10 texts in the first period, and 543 times in those of 12 texts in the second period[3]. Of the citations in the first group, 47% (235) were primary (*Median*=8) and 53% (262) were secondary (*Median*=3.5). In the second group, 45% (244) of the citations were primary (*Median*=14.5), while 55% (299) were secondary citations (*Median*=19.5). One part of hypothesis 5 predicted a significant increase in primary references and citations, however, there were no

---

3   There were no in-text or footnote citations in total 8 books.

significant differences in the number of original references (Mann-Whitney; $U = 111$, $p = .967$) and citations (Mann-Whitney; $U = 55$, $p = .497$). Similarly, there were no significant decreases in the total number of secondary references (Mann-Whitney; $U = 74.5$, $p = .118$) and citations (Mann-Whitney; $U = 59$, $p = .451$). Hence, hypothesis 5 wasn't supported.

3.3. Introductory Language: The Conceptual Patterns

Total 1646 concepts and terms were cited in the introductory chapters of 30 textbooks, and 43,5% (716) of all concepts were defined. The introductory chapters of 16 books in the first period contained total 951 concepts and the number of defined concepts was 372 (39%). In the next period, these numbers had increased to 1164 and 517 (44%) respectively.

Table 9. Means, medians and standard deviations for concepts

	1980-99 (*N*=16)		2000-15 (*N*=14)	
	All Concepts	**Defined Concepts**	**All Concepts**	**Defined Concepts**
F	951	372	1164	517
Mean	153,81	43,25	198,57	72,71
Median	145,5	35	176	62,5
SD	83,348	27,533	78,569	34,793

Since the data were normally distributed and the group variances were equal, independent samples *t*-tests were conducted to test the group differences (hypothesis 6). There was no significant difference in the total number of all concepts; $t(28) = -1.507$, $p = .143$. However, the increase in the number of defined concepts was significant; $t(28) = -2.588$, $p = .015$ (supporting hypothesis 6). It seems that, while the total number of concepts was relatively stable between the periods, recent authors tend to use more defined concepts and terms when presenting the discipline in introductory chapters. Are these results supposed to be an improvement in introductory language? To provide an answer to this question, it's equally important to assess the extent to which the textbooks from different periods agree on these concepts. Regarding the category of "all concepts", in the first period, only four (0,42% of 951) concepts were cited in all books, and there were six core concepts (0,63%) with at least 90% agreement and 18 concepts (1,9%) with 80% agreement or more. In the 2000-15 period, all texts commonly included only 8 concepts (0,7% of 1164) and the number of core concepts increased to 15 (1,3%). Although this was a slight increase, the difference in the number of core concepts was significant (Mann-Whitney; $U = .000$, $p = .000$). Most importantly, total 538 (nearly 57% of 951) concepts in the texts of the first period and 703 concepts (60% of 1164) in those of the second period weren't included in more than one text. Moreover, the difference in the number of solitary concepts wasn't significant (Mann-Whitney; $U = 81.5$, $p = .205$). With regard to the defined concepts, the situation was even worse. In either period, there wasn't any defined concept included in at least 90% of the texts. Only three concepts (0,58%) were cited in the texts from the second period with 80% agreement. In half of the 1980-99 texts, only six defined concepts (1,6%) were commonly included, in the next period this number slightly increase to 17 (3,3%). However, in the first and second period, respectively 236 (63%) and 322 (62%) of defined concepts were unique. There was no evidence that the total number of solitary defined concepts had decreased significantly (Mann-Whitney; $U = 88.5$, $p = .328$). Except the slight increase in core concepts, no core defined concepts were found and there wasn't any significant decrease in the total number of solitary concepts (partly supporting hypothesis 7).

Table 10. Most commonly cited concepts in the textbooks

All Concepts with at least 90% agreement			Defined Concepts with at least 50% agreement		
1980-99	2000-15	Overall	1980-99	2000-15	Overall
Family	Collective consciousness	Family	Mechanical solidarity	Anomy	Ideal type
Observation	Division of labor	Observation	Method	Dysfunction	Mechanical solidarity
Social	Family	Religion	Organic solidarity	Hypothesis	Organic solidarity
Social Event	Means of production	Social	Social dynamic	Ideal type	Social dynamic
Social Institution	Observation	Social Institution	Social static	Latent function	Social static
Society	Religion	Social structure	Society	Manifest function	Society
	Social	Society		Mechanical solidarity	The metaphysical stage
	Social fact			Organic solidarity	The positivist stage
	Social group			Sample	The theological stage
	Social Institution			Social dynamic	
	Social structure			Social static	
	Society			Society	
	The metaphysical stage			Substructure	
	The positivist stage			Superstructure	
	The theological stage			The metaphysical stage	
				The positivist stage	
				The theological stage	

Consequently, at least on conceptual level, there was no sign of more pedagogically attentive language in the textbooks of the second period, since only seven core concepts (0,43% of 1646) were found in all texts and total five defined concepts were cited in 60% of the textbooks. Whereas, total 1188 (72%) of all concepts and total 538 (73%) of all defined concepts were solitary. These results indicate that there is a great variability among concepts and that the language used by the authors in presenting sociology is highly diverse.

3.4. The Basics

When it comes to the basic knowledge presented in introductory chapters, the textbooks maintain diversity. This diversity can be found among topics about sociology's subject matter, its method, causality, prediction and so forth. Approaches or schools, methods and research techniques presented in the respective chapters can easily be compared and provide clean evidence for intertextual diversity. For example, Table 11 shows the so-called theoretical approaches, schools and "paradigms" in sociology that presented in the texts.

Table 11. Theoretical approaches and schools presented in the textbooks

Approach or school	1980-99	2000-15	Overall	Approach or school	1980-99	2000-15	Overall
Actionalist theory		1	1	Cosmological movement	1		1
German sociology	3		3	Materialist-Dialectic sociology	2		2
Anglo-American sociology	2		2	Mechanicalism	1	1	2
Anthropological sociology	1		1	Organicism	1		1
Biological school	3	1	4	Postmodernism	1	3	4
Geographical school		1	1	Post-structuralism		1	1
Conflict theory	2	8	10	Positivism	1	2	3
Darwinist school		1	1	Psyhcological school	4	1	5
Demographical school		1	1	Realism		1	1
Experimentalism	1		1	Symbolic Interactionism	2	8	10
Economical school	2		2	Socio-biology	1	1	2
Critical theory		3	3	Historical school	2		2
Empiricism	1		1	Sociological school	1	1	2
Ethnomethodology		2	2	Universalist movement	1		1
Feminism		2	2	Conciliatory sociology	2	1	3
Formalist sociology	2		2	Structural functionalism	3	8	11
French sociology	2		2	Structuralism		2	2
Racism		1	1	Interpretive sociology		2	2
Idealist-Capitalist sociology	1		1	Zoological approach	1		1
Genetic Structuralism		1	1				

Total 39 schools and approaches were mentioned in the texts. As can be seen in the table 10, in some texts, research strategies such as symbolic interactionism and ethnomethodology (Agger, 1989, p. 367) were presented as theoretical approaches. All 26 approaches and schools in the texts from the 1980-1999 period were included with 20% agreement or less. In the second period, except the "holy trinity", 18 approaches and schools were included with maximum 20% agreement. In the first and the second periods, respectively 13 and 14, and total 16 approaches and schools weren't mentioned in more than one text. Despite a slightly increased emphasis on sociology's three major approaches in the second period, arbitrary classifications can be found in all books. Regarding methods and techniques, similar trends were observed. Of all texts, only 16 provide information about methods and research techniques in sociology. In the first period, the texts mentioned 17 methodological approaches and 27 research techniques, whereas 10 methodological approaches and 26 related techniques were found in the texts from 2000's. Total 12 of 21 methods and 10 of 34 techniques weren't mentioned in more than one text. In all 16 textbooks, "the comparative method", "functionalist method" and "quantitative and qualitative methods" were presented with only 25% agreement. With regard to the techniques, only "survey" and "document review" were presented in half of the texts.

Table 12. Standardized Simpson's Indices for theories, methods and techniques presented in textbooks

Theoretical Approaches			Methodological Approaches			Research Techniques		
1980-1999	2000-2015	Overall	1980-1999	2000-2015	Overall	1980-1999	2000-2015	Overall
.99	.96	.97	.98	.95	.94	.98	.99	.96

Finally, to identify diversity in information represented in the texts, respective Simpson's indices were calculated and the results were summarized in table 12. A quick glance at the table reveals high and similar diversity rates between the categories. No significant decrease was observed in any category. Hence there wasn't sufficient evidence to support hypothesis 8.

4. Discussion

This study quantitatively analyzed introductory chapters and bibliographical entities of Turkish sociology textbooks from 1980 to 2000's, and compared their content features in order to understand how sociology's organizational fragmentation affects its disciplinary presentations and images on introductory level. From the study results, three important points can be concluded. First, by emphasizing sociology and its problems generally, it is acknowledged that above mentioned textbook problems are not related to a particular national sociology profile. Despite the fact that sociology's turbulent development across the globe caused by different local socio-political settings, intellectual climates, and various levels of demand for sociological research, these textbook trends are more likely to be general phenomenon. Verifying this claim is quite difficult since there is scant empirical research on non-western sociology textbooks, especially on those from developing countries. Nevertheless, alongside dozens of studies on American and European texts, some contributions from other countries can give us a clue.

For example, concerning textbook chapters, Harley and Wickham (2014) showed how "promiscuous" is the content of Australian sociology textbooks. We found the same disagreement on the content in Turkish texts. According to Harley and Wickham, this disagreement is caused by "the generally unintended rivalry" among sociologists and is "deleterious to the long-term health of the discipline" (p. 54). Regarding references and citations, Pereyra found that of the citations in sociology textbooks from Mexico and Argentina, only 5-10 percent are to journal papers (2008, p. 280). Although the books he analyzed were older texts, this "scarcity of articles as sources" reveals a striking parallel between Latin American and Turkish textbooks, as the proportion of the citations to journal papers in Turkish books are about 9-10 percent. Furthermore, although not statistically significant, we found a slight decrease in the percentage of journal articles as textbook sources showing a similarity to New Zealand sociology textbooks (Crothers, 2008). Finally, as can be seen in Taiwan case (Chang, Chang, & Tang, 2010), the ominous controversy about what constitutes sociology's disciplinary identity (objectivity, pro-public or critical attitudes?) isn't only a problem of western academies.

Second, the insignificant differences between periods demonstrate a stability in textbook trends over time. Selection of the chapters and disciplinary content, trends in citation and concept usage, and the ways presenting basic information remained relatively similar from one period to another. Perhaps except some improvements in physical qualifications, this means that one can observe no major development in commitment to disciplinary pedagogy through decades, and simply drawing on previous textbook designs continues. This in part can be due to the problematic dependence upon source material. Among sociology textbooks examined here, one can find a text as a "coverage of an entire discipline" with only 40 references. Of course one cannot evaluate the quality of a text by only focusing on its bibliography list. However, there are important information within those lists about range and depth of topics covered in the textbook. And in contrast to those are meticulously reviewed and contributed by hundreds of editors, academic reviewers and consultants, a sociology textbook written by consulting a few number of sources will be a great problem for sociology education. Further, it is clear that most of the references of Turkish sociology textbooks consist of outdated and non-disciplinary material. Especially, the

percentage of references to the disciplinary research literature is significantly low, and equally importantly, references to other sociology textbooks form a substantial part of bibliography lists.

At this point, it's important to underline some political manifestations in this regard. Most of the Turkish sociology textbooks are "shy" and seem to be reluctant to objectively approach local social problems. This is mostly evident in brushing off some vital topics such as "social class", "poverty" and "social inequality". Most of Turkish authors present statistics about various types of inequalities in other countries, share photos of sweatshops and criticize racial oppression in the US. However, they reluctant to write about the inequalities and other social problems peculiar to Turkish context.

Third, and paradoxically, the major commonality between the texts is a striking individuality predominant during their entire production processes. It is evident that if there is a lack of organizational centrality, first thing to look for is the extent to which individual contents form the textbooks. Despite the textual isomorphism at a more general level, sociology textbooks succumb to unrestrained individuality of their authors. To understand how unrestrained it is, one can compare contents such as key figures, references, concepts, approaches etc. between textbooks, and then obtain the rough proportion of "solitary" content in comparison to relatively common features. In Turkish sociology textbooks from both periods, unique names, consulted sources, concepts and "approaches" compose nearly 60% of content of the introductory chapters. This will give us some idea of how lack of coherence and standardization in the discipline are responsible for inaccurate, deficient and inconsistent images of sociology.

The most striking individuality can be observed at a conceptual level. For instance, in their 2004 study Keith and Ender found that over 50% of the concepts cited in the glossaries of the texts were "solitary", and contrary to their expectations, the percentage of these unique concepts didn't decrease in the texts from the recent period (Keith & Ender, 2004, p. 25). This study found similar trends in concept use in introductory chapters of the Turkish texts. In both periods the percentage of unique concepts were around 60%, and there weren't any significant difference between the periods. If we consider the amount of variability in concepts as a criterion for an appropriate introductory language, then the great variability in concepts cited in the introductory chapters is a sign of pedagogically poor and inattentive language. Moreover, authors tend to use unnecessarily large number of concepts in the opening chapters, and to leave most of these concepts undefined. For example, nearly all students who try to learn the discipline from different sociology textbooks encounter the term "social structure", one of the core concepts in table 10, however, very few of them can tell what actually "social structure" means. This is because the concept was cited in nearly 90% of the opening chapters, but defined only in one-third. And it is impossible to say that those definitions are even consistent.

Similarly, the diversity indices of some very basic information about the discipline are ridiculously high in both periods. This is the reason why immediate textbook standardization is crucial. Keith and Ender state that one way of this standardization is to reduce these variabilities among the texts (p. 30). Wagenaar criticized this standardization as "homogenization", and praised a "creative diversity in texts that teach a similar disciplinary essence" (2004, p. 38). Of course a standardization doesn't mean to be a fascist uniformity, however, given the chaos in the presentations of sociology in Turkish textbooks, what we terribly need is not hugging creativity, but an agreement on what is "the essence".

References

Agger, B. (1989). Do books write authors? A study of disciplinary hegemony. *Teaching Sociology, 17*(3), 365-369.

Anık, M. (2008). Lise sosyoloji ders kitapları üzerine eleştirel bir değerlendirme. *Sosyoloji Dergisi/Journal of Sociology*(16).

Babchuk, N., & Keith, B. (1995). Introducing the discipline: The scholarly content of introductory texts. *Teaching Sociology*, 215-225.

Becker, H. S. (1979). What's happening to sociology? *Society, 16*(5), 19-24.

Berger, P. L. (1992). Sociology: A disinvitation? *Society, 30*(1), 12-18.

Best, J., & Schweingruber, D. (2003). First words: Do sociologists actually use the terms in introductory textbooks' glossaries? *The American Sociologist, 34*(3), 97-106.

Bulut, Y. (2008). Türkçe'de yayınlanmış sosyolojiye giriş kitapları hakkında bibliyografik bir değerlendirme. *Sosyoloji Dergisi/Journal of Sociology*(16).

Chang, M., Chang, Y., & Tang, C. (2010). Indigenization, institutionalization, and internationalization: tracing the paths of the development of sociology in Taiwan. *Facing an unequal world: challenges for a global sociology*, 158-191.

Crothers, C. (2008). New Zealand sociology textbooks. *Current Sociology, 56*(2), 221-234. doi:10.1177/0011392107085032

Davis, J. A. (1994). *What's wrong with sociology?* Paper presented at the Sociological Forum.

Ferguson, S. J. (2016). The center does hold. *Teaching Sociology, 44*(3), 163-176. doi:10.1177/0092055x16651478

Fuchs, S., & Turner, J. H. (1986). What makes a science'mature'?: Patterns of organizational control in scientific production. *Sociological theory, 4*(2), 143-150.

Hamilton, R. F., & Form, W. H. (2003). Categorical usages and complex realities: Race, ethnicity, and religion in the United States. *Social Forces, 81*(3), 693-714.

Harley, K., & Wickham, G. (2014). *Australian sociology: Fragility, survival, rivalry*: Springer.

Keith, B., & Ender, M. G. (2004). The sociological core: Conceptual patterns and idiosyncrasies in the structure and content of introductory sociology textbooks, 1940-2000. *Teaching Sociology, 32*(1), 19-36.

Kurtz, R. A., & Maiolo, J. R. (1968). Surgery for sociology: the need for introductory text opening chapterectomy. *The American Sociologist*, 39-41.

Lynch, M., & Bogen, D. (1997). Sociology's asociological" core": An examination of textbook sociology in light of the sociology of scientific knowledge. *American sociological review*, 481-493.

Manza, J., Sauder, M., & Wright, N. (2010). Producing textbook sociology. *European Journal of Sociology, 51*(02), 271-304. doi:10.1017/s0003975610000135

McDonald, D. G., & Dimmick, J. (2003). The conceptualization and measurement of diversity. *Communication Research, 30*(1), 60-79.

McGee, R., Vaughan, C. A., & Baker, P. J. (1985). Introductory instruction for a discipline in decline: A crtique and proposals for reorientation. *Teaching Sociology*, 12-33.

Moore, T. (2002). Knowledge and agency: a study of 'metaphenomenal discourse'in textbooks from three disciplines. *English for specific purposes, 21*(4), 347-366.

Neuendorf, K. A. (2002). *The content analysis guidebook*: Sage.

Pereyra, D. E. (2008). Sociological textbooks in Argentina and Mexico, 1940—60. *Current Sociology, 56*(2), 267-287.

Perrucci, R. (1980). Sociology and the introductory textbook. *The American Sociologist*, 39-49.

Rule, J. B. (1997). *Theory and progress in social science*: Cambridge University Press.

Schrecker, C. (2008). Textbooks and sociology: A franco—British comparison. *Current Sociology, 56*(2), 201-219.

Schweingruber, D. (2005). Looking for the core in the wrong place. *Teaching Sociology, 33*(1), 81-89. doi:10.1177/0092055x0503300108

Sorokin, P. A. (1929). Some contrasts of contemporary European and American sociology: I. *Social Forces, 8*(1), 57-62.

Spiegel-Rösing, I. (1977). Science studies: Bibliometric and content analysis. *Social Studies of Science, 7*(1), 97-113.

Wagenaar, T. C. (2004). Core as science or core as major? Impediments to identifying the core. *Teaching Sociology, 32*(1), 37-38.

Zald, M. N. (1991). Sociology as a discipline: Quasi-science and quasi-humanities. *The American Sociologist*, 165-187.