

The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science

<http://jab.sagepub.com>

The Failure to Integrate Theory and Practice: The Case of the Sociology of Work

George Ritzer

Journal of Applied Behavioral Science 1981; 17; 376

DOI: 10.1177/002188638101700313

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://jab.sagepub.com>

Published by:

 SAGE Publications

<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



NTL Institute

Additional services and information for *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://jab.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://jab.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

from two other intellectual enterprises in criminology: positivism and hermeneutics. Positivists tend toward the position that social phenomena are the product of external forces and can be measured and/or predicted. On the other hand, the micro-sociology of meaning approach attempts to account for deviant behavior "by means of an intersubjective understanding between the observer and the subject." Both of these approaches deny the notion of emancipatory knowledge or explicit political practice. The new criminologists, however, do not confuse their theory and practice with Soviet Marxism, rather their theory is directed toward the development of a socialist consciousness which does not yet exist. For the new criminologist there are three levels of practice: enlightenment, advocacy, and political action. Enlightenment means that one expresses the possibilities of other social arrangements and a recognition of one's own class position. Advocacy of working-class interests is a must for the critical criminologist. Finally, political practice dictates that the new criminologist reject existing legal definitions of crime and instead develop a human rights definition.

William E. Snizek
Ellsworth R. Fuhrman

The Failure to Integrate Theory and Practice: The Case of the Sociology of Work

GEORGE RITZER

"Doing" sociology in an applied setting has tended to be clearly separated from general sociological theory, or even from theories specific to the area in which the sociology is being practiced. To be sure, applied sociologists are usually careful to cite the "right" theoretical sources, and most theorists take pains to point out the need to apply their ideas in real life settings. The true interpenetration of these two domains, of theory and practice, however, rarely takes place. Although this generalization describes contemporary sociology fairly accurately, it is *not* an immutable law. Theory and practice can, and should, be interrelated.

Address all correspondence to George Ritzer at the Department of Sociology at the University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland.

In fact, all of the great sociological thinkers were engaged in the practical applications of their theoretical systems. Indeed it can be argued that one of the things that made them great was the propensity to integrate theory and practice.

Of all of the major sociological thinkers, Marx is the most obvious example of one who integrated theory and practice (praxis). His displeasure with the sterile abstractions of philosophers and his commitment to the dialectic led him to a focal interest in the practical applications of his theoretical ideas. The philosophy of species, being as found in the *1844 Manuscripts* (Marx, 1932/1964), and the structural economics of *Capital* (Marx, 1867/1967) were dialectically related and brought to bear on political pamphlets as well as a wide range of political activities that were designed to help foster the revolution from capitalism to socialism. This change was the dialectical product of both ongoing processes in the real world and the logic of Marx's theoretical work. Because Marx never separated fact and value, he had no difficulty integrating his theory with his practical activities.

Max Weber was supposed to have separated fact from value in his pronouncements on value-free sociology, but the reality is that he too tied his practical activities to his theoretical orientations. Weber's work on authority structures was tied to an interest in the nation-state and ultimately to his nationalism and his activities in behalf of a strong German state. More importantly, his writings on rationalization and bureaucratization led to a fear of the iron cage of rationalization and to a series of speeches in which he pleaded with politicians, scientists, and others to adopt an independent stance toward bureaucrats—to seek to control them rather than be controlled by them.

Durkheim's fear of the decline of the collective conscience and of the resulting loosening of control on the passions led him to suggest structural reforms (e.g., occupational associations). He also educated teachers so that they, in turn, could buttress the system by inculcating morality in school children. As the work of these sociological masters shows, sociological theory need not be practiced in isolation from applied work, and in fact, the best of it is intimately related to work in the real world.

Instead of continuing to look backward, I now turn to contemporary sociology and the relationship between theory and application in a specific area with which I am most familiar, the sociology of work (Ritzer, 1977). This happens to be an area of sociology with which the classical sociologists were greatly, if not focally, concerned, and one that has continued to be of interest to more contemporary thinkers. Thus, one would expect this to be an area rich in theoretical applications to practical issues. In fact, such is not the case. The bulk of the literature in the field tends to be either atheoretical, or informed by errone-

eous interpretations of theoretical work. The richest literature in the sociology of work is still the largely ethnographic studies that were produced by the Chicago school as well as the more modern researchers who follow in that tradition. While this work is long on insight, it is woefully weak in theory and its application to the social world. While we know a great many things about the work world as a result of this research, we have little cumulative knowledge about work processes in general. I should quickly add, however, that this can be seen as a latent strength of the area in comparison to other subareas in sociology (the sociology of organizations is a good example of such a subfield). In such areas the emphasis has been on cumulative knowledge with the result that we have many high-level abstractions, but little knowledge of the real world.

The other major problem in the relationship between theory and application is the use of misinterpreted and/or misapplied theories. This is well illustrated in the sociology of work by the way Marx's concept of alienation has been applied. To Marx, this is largely a *structural* concept that deals with a series of breakdowns caused by the structures of capitalist society. Such a structural concept has been difficult, however, for American sociologists to operationalize, so they have taken the easy course and transformed a structural concept into a *social psychological* concept. Although a social psychology of alienation is useful and interesting, it is not directly related to Marx's structural theory nor does it constitute a legitimate test of it. To be true to Marx, alienation should be studied macro-structurally, but that would require a reorientation of American sociology away from social psychological studies (using questionnaires, interviews, and census data) and require historical/comparative research.

One of the main reasons for this kind of distortion is the tendency to wrench specific concepts from the body of a theorist's work. The extraction of alienation from Marx's broader, historical/comparative work is but one example of this. Another, in the field of the sociology of organizations, is the way Weber's ideal-typical bureaucracy was interpreted. Weber intended his ideal-typical bureaucracy as a methodological tool to be used to study specific administrative forms in various historical settings. Modern sociologists of organizations, however, generally took the ideal type to be a depiction of what modern bureaucracies were really like. Much of the field developed in a dialogue with Weber on the mistaken impression that the ideal type was a description of reality. Further, the ideal type was extracted from the historical body of research in which it was embedded and which it was intended to inform. Had they been true to Weber, sociologists of organizations would have been led to the historical/comparative study of organizations rather than to work in the contemporary context using social psychological data.

The conclusion to be drawn from this is that the sociology of occupations (and organizations), and by inference most other areas within sociology, tend to be either atheoretical or too abstract; and to be informed by erroneous interpretations of theory. The challenge to sociology today, as it always has been, is to interrelate theory and practice. Unfortunately, we often seem further from that goal today than did the classic sociologists.

REFERENCES

- Marx, K. *Capital: A critique of political economy. Vol. 1.* New York: International Publishers, 1867/1967.
- Marx, K. *The economic and philosophic manuscripts of 1844.* In D.J. Struik (Ed. and trans.). New York: International Publishers, 1932/1964.
- Ritzer, G. *Working: Conflict and change.* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1977.