# SOCI 424 discussion Nov 16, 2020

**Facilitator**:

*name*

**Secretary**:

*name*

**Other participants**:

*name*

*name*

*name*

## Prompts (try to respond to all of these)

* How does field theory differ from the kind of network analysis you’ve seen so far in this class? Does it conceive of *relations* in the same way as, say, the adolescent friendship and aggression networks we saw a few weeks ago (Faris and Felmlee 2011)? According to John Mohr, “for Bourdieu social network methods appeared to be limited to capturing only flat, life- less, one-dimensional expressions of social structure” (2013, 117). Do you agree with Bourdieu in this?
* Affiliation networks, like correspondence analysis, characterizes the relations between actors in terms of the similarity the social and cultural *orientations* of those actors. For instance, when projecting a two-mode affiliation network into a one-mode actor–actor network, the ties between those actors measure similarity in their engagement with events or institutions. How, then, does correspondence analysis differ from the analysis of affiliation networks? What are some advantages of correspondence analysis?
* According to its proponents, one of the major advantages of field theory and correspondence analysis is its ability to deal systematically and empirically with cultural forms. Culture, however, is a notoriously difficult topic to codify and quantify. What aspects of culture do you think correspondence analysis could do a good/bad job capturing? Do you agree with Mohr’s critique asserting that Bourdieu privileges upper-class tastes, and that in Bourdieu’s analysis “all people, no matter who they are or where they are, are assessed in accordance with their degree of possession of the cultural styles and forms of knowledge that are employed by the elite class fractions” (2013, 112)?