

FUNDAMENTALS OF SOCIOLOGICAL THEORIZING: ESTABLISHING A NEXUS BETWEEN ABSTRACT THEORETICAL REASONING AND EMPIRICAL RESEARCH ON BOKO HARAM

Dr. Mustapha Bintube

Visiting Senior Lecturer, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Maiduguri, and Staff of the National Assembly, Senate Department, White House Complex Fourth Floor, Room 4.1, Garki, Abuja, Nigeria.

ABSTRACT: *This paper examines the fundamentals of sociological theorizing with the aim of providing niches for the establishment of a nexus between abstract reasoning and empirical research in sociology that is theoretically science driven. To achieve this objective, the paper identified a key problem of post and undergraduate students being faced with a demanding situation while seeking knowledge in sociological theorizing. There would appear to be an explicit and palpable deficit in theoretical know-how on the supply side of knowledge deliverables to link theory to practice. What contributes to this problem, perhaps, is the lackadaisical attitude towards theory on the part of the students coupled with a quest for paper qualifications for the sake of getting employment rather than to demonstrate practical contributions that inform the discovery of new social phenomena to explain new social conditions. This paper raised a number of compelling questions as brief descriptions on the way to go, which, although still a work in progress, will contribute significantly to solving the problem and adding value to existing literature on sociological theorizing. This paper, ab initio, addressed the imperatives of sociological analysis of concepts, variables, facts, propositions and hypothesis in sociological theorizing. Types of theories were examined and handled within the classifications of micro and macro; grand and second-middle range theories, which were analyzed in relation to the four crucial components that are central to sociological theorizing. The five theoretical perspectives were labelled in this paper as the 'Five Alive' grand sociological theoretical perspectives. To further deepen the perspective on sociological theorizing, this paper tried to exemplify abstract versus empirical research and its implication on the contemporary social phenomenon of Boko Haram. Various methods and logics needed in sociological theorizing were presented. The space of eco-systemic evolutionism as both theory and method in the understanding and explaining of most sociological theories and the crucial role of thinking and reasoning in evolutionism in relation to sociological theorizing have also been stressed in this paper.*

KEYWORDS: Sociological Theorising, Social Phenomena, Boko Haram, Theoretical Perspectives, Method vs. Data, Abstract vs. Empirical Research, Inductive vs. Deductive Methods, Theoretical Postulates, Theory.

OBJECTIVE OF THE PAPER

Most students, nowadays, are faced with the challenges of establishing links between abstract theoretical postulates and phenomenological empirical research. To handle the two analytically distinct positions in practice appears to be a herculean task for them, and this has little to do with the nexus between sociological theories embodied in sociology as a science and field of study, on the one hand, and the empirical research on a phenomenon under sociological

scrutiny, on the other. Bhattacharjee, (2012) in his thesis ‘Social Science Research: Principles, Methods and Practice’ pointed out that Kurt Lewin once said, “Theory without practice is sterile; practice without theory is blind.” Hence, both theory and facts (or practice) are essential for social scientific theorizing. This paper is designed to prepare students of sociological theory to appreciate and demonstrate efforts at bridging the contested gap between abstract theoretical reasoning and practice, where both perspectives simultaneously work while analyzing a social phenomenon, during a research.

Therefore, at a theoretical level, this course examines the contributions of many thinkers and sociologists in the development of sociological theory, in particular, and sociology as a science and discipline, in general, with a view to attaining maturity of natural science. This paper serves as guide and value addition to the intellectual exercises of research students in the field of social sciences and sociology in the familiarisation of the dynamics and complexities of theory and practice as every research student is looking up to formulate a theoretical framework during his/her final year dissertation or thesis writing as one of the requirements for social scientific research.

Sociological Theorizing Brief Description On The Way To Go: Still A Work In Progress

There are rigors and challenges in comprehending abstract sociological theories and their application to real life situations. To have an overall view of sociological theorizing, let us look at the following compelling questions with the aim of providing answers to each in the course of analyzing the subject matter: what are concepts, variables, propositions, hypotheses and statements in sociological theorizing? To what extent is it relevant to know concepts such as ‘ontology’ and ‘epistemological foundation’ underpinning numerous sociological theories? What are quantitative and qualitative methods? What role does each play in sociological theorizing? What is a *sui-generis*? What about nomological network in sociological theorizing? When ontology is mentioned, what does it stand for? Ontology, explains the claim of what things exist, the form in which they exist and their relationship to other things that are also said to exist. Every discipline has its own ontology. In short, it is the historical foundation of social phenomenon in sociological theorizing. What about epistemology? It defines thoughts underpinning a theory and it is embedded in the knowledge-base of a sociological theory.

At this point, there is familiarity about methodology and what it is all about. Methodologies are scientific guides and are instrumental for the manipulation of components in social scientific research to enable analytical examination of data about a phenomenon to establish theoretical saturation. The question then is, do we need to know the social construction of reality? In the first place, what is a sociological theory? Sociological theories explain the ‘why’ and ‘how’ of a social phenomenon. However, a scientific theory is a system of constructs (concepts) and propositions and/or relationships between those constructs that collectively present a logical, systematic, and coherent explanation of a phenomenon of interest within some assumptions and boundary conditions (Bacharach, 1989 as reflected in Bhattacharjee A. 2012). Theories should explain why things happen, rather than just describe or predict them. The compelling questions continue as how do we arrive at a theory? What are the prerequisites or ethical values needed of a person theorizing? Of what value does theory add to our lives? What calls for a sociological theory in the first place? How and when do we need sociological theories? When constructing a sociological theory, do we need to follow a systematic way or do we randomize the process? What would happen if there were no sociological theories? When we use sociological theory to explain a particular social phenomenon then what? How do we put sociological theories into practice? How do other theories vary from sociological theories?

Why do we have different sociological theories? Why do sociological theorists differ in their explanations of a particular social phenomenon? What are the fundamentals of theory construction in sociology? Is it so important to know the essence of methods in sociological theories? What are the available methods imbedded in sociological theorizing? When do we need sociological theories to answer questions? Is it when the institutional arrangements of the society are isolated or when they are interconnected? How relevant is deductive nomology (general to particular) and inductive probabilistic (particular to general) in our understanding of sociological theorizing? Must we make classifications of bulk of data in sociological theorizing? What is theoretical saturations? When we say inductive and deductive methods in sociological theorizing, what do we mean by that?

What are we looking at when we code or classify data under themes and sub themes during analyses? When we say flagging themes, what do we mean? Do we need one method, two or several methods in sociological theorizing? What is the essence of demography in sociological theorizing? How does sociological theory differ from sociological perspective? What is positivism and how is it relevant in understanding sociological theories? What is phenomenology and how does it differ from ethno-methodology in our understanding of sociological theories? What is symbolic interactionism? What is a structural functionalist perspective?

How does the Marxian perspective differ from conflict perspective? What is spacio-temporality, relativism and relationism? Do we need to know the significance of concepts, variables and hypothesis in understanding sociological theories? How does a sociological theory differ from laws and principles? Can we arrive at sociological theories without data? When we say +/- relationship(s) or correlations on an empirical and theoretical plane between or among variables and construct in sociological theorizing, what do we mean by that? What do we mean by representativeness and generalization in the practice of sociological theorizing? How does empiricism differ from empirical research? Why must we know action frame of reference to better understand sociological theory? How do various sociologists differ in their views and theoretical perspectives while theorizing? How are levels of measurement of variables and test of significance relevant in sociological theorizing?

Having briefly discussed the above compelling questions in sociological theorizing, we then search for the larger picture i.e. the major theories proper, and implicitly answer some of these critical questions while treating the major theoretical postulates and perspectives in Sociological theorizing.

Sociological Theorizing: The Niche for Concepts, Constructs, Variables, Facts, Propositions and Hypotheses

These are approaches to sociological theorizing: the first approach to sociological theorizing is to build theories inductively based on observed patterns of events or behaviours. Such an approach is often called “grounded theory building” because the theory is grounded in empirical observations. This technique is heavily dependent on the observational and interpretive abilities of the researcher, and the resulting theory may be subjective. Furthermore, in our effort to theorize, observing certain patterns of events will not necessarily make for a theory, unless the researcher is able to provide consistent explanations for the observed patterns of a social phenomenon.

The second approach to theorizing is to use a predefined framework to conduct a bottom-up conceptual analysis to identify different sets of predictors relevant to the social phenomenon

of interest. One such framework, according to Bhattacharjee (2012) may be a simple input-process-output framework, where the researcher may look for different categories of inputs, such as individual, organizational, and/or technological. This approach looks at factors potentially related to the social phenomenon of interest (the output), and describe the underlying processes that link these factors to the target social phenomenon. This is also an inductive approach that relies heavily on the inductive abilities of the researcher, and interpretation may be biased by the researcher's prior knowledge of the social phenomenon being studied.

Similarly, the third approach to theorizing is to extend or modify existing theories to explain a new context, such as the extension of the Durkheimian Anomie theory, amplified by Robert, K. Merton to explain normlessness and/or lawlessness in the human society. While making such an extension, certain concepts, propositions, and/or boundary conditions of the old theory i.e. nomological network of the old theory may be retained and others modified to fit the new context. This deductive approach leverages the rich inventory of social science theories developed by prior theoreticians, and is an efficient way of theorizing on emerging social phenomenon when we build on the existing theories.

The fourth approach is to apply existing theories in entirely new contexts by drawing upon the structural similarities between the two contexts. This approach relies on reasoning by analogy, and is probably the most creative way of theorizing using a deductive approach (Bhattacharjee A. (2012); Newmann, F. et al (2001), Pressley, M. et. al. (1992).

Analysis of Concepts in Sociological Theorizing: The word 'concept' is said to be a terminology. K. Manheim (1936) and Peter, L. Berger (1966), in their separate thesis, pointed out that 'concepts' is a means by which a social scientist seeks to analyze social phenomena, to classify the objects of the observed world, impart meaning through explanation of these phenomena, and formulate higher-level propositions on the basis of his/her observations. In support of this notion, the imperative of description and inference drawing capacity of the researcher about concepts in sociological theorizing have been emphasised by Igun (1994) and Erinsho (2002), while Peter Berger (1966) in reinforcing their view points on these distinctions, posits that concepts have themselves been categorized in many ways, for example, they claim that distinction of concepts is between those which describe directly observable phenomena and those which signify inferred phenomena.

Many concepts in the social sciences, they argue, are both descriptive and evaluative, and many carry emotional or theoretically-loaded overtones. Such terms as 'exploitation', 'alienation', 'discrimination', 'personality', 'status' and even 'social class' bring with them heavy baggage of values. Concepts in sociological theorizing may also have progressive levels of abstraction. Bhattacharjee (2012), in his thesis, "Social Science Research: Principles, Method and Practice" reiterated that, some concepts such as a person's weight are precise and objective, while other concepts such as a person's personality may be subjective and more abstract and difficult to visualize. A construct is an abstract concept that is specifically chosen or created to explain a given social phenomenon for theorizing. A construct may be a simple concept, such as a person's weight, or a combination of a set of related concepts such as a person's communication skills, which may consist of several underlying concepts such as the person's vocabulary, syntax and spelling. In the former instance, weight is a one-dimensional construct, while the latter communication skill is a multi-dimensional construct consisting of multiple underlying concepts. The distinction between constructs and concepts are clearer in multi-dimensional

constructs, where the higher order abstraction is called a construct and the lower order abstractions are called concepts. (Bhattacharjee, 2012; Newman, et al 2001 and Pressley, et. al., 1992)

On the essence of sociological concepts in sociological theorizing, Manheim (1936) noted they are symbols or shorthand way of describing a social phenomenon and also serve as reflatory mirror through which the observer sees, perceives and forms a mental picture about the phenomenon under sociological scrutiny for theorizing. Theory constructions, according to Igun (1994) and Erinisho (2002), require the use of more abstract concepts but an observer has the task of establishing nexus between abstract concepts and empirical observations to test statements from the theory. To overcome the tasks of establishing links between abstract concepts which may be either labelled or referred variables about the phenomenon and the empirical observation made by the observer, an attempt is made to test the significance of the statements embedded in the sociological theory. That, in itself, emphasizes the imperatives of operational definitions of theoretical key terms, concepts and variables be they abstract, labelled or referred variables in sociological theorizing. Again, on label concepts, Manheim (1936) and Igun (1994) noted that it points to the existence of a phenomenon, while variables concepts permit the observer to see the variations in the same social phenomenon.

Analysis of Facts in Sociological Theorizing: Facts and data in social scientific theory building can be used interchangeably; facts are also called information at some level. In obtaining scientific material about a phenomenon, data sometimes can be generated by utilizing certain instruments (Edwards, 1990 and Ellen, 1984). Facts, data or information are also classified as either qualitative or quantitative. Qualitative facts/data are information obtained through interview or focus group discussions (FGD) and they come in the form of statements. On validity and generalisation, while constructing a social scientific theory, Golding, (2002) posits that in social scientific theorizing, we do empirical analysis of qualitative data obtained about a phenomenon in an effort to make a concrete generalisation. Facts obtained in an attempt to theorize are used to validate correlation or scientific statements contained in the hypothesis. It is imperative to note here that, facts/data are generated through interview in social scientific research while employing qualitative methods, according to Song et al (1995), A.G, Shettima (1998) and Wolcott (1990), interviews are classified in a tripodal way in a continuum of structured, semi-structured and un-structured. These three types of interviews are employed to generate facts/data at different stages of research under different social conditions and situations as deemed fit to describe a particular social phenomenon. The importance of qualitative methods to help generate facts/data in social scientific investigation cannot be over-emphasized as methods form the epistemological foundation of social scientific theorizing. Methodology remains the pivot upon which sociological theory rotates. Method, according to Edwards (1990) and Ellen, (1984), is considered in the milieu of social scientific investigators as prerequisites for phenomenological theorizing.

Essentially, methods help researchers explore and discover new concepts for developing theories, for example; the *Boko Haram* 'jihad' and their periodic attacks in Nigeria (Charmaz, 2006; Goulding, 2002; Thomas et al 2006, Glaser et al, 1994). This research therefore, presents the *Boko Haram* periodic attacks as a subject of investigation while methodological issues arising from interviews (qualitative methods) were carefully employed to enhance the reader's understanding of qualitative research. This provides sufficient facts/data for theorizing on *Boko Haram* as a social phenomenon. Consequently, qualitative approach brings to the fore

interview as a qualitative method of eliciting qualitative data as significant methodological consideration and focus of a research.

There are a number of methods and approaches in social scientific investigation utilized to generate facts and/or data which can be classified under two major themes namely: 'Qualitative' and 'Quantitative' research methods (Erinosho, 2008; Blauner, 1987; Cotter et al, 1982; A.G. Shettima (1998). However, qualitative research as method of data collection coupled with the interviewee (respondent) in the field can provide sufficient information or disclose facts which can confirm or disconfirm factual statements about the phenomenon under investigation (Davis, 1984; Dey, 1993; Glaser et al, 1967). For example, below is a typical example of qualitative historical data on *Boko Haram* periodic attacks as a social phenomenon: *...interviewees (respondents) further noted that, between 26th and 28th of July 2009 there were severe clashes when the Boko Haram 'jihadist' group attacked law enforcement agents in Maiduguri the Borno State capital in a declaration of "the D-day for 'jihad'" and subsequent reprisal attacks by the government to demolish their stronghold called Markas. About 1,500 people were killed and the Boko Haram stronghold with about 300 motorcycles, 80 cars and valuable goods belonging to members of the sect were destroyed. Wednesday 29th July 2009 there were reprisal attacks by the Boko Haram at the State Low Cost Housing Estate in Maiduguri. ...on the average, about 50 people were affected by the attacks per week in the year 2013 and 70 people in the year 2014 up to 80 people per day in the months of November and December of 2012, 2013, 2014 and up to early 2015 with higher casualties in Borno and Yobe States and relatively lower numbers recorded in Adamawa, Taraba, Bauchi and Gombe States.* (Source: PhD research thesis)

Interview or qualitative method, as it is called, is an alternative way of getting data through interview, focus group discussion (FGD) and interview schedule rather than using the quantitative method of asking respondents to read through a questionnaire and enter their own responses on the topic, which has a relatively low return rate (Kuhn, 1970; Blumer, 1969; A,G, Shettima (1998) ; Kvale, (1996); Corbin et al,(2003). Interview is generally an approach a researcher employs to elicit qualitative (subjective) data from targeted interviewees (respondents) concerning the phenomenon being investigated. In this research on the *Boko Haram*, the subject matter of study was given a great deal of qualitative methodological and ethical considerations (Mostyn, 1985; Moustakas, 1994; Patton, 1989).

Analysis of Variables in Sociological Theorizing: Variables are concepts which have some degree of properties to explain more of the variations of the elements of a phenomenon under sociological investigation Igun (1995). A comprehensive analysis of variables in sociological theorizing was put forward by Bhattacharjee A. (2012) while classifying them as independent, dependent, moderating, mediating, or control variables. Variables that explain other variables, he noted, are called independent while those that are explained by other variables are dependent variables. Furthermore, variables that are explained by independent variables are mediating variables (or intermediate variables), and those that influence the relationship between independent and dependent variables, Bhattacharjee A. (2012), asserted are called moderating variables. For instance, if one says lack of knowledge caused the *Boko Haram* phenomenon, then it means knowledge is an independent variable and *Boko Haram* is a dependent variable. There are other variables that explain *Boko Haram* as a dependent variable of knowledge with some degree of extraneous impact controlled in scientific theorizing; these kinds of variables are called control variables. Variables are concepts, which show the degree of intensity or influence of either vertical or horizontal integrations of the phenomenon, translating

longitudinal transformations of like phenomenon in the same way an observer theorizing would describe and define the same social phenomenon for generalization. Bhattacharjee A. (2012) posits that, constructs are conceptualized at the theoretical (abstract) plane, while variables are operationalized and measured at the empirical (observational) plane. In this case, variables have relationships while constructs have correlations in sociological theorizing. Theorizing on a given social phenomenon requires the ability to move back and forth between theoretical and empirical planes. Bhattacharjee (2012), in his thesis, "Social Science Research: Principles, Method and Practice" reinforces theorizing the STIM Model which provides stages and typologies in the evolution of *Boko Haram*, classifying it into 'geoformalized' and 'geoinformalized', with a further three (3) categories under each of these classifications. This may be described as a construct at theoretical plane and the same is true of stage 5 of the evolution of *Boko Haram* alluded to in the STIM Model called the geo-multitribal-configured jihadist *Boko Haram* as higher level abstraction (Redfield 1981; Senk S. et al, 2003) still progressively describing the compositions and properties in the evolution of the phenomenon of *Boko Haram*.

The importance of variables and abstract concepts both labelled and referred including statements and assumptions in sociological theorizing cannot be underestimated as they remain fundamental requirements as far as sociological theory construction is concerned. Redfield (1981) and Bhattacharjee A. (2012) in their separate theses further observed that a term frequently associated with a construct is a variable. Etymologically speaking, a variable varies from lower to higher levels e.g. describing stages of the development of *Boko Haram* starting from stage one (1) Geomechanistic Jihadist *Boko Haram* Periodic attackers to stage five (5) Georganistic Transnational Jihadist *Boko Haram* Periodic attackers with the exception of the four (4) stages which explained the dynamics of the phenomenon of *Boko Haram* at the two end of the continuum. The variables here are (mechanics and organics) utilized to develop a construct: Geomechanistic Jihadist *Boko Haram* Periodic attackers and Georganistic transnational Jihadist *Boko Haram* Periodic attackers.

Furthermore, the variables mechanical and organics were borrowed from Emile Durkheim's classification of society into traditional and modern. These two stages of *Boko Haram* explain the transition from simple to complex as lower level variables on the empirical plane and the higher level abstraction on the theoretical plane for theorizing on *Boko Haram*. However, Senk S. et al (2003), and Bhattacharjee A. (2012) further noted that in social scientific theorizing, a variable is a measurable representation of an abstract construct. As abstract entities, constructs are not directly measurable, and hence, we look for proxy measures called variables as in the above example where mechanical and organic solidarity of Durkheim were borrowed and developed further to describe *Boko Haram* into: Geomechanistic Jihadist *Boko Haram* Periodic attackers and Georganistic transnational Jihadist *Boko Haram* Periodic attackers (Kankiya, 2010; Fulk, J., 1990)

Analysis of Hypotheses in Sociological Theorizing: Hypothesis is a probabilistic statement explaining the relationship between or among variables. It consists of guesses or hunches about something expressed as a declarative sentence, and enables researchers to make inference from a sample of the population. In sociological theorizing, hypotheses are a set of interrelated statements (assumptions) used to better explain a social phenomenon. Hypothesis can be alternate, strong, weak, null or two-tailed. Furthermore, Bhattacharjee A. (2012), presented propositions as a tentative and conjectural relationship between constructs stated in a declarative form, for example, propositions deduced from the tenets of classical social tripod

insurgence model are as follows: the model describes *Boko Haram* as a violent historical mono-defaced socio-cultural group; it is historically located that, at the background of the *Boko Haram* insurgency their actions are justification in pursuance of a faithful course; *Boko Haram* insurgents operate within consistent paradigms with distinct nomenclature relative to their socio-cultural setting. *Boko Haram* insurgent background knowledge is seen by the model as a dogmatic commitment to a kind of knowledge borne out of misplaced perception; *Boko Haram's* body of thought was derived from the traditions of authorities whose sources of knowledge were subjected to severe criticism in the realm of its credibility, even among the contemporaries Scholars of the same faith. The model identified the tripod approach as a plausible solution to the crisis, namely: the principles of replacement, engagement and improvement to correct the historical damages perpetrated on the social structure of the society. The above declarative statement does not necessarily have to be true, but must be empirically testable using data, so that it can be adjudged true or false. Propositions are generally derived based on logic (deduction) or empirical observations (induction). As propositions are associations between abstract constructs, they cannot be tested directly, but are tested indirectly by examining the relationship between the corresponding measures (variables) of those constructs. The empirical formulation of propositions, stated as relationships between variables, is called hypotheses, for instance, the above propositions can be formulated into hypothesis as:

- There is significant relationship between historical violence of *Boko Haram* and the prevailing socio-cultural norms and value system of *Boko Haram* as a sub-cultural group.
- There is no relationship between *Boko Haram's* violence and their actions as justification to faithful course.
- There is significant relationship between differential in *Boko Haram's* line of thinking and group identification within the context of their belief system.
- There is positive relationship between *Boko Haram* members' background knowledge and lack of credibility due to misplaced perception of valid knowledge.
- There is relationship between the *Boko Haram* body of thought and the credibility of the sources and traditions of their authorities.
- There is no relationship between reversal of the structural damages caused by the *Boko Haram* and approach to three principles of replacement, engagement and improvement as plausible solutions.

Theory and Perspective are not the same but different in their respective considerations as there are many theoretical postulates within a perspective. For instance, there are many theoretical postulates within functionalist perspectives especially, those that differ in their specifications, scope, dominance, orientation and broader nature of the subject matter under sociological analysis for theorizing. Likewise, functionalism is not a sociological theory but a perspective that subsumes or encapsulates a number of theories built around it. Drawing from the structural functionalist perspectives, for instance, we have Robert K. Merton's 'Anomie Theory' where mode of adaptation was postulated within the functionalist frame work; ditto for Emile Durkheim's 'Theory on Suicide'.

However, there are a number of theories within the functionalist perspective. A theory is more specific, focused and narrower in design to explain a particular element or sets of social conditions than a theoretical perspective which seems too broad and wide to discuss a number of elements or sets of social conditions about the workings of the human society. Similarly, the positivist dimension, testing statements of a sociological theory against the real world of a

social phenomenon, is one of the most important characteristics of a sociological theory and value orientation required of a scientific community Igun (1995). Having said that, there are basically four types of theory, and they are as follows:

What Is a Theory: A theory is a way of thinking and a model of how things work, how principles are related, and what causes things to work together. Sociological theories address key questions, for example, is the sociological phenomenon being studied and understood in a way scientific? A theory is not just an idea but a complex body of knowledge. It is a coherent explanation of a set of relationships that have been tested with lots of research. If the idea survives it would be subjected to rigorous testing and that theory is said to have empirical grounding.

Again, a theory is a relationship between facts that explain a particular social phenomenon in some different ways; it explains observed facts about a phenomenon. Theory has an inherent capacity to make prediction for explanation, understanding and make explanation about a social Phenomenon, situation or event. Theory helps evaluate, examine and or test other theories. Theories help us develop skills and pass on the knowledge to others.

Sociological theory explains complex social realities or social phenomena. A theory is expected to be logical and consistent, with the power to give an explanation, for instance, how much does a given theory explain (or predict) a reality? A coherent theory obviously explains the target phenomenon better than rival theories as often measured by variance value in regression equations. Bhattacharjee A. (2012) outlined attributes of a coherent theory as ‘falsifiability’. ‘Falsifiability’ ensures that the theory is potentially disprovable if empirical data does not match theoretical propositions, as this allows for their empirical testing by researchers. In other words, theories cannot be theories unless they can be empirically testable. Tautological statements, such as “a day with high temperatures is a hot day” are not empirically testable because a hot day is defined (and measured) as a day with high temperatures, and hence, such statements cannot be viewed as theoretical propositions. This alludes to Karl Popper (1940), who argued that for theories to be valid, they must be falsifiable. This view point has also been supported by Newmann et al (1995).

‘Falsifiability’ requires the presence of rival explanations as it ensures that the constructs are adequately measurable, and so forth. Bhattacharjee A. (2012) like Newmann, F. et al. (1996), pointed out that saying a theory is falsifiable is not the same as saying that a theory should be falsified. If a theory is indeed falsified based on empirical evidence, then it was probably a poor theory in the first place. Bhattacharjee A. (2012) further added that parsimony is also another characteristic of a coherent social theory. Parsimony examines how much of a phenomenon is explained with how few variables. When a phenomenon is explained with few variables, the explanations can be described as ‘Ockham’s Razor’.

The concept of ‘Ockham’ is attributed to 14th century English logician Father William of Ockham who stated that among competing explanations that sufficiently explain the observed evidence, the simplest theory i.e. the one that uses the smallest number of variables or makes the fewest assumptions is the best. Explanation of a complex social phenomenon can always be increased by adding more and more constructs. This view point has been reinforced by Smith J. (2001), Stigler et al (1999) and Stigler J. (2004). However, such approach defeats the purpose of having a theory, which is intended to be “simplified” and generalized in explanations of reality. Parsimony relates to the degrees of freedom in a given theory.

Parsimonious theories have higher degrees of freedom, which allow them to be more easily generalized to other contexts, settings, and populations.

TYPOLOGY OF THEORY

Analytic Theory: Consists of a set of axiomatic statements which are true by their definitions and are quantitatively driven. B. J. Richard (1995), A.G. Shttima (1998) pointed out that they are mostly logics found in mathematics, which are highly abstract and explain less about the real social world. Analytical theory is relevant for the description of a natural phenomena rather than social phenomenon and that assumption has further advanced the debates between positivist and interpretivist model in social scientific theorizing Igun (1995). However, noted that has not limited the strength of analytic theory in the study of social phenomenon which has been the subject of intellectual debate put forward by the Positivist and the interpretivist model. For instance, the methodology or logic guiding analytical theory strongly believed in such logic like thus: $4+x=10$ when we make x the subject and you now get $x=10-4$ is equal to 6, then, we can deduce that, $x=6$. To prove this analytical expression, we then substitute x for 6 and thus have $4+6=10$ so, its true that, $x=6$. This kind of method or logic in theory construction is called analytic approach to theorizing, which requires reasoning and thinking to establish the facts.

In social scientific investigation, B.W. Arthur (1977) noted that, analytic theory is synonymous with quantitative method utilized in social analytic psychology. Analytic psychology is also called the 'Jungian Psychology'. It is a school of psychotherapy which originated with the idea of Carl Jung, a Swiss psychiatrist, who emphasized the importance of individual psyche and the personal quest for wholeness. One view of the quantitative science is that it is about representing the observable world by equations (Fichman, R.G., 1992) e.g. the STIM model equation as an example. Sociological concepts are symbols developed by discipline to describe the world in which we live. Facts are the observations we make about the concepts which are dealt with while explaining a social phenomenon, and at some level facts are classified as data. Hypotheses are set of logical propositions or taken-for-granted assumptions formulated or proposed which are yet to be tested and verified empirically.

The Second Middle Range Theory: These are theories derived from specific scientific findings and focuses on the interconnectivity of two or more concepts applied to a very specific social phenomenon or problem such as *Boko Haram*. The second middle range theories from the notion of Ron, J. Hammond (2009), Alavi, M. (2000) and Leidner, D.E. (2001) can be achieved through the process of inductive method as put forth by Robert K. Merton saying we should cultivate the habit of confronting sets of research and large data so that such data could be explained by some relatively particularized principle, that is, the middle principle. This is what Robert K. Merton referred to as 'the middle principle in-sociological theorizing' and suggested that, it should be the main target of contemporary researchers in sociology. However, reasoning implies the ability to engage in a set of interrelated intellectual processing. The result is that whenever we think, we reason and usually are not aware of the full scope of the way we reason that is implicit in our minds Williams, L. (2000). The STIM model also called classical social tripod insurgency model focused on specific social phenomenon of *Boko Haram* and give adequate description of the group from the perspective of knowledge, reality and society. The interplay or interconnectivity of the three concepts is the tripod on which STIM model is powerfully situated as one of the second-middle range theorizing. Below is hypothetical empirical testing of the STIM model equation in practice:

Quantitative Approach to Sociological Theorizing: Empirical Testing of Social Tripodal Model (STIM) Equation in Practice:

Insurgency is directly proportional to $K_n R_n S_n$ ----- (a)

Insurgency is inversely proportional to $R_o E_o I_o$ ----- (b)

$$I_n \propto K_n R_n S_n$$

Introduce constant of proportionality which is K and we now have

$$I_n = K [K_n R_n S_n] \text{ ----- (i)}$$

We make K the subject of the formula by dividing both sides of equation (i) by $K_n R_n S_n$.

$$\frac{I_n}{K_n R_n S_n} = \frac{[K_n R_n S_n]}{K_n R_n S_n}$$

$$\therefore K = \frac{I_n}{K_n R_n S_n} \text{ ----- (ii)}$$

From equation (b)

$$I_n \propto \frac{1}{R_o E_o I_o}$$

$$I_n = K \left(\frac{1}{R_o E_o I_o} \right)$$

$$\therefore I_n = \frac{K}{R_o E_o I_o}$$

We multiply both of the equations by $R_o E_o I_o$ to make K the subject of the formula that is;

$$R_o E_o I_o \times I_n = R_o E_o I_o \times \frac{K}{R_o E_o I_o}$$

$$\therefore I_n R_o E_o I_o = K \text{ ----- (iii)}$$

In equation (ii) above replace K with $I_n R_o E_o I_o$ that is $K = \frac{I_n R_o E_o I_o}{K_n R_n S_n}$

$$\therefore I_n R_o E_o I_o = \frac{I_n R_o E_o I_o}{K_n R_n S_n}$$

Then cross multiply

$$\frac{I_n R_o E_o I_o}{K_n R_n S_n} \times K_n R_n S_n = I_n \times 1$$

$$I_n R_o E_o I_o K_n R_n S_n = I_n$$

Collect like terms we have

$$I_n R_o E_o I_o K_n R_n S_n - I_n = 0$$

Factorize this expression we have

$$I_n [R_o E_o I_o K_n R_n S_n - 1] = 0 \text{ ----- (iv)}$$

Hypothetical Question: (1)

The Northeastern region of Nigeria, particularly Maiduguri the Borno State Capital has been under the siege of the Boko Haram for almost 10 years. The activities of the insurgent has crippled Educational activities especially Schools. From the survey conducted recently by a Non-governmental organisation XY, on the extent of damages caused by the activities of the Boko Haram on quality of Education, for one year and the following quantitative data were obtained as follows;

Hypothetical Data:

$$R_o = 28$$

$$E_o = 6$$

$$I_o = 4$$

$$S_n = 10$$

$$I_n = 8$$

$$R_n = 12.$$

1a) Using tripodal insurgency model equation, determine the value of Knowledge (K_n) of the affected region.

($I_n [R_o E_o I_o K_n R_n S_n - 1] = 0$) take 0.5 error value

Solution:

Given

$$R_0 = 2$$

$$E_0 = 6$$

$$I_0 = 4$$

$$S_n = 10$$

$$I_n = 8$$

$$R_n = 12$$

Recall the Tripodal insurgency model equation (Formular)

$$I_n [R_0 E_0 I_0 K_n R_n S_n - I] = 0$$

Open the bracket by multiplying by I_n

$$\text{Therefore: } I_n R_0 E_0 I_0 K_n R_n S_n - I_n = 0$$

$$I_n R_0 E_0 I_0 K_n R_n S_n = I_n$$

Divide both sides of the equation by $I_n R_0 E_0 I_0$ enable

We have

$$K_n = \frac{I_n}{I_n R_0 E_0 I_0 R_n S_n} = \frac{I_n}{I_n R_0 E_0 I_0 R_n S_n}$$

$$K_n = \frac{I_n}{2 \times 6 \times 4 \times 12 \times 10}$$

$$K_n = \frac{1}{5760} = 0.00017361111$$

1b) To calculate Ten years of knowledge of the affected region in relation to insurgency of the Northeast taking value of 1 year of knowledge from the survey above as = **0.0002** i.e 10 years of insurgency will be **0.002 x 10 = 0.01736 ≈ 0.02**

Interpretation of the value

From the value **0.02** above, the degree of correlation of knowledge to insurgency has a positive value. Hence, there is insignificant degree of positive correlation between knowledge of the region and the prevailing crime of insurgency.

Normative Theory: Normative ethical theory was first proposed by Fred Siebert, Theodore, Peterson and Wilbur Schramm in their book, 'Four Theories of the Press.' It came into being in the United States during the height of the Cold War with communism and the Soviet Union often called western theory of mass communication Stone C. L et al, (1983), Wenglinsky, H. (1998), posits that normative theory describes an ideal way for a mass system to be controlled and operated by the government, those in authority, leaders and the public. Normative theory is different from other communication theories of the press, as it does not provide any scientific explanations or prediction according to Fichman, et al (1999). It is a combination of many theories rather than a single one. Sometimes media practitioners, social critics and academics develop normative theories. It asks questions such as what should people expect from the media in times of crises? Should the media broadcast highly rated content even if it has high levels of violence? It is a theory that deals with the mass media and day-to-day happenings as they occur at the time.

Metaphysical Theory: Metaphysical theories are very close to scientific theories. They constitute useful assumptions which have programmatic or suggestive roles; they are abstract theories. For example, the evolutionary theories of Herbert Spencer and Charles Darwin: 'Origin of Species' also called the 'Theory of Natural selection'. Some also call it 'survival of

the fittest'. Again, potentially, these are the principles used by Aristotle throughout his philosophical works to analyse motion, causality and other issues (Schmidt W. Et al, 1997). The opening arguments in Aristotle's 'Metaphysics Book I' revolve around the senses, knowledge, experience, theory and wisdom. Metaphysical investigations include existence, objects and their properties, space and time, cause and effects and possibility. A central branch of metaphysics is ontology the investigations in to the basic categories of being and how they relate to one another. Another central branch is metaphysical cosmology which seeks to understand the origin and meaning of the Universe by thought alone.

There are two broad conceptions to metaphysical theories: the strong classical view assumes that the objects studied by metaphysics exist independently of any observer, so that the object is the most fundamental of all science. While the weaker, more modern view, assumes that the objects studied by metaphysics exist in the mind of an observer, so the subject becomes a form of introspection and conceptual analysis. Some Philosophers, notably Kant, discuss both of these and what can be inferred about each one, but the logical positivist rejects the entire subject of metaphysics as meaningless while others disagree and think that, it is legitimate.

Scientific Theory: A scientific theory is universally made up of statements that are empirically verifiable, it is a coherent group of propositions formulated to explain a group of facts about a phenomenon or the natural world and repeatedly confirmed through experiences or observations. Specific types of theories are used in the scientific method to explain specific elements of a phenomenon. Most properly used, the word 'theory' means an idea or hunch that someone has but in science scientific theory it refers to the way facts are interpreted. The characteristics of a scientific theory are: the bulk of knowledge to explain reality about a society or phenomena which is testable, replicable, stable, simple and consistent and should contain concepts, statements, variables and hypotheses. More so, at the level of analysis, scientific theory should also have basic assumption/ hypothesis, theoretical content, methodology and critic.

Abstract versus Empirical Research: Implications on Contemporary Social Phenomenon of *Boko Haram*

On the empirical plane, learning to theorize demands both specifics and general approaches, finding ways to enrich our personal experiences through studying the experiences of others, seeking theoretical insights that give meaning to what we do, or formulating sceptical questions about what we think. According to Strauss and Corbin (1990), Stebbin (2001), Kelle (2005) and Mey et al, (2007), inductive analysis is the principal technique used in the grounded theory method. Inductive analysis means that the patterns, themes and categories of analysis come from the data; they emerge out of the data rather than being imposed on them prior to data collection and analysis Patton, (1980), Strauss and Corbin (1990), Bowen, (2006) Glaser and Strauss, (1967). Inductive method, according to Cauhape (1983) and Broadhead (1983), is also said to be a general methodology, a way of thinking about and conceptualizing data among other methodological issues available in sociological theorizing. Woods (2011) in his thesis on "Interviewing for research and analyzing qualitative data" sufficiently highlighted steps for data analysis from the perspective of grounded theory. He posits that, data collection can only stop when the researcher decides that, no new material or new codes are being generated on the phenomenon under study. Each code, he added, is gradually merged into bigger codes or conceptual units until main codes or categories emerge.

Boyatzis (1998) had identified five elements of a good coding system as labels or definitions of what each theme constitutes, citing its characteristics or issues constituting each theme, descriptions of how to know when each theme occurs, referred to as flagging themes, descriptions of any qualifications or exclusions of identifying themes and to eliminate possible confusion when looking for such themes.

Similarly, the codes, themes and categories of, for instance, the *Boko Haram* periodic attacks that emerged during data analyses were defined, characterized, and adequately described to give the phenomenon of *Boko Haram* attacks a theoretical footing. It enables us to discover two (2) major categories of the group's attacks, with six (6) minor ones and a number of themes and codes with their properties to better understand what Woods (2011), called 'underlying uniformities in sociological theorizing'.

The design employed in this research was descriptive qualitative (subjective) research method with purposive sampling method, while grounded theory supplemented with inductive thematic analysis was employed as method of data analysis. Based on the analysis of the qualitative field data, major findings were discovered as stages and typologies of *Boko Haram* 'jihadist' periodic attacks in Nigeria. Analysis of the qualitative field research confirms the evolving nature of the 'jihadists'. *Boko Haram* which can best be described, at present time, as a gradual but steady growth of a hitherto simple monolithic hierarchical religious group in north-eastern Nigeria to a complex sophisticated but morally decadent phenomenon in what Durkheim (1912) in his thesis on 'Elementary Forms of Religious Life' described as 'periodic transition to moral crisis'. Similarly, Hammes (2009), in his study entitled 'Armed Group: Changing the Rules' portrayed *Boko Haram* as an armed group which can best be described as a 'Coalition of the Willing'. Examination of the qualitative and quantitative data on *Boko Haram* and its attacks in Nigeria classified these attacks under two major categories: (1) Geo-formalized periodic attacks' and (2) Geo-informalized periodic attacks. Similarly, comparative analysis of these two classifications further split them into six (6) major themes as stages and typologies in the evolution of *Boko Haram*.

Furthermore, the overall network of relationships between a set of related constructs is called a nomological network. Theorizing on the evolutionary stages of *Boko Haram*, Bhattacharjee (2012) noted, requires not only being able to extract constructs from observations made about the group as a social phenomenon, but also being able to mentally visualize a nomological network linking these abstract constructs. Consequently, empirical research utilizing inductive method in sociological theorizing, a grounded theory and constant comparative perspectives discovered the following categories of stages and typologies in the evolution of *Boko Haram* periodic attacks as follows:

1. The Geomechanistic-Talibanism 'jihadist' periodic attacks;
2. The Geoconservative-Yusuffiya 'jihadist' periodic attacks and
3. The Geolone-Ya'anawa 'jihadist' periodic attacks.

Whereas in contrast to the Geo-informalized category of 'jihadist' periodic attacks, the Geo-formalized category of 'jihadist' periodic attacks are categorized as follows:

4. The Geoindigenous mixed-clan 'jihadist' periodic attacks;
5. The Geomulti-tribal configured 'jihadist' periodic attacks and
6. The Georganistic-transnational 'jihadist' periodic attacks.

Supporting the notion that, theories are sets of inter-related concepts, variables, hypotheses and scientifically tested facts, R. J. Hammond, (2009), reiterated that sociological theory, thus,

provides views, magnifies, enlarges, clarifies, and expands our understanding of people, their behaviours, and societies. Theories, he added, help scientists to brace-up to perform a certain type of study with certain types of questions about a phenomenon and their taken-for-granted assumptions about the theorized phenomenon would be tested. Once the study is conducted and the findings or outcome are generalized to support the claim then theoretical postulates are said to be attained, but if they do not support it then similar studies will be performed by the researchers to repeat the inductive process of sociological theorizing and fine-tune the methodological requirement of such processes. R. J. Hammond, (2009) further argued that, any given sociological theory usually investigates one aspect of a phenomenon. From observations, for instance, one can create an explanation or a theory of the different stages of the phenomenon as exemplified above on stages and typologies of *Boko Haram* periodic attacks.

Sociological theory is a body of knowledge which demonstrates the relationship between two or more variables as they relate to human social actions; action not behaviour. It has a number of concepts for adequate explanations or description of a phenomenon under sociological examination. However, no single sociological theory can adequately explain a particular social phenomenon; this is so because it has many elements some of which are the focus of one theory while others are the concern of other theories. Consequently, there is the need to appreciate the dominance of information technology in today's globalised world and its effects on the intellectual strength of existing sociological theories. There are a number of sociological theories, models, approaches, themes and perspectives in sociology that can be used to explain social phenomena, however, theoretical perspectives are usually employed by social scientists to better enhance their understanding in the description of a social phenomena. Sociological theories and/or perspectives that are more pronounced in the realm of social science today and utilized to investigate social phenomenon are: the theory of evolution also called evolutionism; Marxism called the Marxian perspectives; symbolic interactionism called the interactionist or phenomenological perspectives; structural functionalism called the system theory or functionalist perspectives and the conflict perspectives, among other theories, approaches, themes and perspectives in sociology.

Sociological theory is used to describe or explain the interrelationship of a set of social facts that have been empirically verified or are capable of being verified. Theory is a statement derived from bulk of knowledge to explain reality about a phenomenon in the society; the very tripod on which classical social tripod model is powerfully situated. Sociological theorizing requires mental exercise i.e. the active use of senses, thought, thinking and reasoning which are central to sociological theorizing and experimentation of discovery made by a social scientist about social phenomenon.

Theoretical Development: Inductive Method in Sociological Theorizing

Theoretical development in sociology, like other scientific theories, follows systematic ways of enumeration in searching for scientific laws for generalization. Sociological theorizing therefore follows inductive methods, that is, noting the characteristics or behavior of as large a number of instances of a phenomenon as possible and proceeding to generalize all instances of that phenomenon. It is important to caution here, however, that as students of sociological theories, we should not juxtapose all elements of a phenomenon for generalization. It is always advisable to select an aspect of a phenomenon for empirical research, observation or test and then subsequently attempt to theorize based on the findings that would eventually emerge from the analysis and classification of large data gathered.

A researcher who is tasked with developing a sociological theory employs inductive method when he/she moves from specific research questions about the problems and specific elements of a phenomenon to be investigated, and subsequently develops a dogmatic commitment about his/her findings, thereby arriving at a generalization. John Rex, in his book, 'Key Problems of Sociological Theory' (1961) pointed out that it would be convenient, therefore, to follow Emile Durkheim's inductive sociological theorizing in order to understand the implications of the adoption of such a model of scientific method. Durkheim in his thesis, 'The Rules of Sociological Method' outlined five stages of scientific investigation which give way to the inductive theoretical development of sociology:

1. Definition of the subject matter in terms of some observable characteristics;
2. Description of normal types after a study of many cases;
3. Classification into species genera etc;
4. Comparative and causal investigations of the reason for variations;
5. The attempt to discover any general laws that might emerge in the course of these variation stages.

Following Durkheim's propositions, one can say that inductive method in sociological theorizing is a research process rather than a predetermined theoretical abstract position. An example of Durkheimian proposition of inductive theorizing was the discovery of evolutionary stages and typologies of *Boko Haram* discussed above. A researcher is said to have engaged in inductive theorizing when he simply tends to be analytical in establishing a causal relationship about an element of the phenomenon subjected to scientific inquiry, which may, in the end, benefit humanity. As a student of sociological theory who wishes to employ inductive method to contribute to the development of sociological theorizing, one must, in the first place; set goals, purposes or objectives about the element of the phenomenon to be theorized on and then form consistent and specific research questions, hypotheses and/or assumptions upon establishing problems on the issues surrounding the investigation. Then, construct hypothetical assumptions and beliefs on the issue being investigated, become familiar with the concepts, ideas, and the perspectives to be employed and then make objective points of view within the context of theoretical underpinning about the specimen, that is, the set of data obtained from the demography on the same element to be theorized on.

Consequently, focus on the implications and consequences of the issues under sociological examination; make clear distinctions between correlations and assumptions which go with the relationship between or among variables that deal with the element of the social phenomenon under investigation. Fix methodological considerations to enable you manage your data that may eventually establish evidence/facts that require high degrees of familiarity and experience as a researcher to answer all the questions asked earlier about the phenomenon. Interpret findings which must validate, confirm or disconfirm your hypothesis or assumptions for generalization, then, draw conclusions on what you wish to theorize about. This process is called inductive method in theoretical development, but a lot of work, exercise and reading needs to be done to get it right and the end product is vulnerable for validation and scientific proof. Bhattacharjee, A. (2012), on sociological theorizing following inductive deductive method, notes that, the process of theory or model development may involve inductive and deductive reasoning. Deduction, he argues, is the process of drawing conclusions about a phenomenon or behaviour based on theoretical or logical reasons on an initial set of premises, while in deduction, the conclusions must be true if the initial premises and reasons are correct.

In contrast, induction is the process of drawing conclusions based on facts or observed evidence, inductive conclusions are, therefore, only a hypothesis and may be disproven.

Normothetic Approach in Sociological Theorizing: Normothetic approach in social scientific theorizing tends to investigate large groups of people in order to make general laws of behaviour that apply to everyone. The basic assumption of the Normothetic approach is that an individual is a complex combination of many universal laws and therefore argues that, it is best to study people on a larger scale, and the methodology governing Normothetic approach is quantitative research method. Normothetic approach is aimed at identifying the universal laws governing human behaviour. The approach tends to reduce human beings, especially individuals, to continuous variables such as numbers, classify them with others and then measure the actions as a score upon a dimension or a statistic supporting the general principle (averaging).

Ideographic Approach in Sociological Theorizing: It is an approach of investigating individuals at personal in-depth details to achieve a unique understanding of them. Ideographic approach assumes that human beings are unique, the method employed in ideographic is qualitative and, at times, a case study approach would provide a more complete and global understanding of the individual being studied using flexible, long terms and detailed procedures in order to put them in a class of their own.

In this case, for as long as sociology deals with individuals, groups or societies would have less business in looking at an individual as a unit of analysis, as it has undermined the importance of ideographic approach as a method of sociological theorizing. Ideographic approach is, perhaps, suitable for social psychology, while Normothetic method is well suited for sociological theorizing, as it deals with demography i.e. large group(s) and their characteristics in a given social setting.

Posterior Approach In Sociological Theorizing; Most of what is referred to as sociological theory today falls within the orbit or realm of posterior approach knowledge from experience which mostly derives its validity from the evolutionism of Charles Darwin, Herbert Spencer and later August Comte who coined the discipline of sociology, and subsequently Emile Durkheim who introduced the scientific method of investigation M. Abdullahi, (1998). However, Kankiya (2008), posits, there was a bone of contention among scholars as to whether August Comte or Ibn-Khaldun that, first mentioned the concept of sociology. Central to evolutionism is the origin of species and how it evolves by way of transfer of characteristics from the larger parents to their offspring and how the stronger species tend to survive, integrate and regenerate to form a new generation, while the weaker ones goes into a comatose state or extinction. This is one of the theoretical contents of Charles Darwin's evolutionary theory called, 'The Origin of Species' or 'Survival of the Fittest'.

Evolutionary theory is the earliest way of man's thinking, centred or geared toward social change for sustainable development. To better understand the relevance of evolutionism in understanding sociological theories, we are going to discuss the phenomenon of *Boko Haram*, as an example, in subsequent lines of thought. Celebrated examples of the exponents of evolutionism include earliest thinkers such as Herbert Spencer, Charles Darwin, August Comte and Emile Durkheim et al, to mention but a few.

Evolutionary theory is built on the very foundation of quantitative method and it is also called 'positivistic organism'. Most of the earliest social thinkers used evolutionary approach to give

description to and form perspectives on their explanations of a social phenomenon. It is a method of thinking through which man discovers himself. When man develops a faculty of reasoning (and reasoning here can be inductive or deductive or rational as championed by Marx Weber), he first of all thinks and his thinking is centred on social change, after which and he now asks himself some fundamental philosophical questions (how was, is and would be a man?) When these questions are answered utilizing sociological theories then the outcome or the end result is synonymous with growth and development. Evolutionary theory or methodology is thus central to sociological theories.

Evolutionism: The Structural Foundation of most Sociological Theories

Evolutionary theory gives an account of why and how a social phenomenon occurs, and this inevitably makes us think and ponder, in an attempt to establish methodological consideration to get answers to the questions of the WHY and HOW of a social phenomenon, social situations or things which at some level are called social facts. Durkheim referred to this as things which exist independent of an actor or social investigator's views and opinions. Sociological theories are more often utilized as a framework to organize specific social phenomena as they happen in human society. There are five major theoretical perspectives in sociology which were actively utilized by social scientists to draw inference and/or generalization, these include: the theory of evolution also called evolutionary theory, the Marxian theory also known as the Marxian perspective, structural functionalism called the functionalist perspective or System theory, symbolic interaction called interactionist perspectives or phenomenology and conflict theories, among other perspectives.

Theory is simply said to be what is happening and how people observe and document it. It is derived from meaning, and meaning can be understood by way of explanations and explanations comes from observations and experience and, therefore, these are the roots of a theory. The antecedents of any theory are derived from experience. In that sense, any theory built on the very foundation of experience is called *posterior*, that is to say, experience and knowledge form an integral component of that sociological theory as it was derived from experience. Similarly, sociological theories may take a perspective of *a-priori*, that is, knowledge without experience, for instance, intuition and powerful observations.

Evolutionism: The Relevance of Thinking and Reasoning in Sociological Theorizing;

As students of sociological theories who wish to build a system in sociology that should have been empirically verifiable or falsifiable laws like those of physics and chemistry, we are left with no other option than to think, and our thinking should follow general laws and principles as found in inductive sociological theorizing. Two things are fundamental and sacrosanct for this to happen: thinking and reasoning as advocated by evolutionism as both method and theory. These two elements are central and prerequisites for making credible inference about any phenomenon being studied, with a view to establishing sociological theory with perfect generalization within the realm of sociology of one world. Olu, Ogunika (1998) Schmidt, W. et al (2002), Williams, L. et al (2000) maintain that, there is no way we can theorize without thinking and reasoning, we think as human beings but reasoning is the higher level and requires formal procedure for arriving at credible conclusions same as Herbert Spencer and the likes of Emile Durkheim, August Comte and Talcott Parson and Robert K. Merton did in their respective sociological theorizing.

However, John Rex in his book, 'Key Problems of Sociological Theory' noted that a lot needs to be done in sociological theorizing for sociology as a discipline to attain the maturity of

physics. Reasoning, he noted, highlights the inference-drawing capacity of the mind, it is said to be in action when the mind draws conclusions on the basis of reasons. We draw conclusions whenever we make sense of things, and to achieve conclusion we think of several possibilities and then follow steps of reason for it to occur. However, in that sense, we can upgrade the quality of our reasoning when we understand the intellectual processes that underlay it. To achieve anything like the maturity of physics in sociology, as students of sociological theories, we must first of all learn to develop hypotheses, in other words, take assumptions for granted and give proper description of all elements of the social phenomenon being studied, as well as put forward inductive generalization.

As students of sociological theories who wish to learn the complexities and dynamics of sociological theorizing, we should cultivate the habit of confronting sets of research and large data so that such data can be explained by some relatively particularized principle, in other words, the middle principle, Jereery R.Y. (1959), Alavi, M.et al (2001) noted. This is what Robert K. Merton referred to as the 'the middle principle in-sociological theorizing' and suggested that it should be the main target of the contemporary researchers on sociological theorizing. However, reasoning implies the ability to engage in a set of interrelated intellectual processing. The result is that, whenever we think, we reason. Usually we are not aware of the full scope of the way we reason that is implicit in our minds.

The Relationship between Evolutionism and other Sociological Theories: Most of what we called sociological theories today drew their origins from the evolutionary theory, which is the earliest way of thinking of great scholars who align their strategic thinking and observation on phenomena within the eco-system and to its evolving nature and progressive stages of its development. For better understanding of evolutionism, we may cite example of differential theorizing on the stages of development, for instance, Clarence Jereery R.Y. (1959) posits that development is a progression from primary to the secondary group; Spencer viewed the movement as one from homogeneous to heterogeneous units; George C. Hommans (1950) pointed out that Durkheim viewed change or development as evolving from mechanical to organic solidarity. Furthermore, Tonnie's expressed change to mean some sort of evolution from *Gemeinschaft* to *Gesellschaft* which also means transition from community to society. Saxon Graham (1957) added that Park and Becker talk about sacred and secular societies, which also describes evolution from end to end. Sweedlum et al (1956) further noted the organic transition and/or evolution of phenomena, as Redfield uses the terms 'folk society' and 'urban society'. Similarly, *Boko Haram* as a social phenomenon also evolved from its simpler stage to a more complex one which can be described as 'Geo-mechanistic-jihadist' periodic attackers to 'geo-organistic-jihadist' periodic attackers. Maine discussed the transition of a phenomenon in terms of status and contract. Marx Weber viewed the change in social organization as evolving from traditional authority to legal-rational authority.

Furthermore, August Comte propounded the stages of development as: theological, metaphysical and scientific. Durkheim talked about mechanical and organic solidarity which was later expanded by Tonnie's to describe how phenomenon changes from one stage to another and coined what he referred to as the *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*. According to Tonnie's, *Gemeinschaft* was coined to mean a world of close emotional face-to-face ties, attachment to a place and a homogeneous setting, which is more or less 'geo-mechanistic' and regulated community, while the *Gesellschaft* concept refers to association; it is a term linked with urbanism, 'geo-organistic' industrial life, heterogeneity and sedentary life. These concepts are highly abstract and theoretical, hence, the need to establish a nexus between theory and practice

and/or empirical research. However, what Durkheim and Tonnies are saying tends to explain simple versus complex and if we are to introduce an example from our immediate environment, it would enhance our understanding of what the theories are saying. For instance, the phenomenon of *Boko Haram's* transiting from simple to complex, which can be described as 'geo-mechanistic-jihadist' periodic attackers to 'geo-organistic-jihadist periodic attackers.

***Boko Haram* Insurgency: An Evolutionary Perspective:** Sociological theories enable us understand and predict the 'why' and 'how' of *Boko Haram* as a social phenomenon. *Boko Haram* eventually waxed stronger and metamorphosed into the complicated social phenomenon it is today. The transformation that brought about the differentiation and integration of the insurgent group confirmed what social theorists such as Spencer, Simmel, Khaldun and Darwin (1968 [1859]) in one of the most actively cited theories in dealing with sociological theories, the 'Theory of Evolution', believed, and which was, supported by Durkheim (1965 [1912]). The sociological thoughts of the former described the phenomena of *Boko Haram* as transiting and evolving from 'simple (geo-mechanistic-jihadist periodic attackers) to a more complex (geo-organistic-jihadist periodic attackers), and then, the later noted the graduation of the group from 'mechanical to organic'. The theory of evolution also confirmed that *Boko Haram* was hitherto a relatively 'simple' and 'mechanical' group of socially excluded Islamic students who graduated to a violent, destructive, 'complex' and 'organic' insurgent group, capable of creating some sort of altruistic suicidal allegiance to their sub-cultural society for the maintenance of their ideological hegemony, thereby causing an anomie condition (lawlessness and/or Normlessness in the society)

What the evolutionary theorists such as Herbert Spencer and Durkheim et al referred to as 'complexity' can be understood from the viewpoint of *Boko Haram* becoming complex, defensive and offensive in what Mao Tse-tung (1972) alluded to in his study of the 'Strategic Defensive and the Strategic Offensive in Guerrilla Warfare', he described the fluidity of *Boko Haram's* operations, taking advantage of interior lines as against the Nigerian military personnel who conducted exterior-line operations. Tse-tung also pointed out that when the phenomenon of *Boko Haram* evolved to a stage of 'geo-organistic-jihadist' periodic attacks, there would be a geometric increase, that is, sudden rise and fall of the group's base stations, indiscriminate recruitment of members regardless of background affiliation, sophistication of weapons, changing nature in the trend and pattern of its operations and the building of indigenous initiatives over the Nigerian military men of the joint task force deployed to restore peace in the Northern States of Nigeria. This stage was more developed, complicated and stronger as opposed to the earlier phase of *Boko Haram's* development, which could be described as the 'geo-mechanistic-Jihadist' periodic attacks, as the group appeared to have emerged as a social phenomenon with its complexities for sociological theorizing.

Aside complexity, evolutionary theory also tells us more about differentiation and integration of a social phenomenon. Again, for instance, *Boko Haram* as a social phenomenon, at some point in its evolution, differentiated and integrated to suggest what Hoffer (2005) in his study of 'the true believers: thought of the nature of mass movements' described as the 'inter-changeability of *Boko Haram* by substitution' in support of the changing nature of its insurgency. Rahman (2012) argued and maintained that the United States of America (USA) disclosed that *Boko Haram*, Al-Shabbab and Al-Qaeda had jointly established a complex network of swapping funds, ammunition and training of members, the aim of which was to entangle the phenomenon with religion. *Boko Haram* left so many people in doubt and confusion because of its complexity, having undergone differentiation and integration to

produce more and more elements that needed to be understood and answered through powerful scientific observations. This is what the sociological theories, such as the theory of evolution and structural functionalist theories, try to postulate about sociological theorizing while utilizing Positivistic organicistic perspectives.

Four Crucial Components that are Central to Sociological Theorizing

There are four crucial components that are central to sociological theories, these are: the basic assumptions, that is, what the theorists have taken for granted; theoretical content which is the core of the theory and thoughts embedded in the epistemological foundation of that theory; methodology that defines the logical guide or process followed to arrive at a theory and the critic means where there are gaps or inadequacies of a theory. When we understand the elements of reasoning, we realize that all subjects and disciplines have their fundamental logics defined by the structures of thought embedded in them. Similarly, Bhattacharjee, A. (2012) alluded to Whetten, D. (1989) in noting the prerequisites for sociological theorizing. He suggested that, there are four building blocks in sociological theorizing similar to the crucial components discussed above: constructs, propositions, logic, and boundary conditions and/or assumptions. Constructs capture the ‘what’ of theories i.e., what concepts are important for explaining a phenomenon, propositions capture the ‘how’ i.e., how are these concepts related to each other, logic represents the ‘why’ i.e., why these concepts are related, and boundary conditions and/or assumptions examine the ‘who, when, and where’ i.e. under what circumstances these concepts and relationships work together. To appreciate the discipline of sociological theory, we must first and foremost begin by knowing the fundamental logics of theory construction and to do that, we ask the following questions: What is the main purpose or goal of studying sociological theories? What are scholars in the field of sociological theories trying to accomplish? What kinds of questions do they ask to arrive at a particular theory? What kinds of problems do they try to solve by employing sociological theories? What kinds of problems are they trying to solve? What sorts of information or data do they gather in sociological theorizing? What types of inferences, generalization or judgments do they typically make about the phenomenon being studied? What are the most basic ideas, concepts of sociological theories to employ? What have scholars in sociological theories taken for granted or assumed? How should studying sociological theory affect our view of the world?

The questions above are fundamental philosophical ones that can be contextualized to broaden our understanding of sociological theorizing. How does this problem relate to everyday life? What sort of information or data do we need? How can we get that information? What is the most basic idea, concept or theory we need to understand to solve the problem we are most immediately facing? From what point of view should we look at this problem? What can we safely assume as we reason through this problem? Should we call into question any of the inferences that have been made? What are the implications of what we are studying?

There are two analytically distinct positions to sociological theory. Thus, micro and macro sociological theories are also called grand and the second-middle range theories. Macro or the grand theories are those theories which deal with the universal aspects of social phenomena or problems and are based on abstract ideas and concepts rather than on case specific evidence. These include evolutionism, conflict, functionalism, Marxism etc are regarded as macro, while *Symboloci* interactionism or the phenomenology are regarded as micro-sociology because of its emphasis on microcosmic analysis of interaction and emphasis on symbol. These five sets

of theories are the 'Five alive' grand sociological theoretical perspectives due to their universality and pocketing of a number of theoretical postulates and second middle range theories. The other position is called the second middle range theories. These are theories derived from specific scientific findings and focus on the interconnectivity of two or more variables applied to a very specific social phenomenon or problem. Examples of second middle range theories are: Merton's (1957) 'Theory of Anomie', Southerland's (1939) 'Differential Association Theory' Shaw and Mckay's (1929) 'Social Disorganization or Cultural Transmission', and Cohen's (1955) 'The Delinquent Boys' theories, among others. The second middle range theories focused on smaller but more specific and precise aspects of a social phenomenon.

In order to have a larger picture of these theories, let us look at the five grand sociological theories one after the other in a thematic form from the angle of their basic assumption, theoretical content, methodology and their critique.

The Five-Alive Grand Sociological and/or Theoretical Perspectives: Basic Assumptions; Theoretical Contents; Methodology and Critiques

Structural Functionalist Perspectives/System Theory

The Basic Assumption of Structural Functionalist Perspectives: The functionalist perspective or the 'system theory' as it is called argues that each aspect of the society i.e. the institutions such as economy, polity, education, family and religion which are called structures have sub and super-structures, and all are interconnected and interdependent. King (2005), Henard, D. H. (2001), noted that each of these institutions is expected to dispense functions that would keep the society in harmony. The government, or state, provides education for the children of the family, which in turn pays taxes on which the state depends to keep itself running. That is, the family is dependent upon the school to help children grow up to have good jobs so that, they can raise and support their own families. In the process, the children become law abiding, taxpaying citizens, who in turn support the state. If all goes well, the parts of society produce order, stability, and productivity. If all does not go well, the parts of society then must adapt to recapture a new order, stability, and productivity.

Functionalists believe that society is held together by social consensus, or cohesion, in which members of the society agree upon, and work together to achieve what is best for them as a whole. Krugman, P. (2009), Gioia, D.A. et al (1990), noted that Emile Durkheim suggested that social consensus takes one of two forms: mechanical solidarity is a form of social cohesion that arises when people in a society maintain similar values and beliefs and engage in similar types of work. Mechanical solidarity most commonly occurs in traditional, simple societies. In contrast, organic solidarity is a form of social cohesion that arises when the people in a society are interdependent, but hold to varying values and beliefs and engage in varying types of work. Organic solidarity most commonly occurs in industrialized, complex societies such as those in large cities. The functionalist perspective achieved its greatest popularity among American sociologists in the 1940s and 1950s. European functionalists originally focused on explaining the inner workings of social order while American functionalists focused on discovering the functions of human behaviour.

Among these American functionalist sociologists is Robert K. Merton, who divides human functions into two types: manifest functions are intentional and obvious, while latent functions are unintentional and not so obvious. The manifest function of attending a congregation like a

place of worship as part of a religious community, but its latent function may be to help members learn to develop high sense of social solidarity among themselves and sometimes contribute to the less privileged ones to overcome their difficulties. Workings of the human body demonstrate the concept of functionalism or functionalist perspectives and the perspective and/or theory assumed are thus:

-Structural functionalist perspective assumes that human society is made up of interconnected parts, in other words, institutions which are classified as sub-structure and super-structure and the institutions are interconnected and interdependent for the survival and wellbeing of the entire social system which is referred here to as human society.

-The system theory also assumed that human society works in the same way as the workings of the eco-system; where human, plants and animals live in an interdependent way and are expected to closely relate with one another in harmony for their survival and sustainability of the same social system.

-Structural functionalist perspective is an upshot of evolutionism, drawing analogy from biology, believing in positivistic organism and emphasizing the imperatives of social order and stability of all parts in relation to the entire system.

-Functionalism as a social theoretical perspective, believes that all institutions have functional prerequisites to perform in order to ensure social order and progress and to dispense some sort of demographic dividends to meet the requirements of the members of the society. These cater to the needs and expectations of the members of the same society for stability and harmonious co-existence which is central to the claim by structural functionalist perspectives.

-The System theory also believes that the development of any society largely depends on the stability of the institutions that should be interconnected and not isolated or segmented.

-What one calls human society, according to the functionalist perspective, is within us and inherently built in our consciousness; one's self and in the same way has its own reality which exists independent of the members of the society which is over and above an individual.

-Members of the society, functionalists assume, relate through social consensus to build on collective representations; and shared sentiments and/or beliefs (collective conscience) to ensure a unified and integrated society and ensure order, stability and social cohesion for social solidarity, as well as social justice for overall social progress.

Theoretical Content of Structural Functionalist Perspective: Theoretical content of the functionalist perspectives or the system theory begins with the thoughts of functionalist scholars such as August Comte (1798-1857), and Herbert Spencer (1820-1903) and further developed by Emile Durkeim, Talcott Parsons and refined by R. K. Merton et al. The theoretical content of functionalism views the human society as a system, that is, a set of interconnected parts which together form a whole. The basic unit of functional analysis is society and its various parts are understood primarily in terms of their relationship to the whole (Haralambos, M. et al; 1980 and Peter, L. B.; 1966). The content of the functionalist perspectives stressed the importance of the social institutions such as family and religion, which can be seen as a part of the social system rather than an isolated unit. In particular, they are understood with reference to the contribution they make to the system as a whole. The basic needs or necessary conditions of existence are called functional prerequisites.

Functional prerequisites are referred to as basic needs which all systems have to meet if they are to continue to survive as a functioning system. The exponents of this school such as Marion Levy and Talcott Parsons are highly associated with the concepts of functional prerequisites. The functionalist perspective, also called functionalism, is one of the major theoretical

perspectives in sociology. It has its origins in the works of Emile Durkheim, who was at the epicentre of the content structural functional school of thought concerned with how social order is possible and how society remains relatively stable for social change, transformation and social progress.

Social Phenomenon Theoretical Postulate of Durkheim: At the core of the structural functionalist perspectives, according to Durkheim, who was more interested in social facts, in other words, social phenomenon which is *sui generis*, exclusively explain ‘thing’ as subject matter of sociology, that is to say, what the society saw, thought, perceived and concluded as fact. Durkheim placed less emphasis on the individual and considered the society as supreme in his analysis of social facts. Society, according to Durkheim, dictates human behaviour; the establishment of the society through institutions was his major concern. He is a functionalist *par excellence*. Any explanation using Durkheim’s work is not complete without the functional analysis from positivistic organicist angle or biological analysis. In religion, he talked about collective representation and collective consciousness. Religion, to Durkheim, increases social solidarity, establishes and refreshes societal norms and value systems and is very important to the existence of the society. Durkheim and his contemporaries talked about a lot of things to explain the content of their theorizing about human society, which he referred to as social facts, in other words, the realities devoid of bias and prejudice which can be discovered through empirical research.

Social facts, according to Durkheim, are the subject matter of sociology; they are evidential and concrete with universal validity. Such facts can be generated through the process of empiricism (empirical research). Anything social has to do with individuals in the society, behaviour is said to be social when members of the society see and interpret it as such. Social behaviour is the behaviour that has relationship with groups or society, and to Durkheim, social facts are the main subject matter of sociology and that has been one of the theoretical elements or pivot upon which the functionalist perspectives rotates. Social facts serve as a constraint for Durkheim (Kankiya, 2010; Fulk, J. 1990; Eisenhardt, K.M. 1989).

Social facts are the main interest of sociology, so long as an individual has little actions over his behaviour he remains less important and the focus of the structural functionalist exponents such as Emile Durkheim remains in the society. An individual, he said, merely acts according to the dictates of the society. While talking on deviant behaviour, Durkheim said its abnormal behaviour and that where it occurs it should be followed by sanctions which he termed ‘structured condition’ which represents the main thing that shapes the society. He emphasized much on social structures which are institutions and there is interplay among the institutions for the society to grow and develop. For that to happen, individuals must play their roles for the society to differentiate and integrate and give more role for others to perform (Mostyn, B. 1985; Moustakas, C. 1994). There are also roles to be performed and the roles are highly stratified according to individuals who have the necessary prerequisites. Kinsley Davis and Wilbert E. Moore are functionalists who wrote on stratification system (role allocation and effective performance); roles must be assigned to members of the society and it must be assigned to those that would carry them out. Structure, according to functionalists, may also mean to be in a relationship built over time.

Functional Pre-Requisites/AGIL/Mode of Adaptation Theoretical Postulates of Durkheim, Talcott Parson and Robert K. Marton Respectively

It is fundamentally difficult if not impossible to think of a crime-free society. In fact, there can be no society without the problem of crime and criminality. Alluding to Emile Durkheim's postulation of functional imperatives of crime will make one appreciate the functions of the occurrence of crime in the society, which provides the niche for security and employment of guards to overcome the phenomenon of crime and the function of crime in the society. Again, the existence of crime made it possible for the establishment of a criminal justice system: police, court and prison. This theoretical position has reinforced the view point of Thomas Hobbes and John Locke in 'State of Nature' and the need to heed their calls for the emergence of a government to deal with the excesses and shortcomings of human beings to be law abiding for the smooth functioning and wellbeing of the society as a whole.

The social order of all existing societies is built on the foundation of mutual trust, therefore, crime prevention and its control are mutually connected and it is essentially concerned with the hope of ensuring social order and peaceful co-existence of a given society for sustainable development. Similarly, social order of a given society is ensured when the internal working mechanisms of that society is buoyant enough to allow for integration of the policies on crime prevention and its control. Talcott Parsons postulated the acronym AGIL (A- Adaptation; G- Goal attainment; I- integration; L- Latency and /or Pattern Maintenance) to ensure the functional integration of, for instance, policies on crime to maintain order and stability in the society. In as much as we are dealing with such crimes as cybercrime, insurgency and terrorism, money laundering and advance fee fraud, kidnapping and pipeline vandalism, among other sophisticated crimes, the complexities of the modern day society, structural scrutiny of the society, on the one hand, and the enabling social system for the perpetration of such crime, on the other, are fundamental and sacrosanct.

Talcott Parsons, who in his thesis, viewed the larger society from the strategic context of AGIL, was of the opinion that the internal working mechanisms of the society needed to be measured or gauged in order to understand how functional and ordered people are. This is largely determined by the level of individual adaptation, integration, goal attainment and latency and/or pattern maintenance and that would give a sense of the nature of social order prevailing within a social system and the nature of crime that exists in the same society.

Kankiya (2010), Fulk, J. (1990), pointed out that this was echoed by Emile Durkheim in the anomie condition and later amplified by Robert K. Merton's mode of adaptation which rests on conformity, innovation, ritualism, retreatism and rebellion. All of these are mentioned here in an attempt to understand order and stability in the human society *vis-a-vis* the prevailing crimes bedevilling the social system. An integrated society maintains balance between means and goals, on the one hand, and the social order and stability, on the other. This assertion may help *ab initio* to determine the nature of the society and its level of integration in relation to, for instance, occurrences of crime and criminality (McCracken, G., 1988; Morse, J. M., 1994).

Social Order and Stability: Theoretical Postulate of August Comte: as August Comte rightly observes Durkheim also echoed the need to have order and stability which he said must be ensured through division of labour and each and every member of the society is expected to know his/her own role and position in the society. Human society differs but stability must be ensured through social solidarity. Durkheim is concerned about order and stability and the society as a whole because he lived at a time when the society was under tremendous pressure

faced with numerous social dislocations and institutional fractures on the social fibre or social capital that binds people together to ensure social progress, order and stability. The social capital or fibres were institutional norms and value systems as a result of the 19th century Industrial and French Revolutions, culminating in the great depression calls for the need to have social order and stability in the society. These developments prompted Saint Simon, Emile Durkheim and August Comte among other functionalists to intensify efforts, and it was in light of that, they developed 'Positivistic Philosophy' in 1844; Positivistic scientific method was incorporated into sociology to solve problems confronting human society.

Action Frame of Reference Theoretical Postulate of Robert K. Merton: The action frame of reference theory distinguishes action from mere behaviour, in the sense that action involves meanings or intentions. Action theory is an analysis of action starting with the individual actors 'Dyad' and 'Triad'. Analysis proceeds in terms of typical actors in typical situations by identifying their goals, expectations and values. Williamson, O. E. (1981) noted, is the means of achieving these goals, the nature of the situation and the actor's knowledge of the situation, Talcott Parsons refers to as action frame of reference. Action theory can be traced to the works of Max Weber who caused two forms of action theories to be developed; one form of action theory is reflected in the works of Alfred Schultz, and subsequently Harold Garfinkel. Here, priority is given to the meaningfulness of the action. The other form of action theory is found in the works of Talcott Parsons in which the idea of meaningfulness is subordinated in the concept of social structure (Barney, J.B., 1991).

Anomie Condition; Theoretical Postulate of Durkheim expanded by Robert K. Merton: 'Anomie' means lawlessness according to strain theory. It is said to have taken place when there is a feeling of being disconnected from society. This can occur when people are not provided with the institutionalized means to achieve their goals. According to Emile Durkheim's statement, there are two ideal types of stages - mechanical solidarity and organic and there is also, voluntary solidarity which is associated with the functional nature of an organized society. Anomie is a social condition characterized by the breakdown of norms governing social institutions and interaction; this may take place either due to the existence of contradictory norms or due to inadequacy of norms. Durkheim used this concept to describe abnormal forms of division of labour and also in his typology of suicide. Later, Merton adapted this concept to explain deviance in the American society, (Pisano, G., 1997). According to him, anomie situations arise when there is lack of coordination between culturally defined goals and the legitimate institutional means of achieving those goals. Individual adaptations to such an anomie situations leads to deviant behaviour (Kankiya, 2010; Fulk, J., 1990)

Social Action; Ideal Society, Bureaucracy, Power And Authority: Theoretical Postulate of Max Weber: Max Weber studied social behaviour, social action or social facts. Society, according to Weber, is determined by the kind of social action they created by themselves. Weber's sociological explanation is based on positivist philosophy like Durkheim. Behaviour is said to be social when it involves relationships of groups or society; an action that relates to others and judged by people as social (Tsai, W., 2001). Marx Weber sees social action as the one to have meaning, according to him, sociologists should always consider the meaning of social action and not behaviour in their interpretation of rationality. Marx Weber is not a positivist he started from subjective (deductive method) to positivist (inductive method) in most of his explanation. He talked on such action as:

- Rational action in relation to value
- Rational action in relation to goal

- The affection is an emotional action of an actor in a given set of circumstance.
- The traditional action is related much to tradition.

Max Weber explained the action people take in their social milieu, and applied these actions to any social phenomenon he studied. He has been very influential in the area of power and authority. Power is what one exercises based on shared ability to exercise it. Power has no legitimacy but it involves coercive force (action). Power and authority are determined by legitimacy. How legitimate is power or authority? Authority has legitimacy. Weber identified different types of Authority which include but not limited to: Traditional Authority, Charismatic Authority and Legal Authority.

The Methodology of Structural Functionalism Perspective: Structural functionalist theory is an offshoot of evolutionism and most of the scholars of functionalist theory including its founder, Emile Durkheim, allude to evolutionary methodology as a method of thinking. The likes of Emile Durkheim, Talcott Parsons, Robert K. Merton, among others, actively utilized evolutionary theory as either their method of thinking or as a theoretical perspective to describe and/or give an account of the 'why' and 'how' of a particular social phenomenon. What is central to evolutionism in our understanding of sociological theories is that it operates within a continuum that seeks to explain the changing nature of a social phenomenon at two ends as its structural foundation and continuous growths of the same situation in stages on the other end. Evolutionism seeks to describe the order of succession of a phenomenon and, on the other hand, gives an account of the mechanism by means of a phenomenon developed into another (John R., 1961)

Critique of Structural Functionalism Perspective: Functionalism is antithesis to classical Marxian theory, it has nothing to do with conflict as a requirement for social progress but instead, functionalism put premium on social consensus, stability and social order as requirements for social progress. Functionalism, in recent times, has received criticism for neglecting the negative functions of a social condition such as divorce. Critics also claim that functionalism does not encourage people to take an active role in changing their social environment, even when such change may benefit them. Instead, functionalism sees active social change as desirable because the various parts of the society will compensate naturally for any problems that may arise (situations would sort themselves out).

The Basic Assumptions of Marxian Perspective (Marxism)

In the manifesto of the Communist Party, Engels like Karl Marx asserted that society is borne out of conflict; organized through conflict and would continue to exist in conflict. Struggle rather than peaceful growth is the engine of progress. The philosophy of Marx is dialectic materialism also called (Diamat) it is a philosophy which explained science and natural occurrence from the social thoughts of Marx and Engels. Dialectic materialism as a philosophy of explaining activities of man to his natural environment is expressed in Tripodal (Triad as opposed to Dyad). In other words, three concrete terms thus: thesis, antithesis and synthesis by Hegel, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels (1818-1883, 1820-1895). The Marxian perspective assumed that:

- The history of all societies with the exception of the communal society is characterized by class struggle. Struggle rather than peaceful growth, according to Karl Marx, is the engine of progress.

-The perspective also assumed that, in all existing human societies the idea of the ruling class or elites is the ruling ideas; what the ruling class wish to broadcast in electronic media and subsequently published in print media are the things that they wanted the rest of the society know and believe. While in reality, such ideas are the bourgeoisie slogans invented to exploit and subjugate the masses.

-In modern capitalist society, the bourgeois (capitalist) class had destroyed and replaced the unproductive feudal nobility and had performed the economically creative tasks of establishing a new industrial order. This proportion is better explained by the Marxian notion of thesis, antithesis and synthesis. The stage was thus set for the final struggle between the bourgeoisie which had completed its historic role and the proletariat, composed of the industrial workers, or makers of goods and services which had become the true productive class but remained alienated 'a tin of milk is more powerful than a human being 'factory worker' in an industry controlled by the bourgeoisies'. The factory worker uses his energy and talent to produce cartons of tins of milk but he cannot consume one for fear of industrial sanction, hence, remain alienated because what he has produced now has power over him.

-Economic and political theories supporting Marxism's historical premises are its economic theories of central importance; labour theory of value and the idea of surplus value accumulation. Marxism supposes that the value of the commodity is determined by the amount of labour required for its manufacture. The value of the commodity purchasable by the worker's wage is less than the value of the commodity he produces; the difference is called 'the surplus value' which represents the profit of the capitalist. Thus, the bourgeois class has flourished through exploitation of the proletariat.

Theoretical Content of Marxian Perspective (Marxism): Marxian Dialectic Materialism is also called 'Diamat' in both history and production. The Marxian notion of dialectics believed that man is the maker of history. Man, according to Karl Marx, is the one who controls his own life by turning natural materials into commodities that would become useful for adaptation to his own environment. He went on to say that through a complex process of dialectics in production i.e. by turning natural materials into commodities, in the same process he creates his own institution and by doing so eventually he creates and discovers himself. Relationship of man to man, Karl Marx held, is determined by the relationship of what they possess Olugogunika, (1998). These interdependent and interrelated complex and diversifying scenarios among men, and their environment and the desire of man to create commodity with a view to generating surplus value eventually created some sort of dichotomy which resulted into the typologies referred to as 'bourgeoisies' and 'proletariat'. The bourgeoisies has enormous power with capital to create a particular commodity that can create another commodity with value, that is, capital and that is the sense behind calling the bourgeoisies 'capitalist individuals' in the society, while the myriads of the proletariat which Karl Marx at a time called "a sack of potatoes" lack power to create commodities that can create other commodities with surplus value, thereby undermining himself and thus remain alienated and poor Olugogunika, (1998), Engels, 1955; Maxwell, J. A., 1996.

The idea of dialectics involves the interplay between the various parts of the society. It rejects the view of unidirectional causation proceeding solely from economic factors; instead it argues that the various parts of the society are interconnected in terms of their mutual effects. Karl M. (1936), Merton, R. (1973) Mills, C. W. (1940) agreed that Marx's historical dialectics described the economic infrastructure as the ultimately the determinant element in history of

production. Yet, Marx added that if someone twists his proposition of dialectic materialism (Diamat) in both history and production into saying that the economic element is the only determining factor in Marxian dialectic he is now transforming Marx's propositions of dialectics materialism (Diamat) into a meaningless, abstract and senseless phrase.

The following concepts are central to Marxian theory: state as machinery of ruling class to maintain the status-quo, relative autonomy, thesis, antithesis and synthesis, communism, egalitarianism, exploitation, bourgeoisies, proletariat, alienation, class, social status, stratification, among other concrete concepts and variables that explain Marxism. Marxism is dominated by the dynamics that are happening and events in production explaining the relationship of the factory owners *vis-a-vis* the role of the factory workers in relation to mode of production and surplus values sharing and accumulation which always turn out to be at the expense of the poor factory workers. Marx method is dialectic materialism in both history and production; in class relation thesis antithesis and synthesis. Marx also talked about alienation; egalitarian society which is viewed as utopian.

Thesis, Antithesis and Synthesis (Boko Haram frame work) Marxian Political Economy

Perspective: The Marxian notion of *Boko Haram* rests upon the premises of social relation of production. It argues that as a result of sharing of resources in a society, there is the probability of struggle between the upper and lower class. This, according to Karl Marx, leads to class struggle and class conflict between those in power and the lower class which may at last lead to class revolution, where the lower class, (like *Boko Haram*), take up arms against the upper class with the motive of violently overthrowing the elitist regime and installing in its place a government of the 'commoners for the commoners and by the commoners'. Materialism, according to Karl Marx, is inherently rooted within the society and is the key element in production that keeps people going.

The whole dialectic philosophy of explains tension that occur as a result of differential invested and entrenched interest or grounds held by forces like the Boko Haram of establishing their regime and the perceived injustices meted generated the idea of freedom conflicts which subsequently, enable the calls for the fight in the North East of Nigeria. The notion of Marx, Hegel and Engels (1818-1883, 1820-1895) Thesis exemplify the Phenomenon of *Boko Haram* as challenging the opposite sides; the government and the Nigerian citizen who don't want to believe or subscribe to the Boko Haram ideological hegemony. The Hegelian Philosophy also meant to believed that, no idea could exist without opposite. If *Boko Haram* Phenomenon is the thesis in this frame work, then it goes to say that, its opposite would be its Antithesis; who the Boko Haram labelled as the *Kufars* (infidels) and the *Tagbot* (idolators). While in another sense the idea of the government side; military, civilian JTF and coordinated interagency approach in the fight against Boko Haram that is in conflict with the idea held by the *Boko Haram* in their struggle is called the Antithesis to *Boko Haram* Ideology.

Consequently, in this realm of the mind (as subjective reality) within which the universe had its only real existence as unchallenged referred to as (objective reality). Thesis and antithesis are inevitable forces, and therefore must exist side by side. Conflict and struggle are facts for social change in human history, hence, thesis and the opposition tension on the antithesis side. For example, the struggle by the government to end the *Boko Haram* crisis, in this sense is referred to as antithesis to *Boko Haram* Ideology. However, the group's anti-democratic philosophical dogma which come into play as far as they are concerned is borne out of perceived injustice meted out to them due to entrenched 'injustices' in the socio-politico sub- and super-structures of the society, which eventually lead to poverty and as a result those who

felt deprived revolted that degenerated into the anomie condition and the present day precarious security challenges and the condition of the displacement of mass population.

The two opposing tensions in this action frame of reference; thesis and antithesis struggle of the *Boko Haram* acting and reacting in the opposite direction in conflict would definitely lead to a new phenomenon and that is what Karl Marx called the 'synthesis'. According to Marx, Hegel and Engels (1818-1883, 1820-1895), synthesis is achieved when the two opposing forces agree to reach consensus equilibrium when they eschew their differences by their odds as significant ingredients for social change and a significant milestone and progress in human civilization.

In this action frame of reference where *Boko Haram* remains the thesis and the Nigerian government the antithesis, according to Karl Marx, it would definitely culminate into synthesis, which is the progress of reconstruction to modernize the hitherto traditional societies. Rehabilitation of the existing structures to meet the status of the functioning core and resettlement of displaced people from hitherto non-integrating gaps to a relatively highly integrating eco-system and by extension the whole of the North East.

These developments, according to Karl Marx, constitute change; it is development and progress culminating from the opposing tension of synthesis. Marx like Hegel used this system of dialectics to explain the whole of the history of philosophy, science, art, politics and religion. On the need to achieve synthesis in this dialectic, Merriam (2014) believes that dialogue and consensus building are primary tools of the dialectic (Diamat), terror and intimidation are also acceptable formats for obtaining the goals of synthesis. In the light of the *Boko Haram* thesis that is their struggle which has generated a number of new phenomena of internally displaced peoples (IDPs), colossal loss and wastage of resources coupled with enormous corruption and alleged siphoning and looting of government treasury in the name of solving the *Boko Haram* problem in Nigeria. All action or change occurring in the universe, according to Marx was, under the Hegelian philosophy as the product of the dynamics of thesis, antithesis that eventually culminated to synthesis all in the realm of ideas, since objective reality could exist only in that sphere. Since the two opposing tensions in this action frame of reference, thesis and antithesis result in synthesis, the process Karl Marx and Engels believe was universal and never ending, it offered a complete explanation of the causal processes of creating all phenomena within the universe.

The Methodology of Marxian Perspective (Marxism): At the core of the orthodox Marxian perspectives lies the philosophical method of dialectical materialism (in both history and production), a reversal of the dialectical idealism of Hegel and not economic materialism as erroneously believed by many. Economy is the only determinant element in history, dialectical materialism presumes the primacy of economic determinants in history, however, dialectical materialism is the pivot on which original orthodox Marxian theory revolves Olugogunika, (1998). According to this premise, a specific class could only rule for so long as it best represented the economically productive forces of the society; when it becomes outdated, it would be destroyed and replaced. From this continuing dynamic process a classless society would eventually emerge (Cosser, 1959; Glukman, 1955).

There is controversy about Marxian methodology as Charles Darwin's evolutionism is still being debated as the Marxian methodology which was unclear. For instance, when Engels and Marx based their communist theory on Lewis Henry Morgan's theory of anthropology in 1877, they again based their theory of communism on an questionable theory and later after Marx

read 'The Origin of Species', he wrote to Engels saying that although it was developed in a "crude English style, 'The Origin of Species' contained the basis for natural history about our views." They turned against what they saw as social evolution with its biological implications of Darwinism when they realized that it contained no support for their dialectics: thesis, antithesis and synthesis, which describe class oppression. The contending methodological claim of whether Marxian method is positivistic organism of evolutionism or dialectic materialism (Diamat) were extensively discussed by Anton Pannekoek (1912) and Lewis Henry Morgan 1877's publication of 'Ancient Society or Researches in Life, Lines of Human Progress from Savagery, through Barbarism and to Civilization.' Then Engels seized upon Morgan's work as the constantly "evolving" basis for the theory of natural social evolution into utopian world communism. In conclusion of Marxian methodology, critical analysis of the dialectics has provided firm footing for the implicit utilization of the principle of the theory of evolutionism.

Critics of Marxian Perspective (Marxism): In short, Marx argued that the first socialist revolution would take place in the most advanced capitalist state where exploitation of the poor by the rich was at its peak. The critics of the Marxian Theory of class struggle and the attendant consequences on a bourgeoisie state pointed out that there is a huge lacuna in the theory. More especially when one considers the fact that the first capitalist revolution took place in the then most backward capitalist state of Russia, also known as the Soviet Union which undermines Karl Marx's prediction in the most advanced capitalist state where exploitation of the poor by the rich was at its peak, this led to the birth of a new idea of Leninism which oversaw the end of the bourgeoisie-inclined Tsarist Regime through the Bolshevik Revolution.

Again, Marx placed two limitations on the dialectic as he came to apply it in his studies. First, while admitting that it constituted a universal explanation of all phenomena, he had no interest in applying it outside the field of social institutions and processes. Indeed, it would be impossible for any student to apply a philosophical concept intensively to any but a limited phenomenon. Another pointer to the lacuna in the Marxist Theory of Revolution is the emergence of Maoism in China through the peasant revolution which Mao Tse-Tung spearheaded in the name of communism. According to Marx, peasants will never spearhead a revolution because of their backwardness; however, the success of Maoism in China again proved Marx wrong. Marx generally portrayed states and capitalism as two agents of mass exploitation and advocated for the overthrow of capitalism through a socialist revolution and withering away of state to pave way for communism. He argued that, armed struggle in any community was as a result of class exploitation in relation to controlling the means of production (Wright Mills, C., 1959; Marx, K., 1910)

The Marxian dialectic is a universal explanation of phenomena in two senses Thesis and Antithesis to peace consensus-building and Synthesis as a new social Phenomenon. However, the Hegelian philosophy by Marx is over ploughed with the Tripodal (Triadic) concepts of thesis, antithesis and synthesis giving explanation of abstract concepts than concrete social situation or phenomena. It constitutes a philosophical explanation of all categories of realistic phenomena and can be applied to physical, chemical, astronomical, mathematical, geological, and all other phenomena as a universal explanation of what exists and is occurring in the universe. Secondly, it includes the mind of man as a part of the universe within which change through thesis, antithesis, and synthesis frame work which constitutes the never-ending creative process.

Symbolic Interactionism (Phenomenological) Perspective

Symbolic interactionism is an American branch of sociology, its exponents include John Dewey, William I. Thomas, Hebert Blummer, George Herbert Mead, Manis, Fred Davis, Meltzer, among others. Symbolic Interactionist perspective is also referred to as micro-sociological or phenomenological perspective because of the emphasis on the actor's views and his interpretation of the social phenomenon. Interactionist perspective is concerned with the 'inner meaning hold by the social actors' or the phenomenological aspect of human behaviour in relation to his thought, intentions and social actions developed through interactions by means of symbols. George Herbert Mead is regarded as the father of the symbolic interactionist school, a branch of sociology later developed by his student Herbert Blummer.

The Basic Assumption of the Symbolic Interactionism (Phenomenological) Perspective

-The Perspective assumed that human thoughts, experiences and conducts are essentially social. Man is both actively creating the social environment and also being shaped by it. The individual imitates and directs his own actions while at the same time being shaped and influenced by the attitudes and expectations of others in form of 'generalized others'.

-The interactionism perspective assumed that interaction takes place through mutual signalling and reading of gestures which modify responses to exhibit some sort of behaviour or response. This process, according to the interactionist model, involves the capacity for thought processing, deliberations, mind and covert rehearsals of alternatives by seeing oneself as an object to understand the actions and reactions of the other persons in our every day conversations.

-Symbols impose particular meaning on object and events. An action indicated by the symbol clearly defines usage of that object. Symbols provide the meaning by which man can interact meaningfully with his own natural and social environment. Without communication in terms of symbols, whose meanings are shared, there would be no communication. Man, according to the interactionist perspective, lives in a world of symbols which give meaning and significance to his life and provide the basis for human interaction.

-Human beings interact in terms of symbols, the importance of which is contained in language. Symbols, according to the interactionist perspective, do not simply stand for an object or event but define them in a particular way and indicate responses to them.

Theoretical Content of Symbolic Interactionism (Phenomenological) Perspective:

Symbolic interactionism, is a perspective which tried to provide an alternative paradigmatic explanation of how society works by giving account of human social actions through interaction. Interactionism focused attention much on micro-individual interactions and social actions that emanate through those interactions rather than lay emphasis on the interplay between individuals or groups of individuals in relation to their eco-system. George Herbert Mead maintained that without object there would be no interaction, without interaction there would be no human society. Symbolic interactionists believed that interaction was necessary since man had no instinct to direct his behaviour. Micheal H. et al (2002), Herbert B. (1962) and John J. (1999) in their separate writings believed that man, according to George Harbert Mead, is not genetically engineered to react automatically to particular stimulus. So in order to survive, man must construct and live within the world of meaning. Social life can only be possible if the meaning of symbols are largely shared by the members of the society if not communication is not possible.

The perspective is also called micro-sociological perspectives. In order to understand human behaviour in the society, according to the interactionist model, the meaning of their actions need to be understood in a concrete terms at the level of individuals on daily basis. The following concepts and phrases are critical to our understanding of symbolic interactionist perspectives. These are: interaction which focuses on individuals; objects or symbols should be present and carry subjective meanings; meaning can be interpreted, evaluated and re-evaluated; the interpretations must reveal something about individuals interacting in the society, an actor is needed to come into play; self (the Me and I); intention, thought processing and mind should make conversation possible; self plays a significant role and is seen or perceived as either looking glass self or generalization of others' points of view; the development of self, according to the interactionist, begins with developing play stage and moving to game stage; human interactions must be interpreted with meaning, which Zimmel called 'Dyad' meaning interaction by two persons or 'Triad' meaning interactions among more than three people or groups of persons.

Therefore, for successful interaction, each person involved in the interaction proper must interpret the meaning and actions of others and this is made possible through the process of 'role taking' which involves the individual taking the role of others by imaginatively placing himself in the position of the one with whom he is interacting. For instance, consciously or subconsciously, when one observe others shaking hands, crying, smiling or waving with some other people then you tend to interpret their actions by subconsciously putting yourself in the persons' position by taking on their roles and subsequently placing your own responses to take the place of their social actions for perfect interpretations of their intentions, meanings and actions (Herbert B., 1962).

George Herbert Mead argued that through the process of role taking, the individual develops the concept of 'self', that is to say, placing himself in the position of others, and by so doing he is able to look back upon himself. This is what the interactionist referred to as 'the looking-glass self'. The idea of self, according to George Herbert Mead, can only developed if the individual interpreter of the social actions of others can only get out of himself experientially in such a way that he becomes an object unto himself, and to achieve that process, Mead noted, the observer must observe himself from the standpoint of others (Sellin, T., 1938).

There are two main stages in the development of self, these are: 'the play stage' and the 'game stage'. The play stage the same as taking the role of others and demonstrating it, while in doing so you realize that there are fundamental differences between you and the person you are imitating. The comedians who performs jokes on stage or the disc jockeys (DJs) in FM stations are good examples of 'self developed play stage taking role of others' and subsequently, form 'looking glass self'. Their social action in achieving the entire process is what the interactionist perspective referred to as 'Make believe others'.

The second stage is called the 'game stage' and one may see himself from the perspectives of generalization of others. This stage requires the process of thinking, becoming conscious of actions directed at thought through conversation. Man is a rational being and can set goals for himself, plan for future actions and consider the consequences of the alternative course of his actions. With the awareness of self, the individual is able to see himself as others see him. When we take on the role of others, we observe ourselves from their stand point and become aware of their views about us which causes us to modify our actions and behaviour. Through this process, we would become conscious to realize the general attitude, perception and the

judgment of others about us and then we do self re-evaluation and then subsequently, modify our behaviour in terms of “generalized others”. (Skoepol, T. (1980; Tylor, Lan, R., 1988). Therefore, it is right to say from the interactionist perspectives that, there is an inner and deeper conversation going on consciously, sub-consciously or unconsciously between the “generalized others” and the “individual self”.

The Methodology of the Symbolic Interactionism (Phenomenological) Perspectives: The method was used by the symbolic interactionism in interpreting mind or actions by way of symbol, and can be situated within the subjectivist school of thought. Intentions, meaning and actions being interpreted, employ role taking, construct to form an individual’s intention from the perspective of a looking glass self. The interactionist method is based on subjective reality as opposed to objective reality. Through this kind of process, the perspective creates sense about individuals from more ‘generalized others’ point of view and such actions are referred to as qualitative interpretations of the actors “inner meaning”. Therefore, the methodology of interactionist perspective is called qualitative method which emphasized subjective reality as opposed to objective reality. However, ethno-methodology emerged as a variant to symbolic interactionism or the phenomenological perspective (Turk, A., 1969 and Wallerstein, I., 1974).

Criticism of the Symbolic Interactionism (Phenomenological) Perspectives: The interactionist perspective has been criticized for a number of methodological faults. First, is its direct reaction to empiricism, second, it focuses more on a small face-to-face interaction rather than large groups of people, with little concern for historical or social setting. Thus, it pays little or no attention to cultural forces as imperatives or demographic differentials of the individual members of the society (Turk, A.1969). The perspective also failed to explain why people choose to act in all the other ways they might possibly have acted. Another criticism labelled against the interactionist perspective is that their micro-sociological emphasis on interaction by way of interpreting symbols did not conform to any general or standardized social structure and/or social action. Neither, does their theorizing take into cognisance normative cultural standards which define and redefine the array of actions which may inform different situations, such as social, economic, religious and political forces acting in the society which lure members into one situation or the other, and hence lacks sound footing within the realm of the interactionist social phenomenological theorizing (Durkeim, 1957).

Ethno-methodology was first coined by Harold Gafinkel (1967). It emerged as a critic to the symbolic interactionist perspective, which argued that there are things that we see, describe and explain yet we cannot comprehend their underlying meaning, actions and intentions. Harold Gafinkel (1967) theorized this as ‘seeing but not noticing the activities of man’. This limits the intellectual strength of the symbolic interactionist perspective and our actions of interpreting symbols in relation to human activities. Gafinkel introduced ethno-methodology to give perfect interpretations of symbols as the interactionist did. He projected human interaction beyond the symbolic and that employed a construct of people he referred to as individuals in the society and various methods employed to analyze interaction. ‘Ethno’ means people, and ‘methodology’ means various methods employed to give account of certain actions and give meaning to the interpretation of the social phenomenon in a more comprehensive way than that of the interactionist perspectives.

The Basic Assumption of the Conflict Perspective

Conflict Perspective is to the credit of many writers, sociologists and scholars who had contributed immensely to the development of this perspective. Prominent among the exponents

of the conflict perspective are the scholarly works of George Simmel (1918), followed closely by Coser (1959) who has based his own theories on those of Simmel (1918) as reported by John R. (1961). John, in his book, 'Key Problems of Sociological Theory' noted that amongst anthropologists was Gluck-man who emphasised in his thesis 'The Role of Conflict in Primitive Societies' and in recent developments, Dahrendorf (1959) who has produced an account of 'Class and Class Conflict In Industrial Societies (1959)' while revising Karl Marx stand in relating to his thesis on the concept of class and that of conflict. Dahrendorf (1959) explicitly challenged Talcott Parsons and insisted on the need to develop a conflict model to supplement if not completely replace Person's model of 'Stable Social System'.

Dahrendorf (1959) emphasised two opposing ends: the position of those in authority and subordinate in relation to scarce resources, and power attached to the position of authority. He noted that inadequate resource sharing may lead to a conflict situation. The potentials of conflict arise from a particular configuration of those in the position of authority in a given society. Randall Collins (1941) in his Book 'Conflict and Sociology' attempted to free conflict theory from its roots in structural functionalist perspective as the first formal theoretical paradigm, which he said, is open to a wide range of theories. Marx Weber and Randall Collins sought to articulate an integrated theoretical approach that avoided the political polemics of some scholars like Charles Wright Mills, while establishing theoretical links between micro and macro level analysis. Collins then outlines a conflict theory of stratification looking not only at class and authority as Dahrendorf did, but was more coherent and elaborate as the Durkheimian thesis on 'occupation in traditional and industrial society'.

Kankiya H. A. (2009) further noted that Lewis Cosser (1983) also wrote on 'Conflict Theory,' his thesis was from the functionalist perspectives same as that of Simmel and Parsons. Cosser argued that conflict can draw antagonistic parties together in a web of group affiliation which was termed by Simmel as 'Sociation' meaning the function of conflict in reinforcing group solidarity while channelling grievances in a tense situation to create positive or constructive situation. Society, he added, is divided along class lines and the root of any conflict in the society, he said, is class consciousness. Cosser further noted that some people occupy positions of advantage with authority, while others are in subordinate positions. When authorities are established, some people are in control and conflicts occur as a result of the social conditions that determine their class and status in the society that relegate the subordinates to the background.

Assumptions on Conflict perspectives:

-Conflict scholars such as, Louis Cosser, maintain that conflict frequently helps revitalise existent norms or contributes to the emergence of new norms. In this sense conflict is a mechanism for adjustment of norms adequate to new social conditions. A flexible society, according to Louis Coser, benefits from social conflicts because it helps create and modify norms thus insuring its continuity under changed conditions.

-Conflict, of whatever nature, lies within the two extremes of peaceful bargain and open violence. The existence of conflict can produce a unitary but plural society in which there are two or more classes, each of which provides a relatively self contained social system for its members. The activities of these members take on sociological meaning and must be explained by reference to the group's interest in the conflict situation. Relations between groups are defined at first exclusively in terms of the conflict situation.

-Within the two groups at the extreme conflict situation there is a marked of an unequal balance of power, so that one of the two classes emerges as the ruling class and such a class would

continually seek to gain recognition of the legitimacy of its position among the members of the subject class and the leaders of the subject class will seek to deny this claim and to organise activities which demonstrate its denial (passive resistance).

-The power situation between the ruling and subject classes may change as a result of change in a number of variables which increases the possibility of successful resistance or actual revolution by the subject class, among these variable factors are leadership, the strength of the members aspirations, their capacity for organisation, their possessions of the means of violence, their members and their role in the social system as proposed by the ruling class.

-Sudden dramatic change in balance of power between the subordinates and those in positions of power to favour the subject class would come into force and they suddenly find themselves in a situation in which it cannot only impose its will on the former ruling class, but can actually destroy the basis of that class existence. New divisions within the revolutionary class may open up but this may be of an entirely different kind to those which existed in the previous conflict situations.

Theoretical Content of the Conflict Perspective

Cultural norms and value systems serves as fibre that binds members of a society together and helps them avoid conflict situations. There is a high degree of social solidarity and cohesion among them, and collectively they conform to the norms, values system and orders governing that society. According to the conflict theorised, it is not that members of that society are obedient so as not to create conflict situations, but because compelling coercive forces acting around them, which were imposed by those in the position of authority, actually compel them to be law abiding (Chambliss, W.S., 1971).

Conflicts are more likely to be disruptive in social groups where there exists high frequency interaction and high personality involvement among the members than it is in groups comprising of individuals who participate only in segments (the means-end chain). Dherendorf holds that class conflict occurs between those possessing authority and those who do not possess it. Hence, there may be class conflict in any of a number of different institutions thus: industry, religion, family and politics etc. Whether or not the class conflict becomes really disruptive and revolutionary depends upon whether in the separate institutional context it becomes superimposed upon another (Coser, L., 1959).

Conflict, according to Dherendorf, is functional which in the end brings about some level of stability and normalcy. Dahrendorf's view of conflict is different from Marx's conflict of society, as Dahrendorf like Louis Cosser and Collins strongly believed in authority, which must be present to establish individual positions. Such conflict comes into force as a result of sharing of resources. Marx's conflict can be seen within the context of society and subordination of individual positions, which is inherent in the relationship of sharing scarce resources as surplus value of production, whereas, Dehrendorf's conflict is based on the imperative of authority in generating and resolving conflicts.

Louis Coser noted that the emergence of norms may depend upon the balance of power achieved. Conflict theory emerged as a reaction to the structural functionalism theory, while deeply rooted in Marxian perspectives. Every society, according to Dahrendorf, is subject to disintegration and change under certain social conditions. The fact remains that no human society is static but is rather a complex dynamic social system. He was interested in the psychological and behavioural patterns of thinking of those in positions of authority, rather than seeing them as a collection of individuals with abundance of power. There is the notion

among conflict theorists that society lives between two opposing extremes i.e. conflict and its resolution, which happens through consensus. Hence, demarcation was made of conflict theory and the consensus theory. The conflict theory focuses on the conflict - the Marxian roots of perpetual interest and the consensus - the structural branch of functionalist social cohesion and value integrations. Thus, conflict perspective pocketed two major constructs of the conflict and consensus models. The two go side by side to keep the society together in harmony, at an equilibrium state for social change and sustainable development of the society as a whole (Dahrendorf, R., 1959).

The authority attached to positions is the key element in Dahrendorf's analysis of social conflict. Authority implies super-ordination and subordination. Those occupying position of authority are expected to control subordinates because of the subordinates expectations of benefits from those in power. The power is not the constituent of the individual psychological makeup but the power which resides in the position of authority the person find himself. Person who is subordinate in one social setting or group may be in a superior position in another group. Society to Dahrendorf is made up of 'imperatively coordinated association' there are two conflict groups in the society or association those in position of authority and those in position of subordination. Giddens, A. (1997). Those in the position of authority always strive hard to maintain status-que while those in the subordinate positions seeks to change the entire enterprise and the social action to make that happened has always been latent while the exercise of power by those in position is manifest sort of action.

-Criticism Of The Conflict Perspective

It may be doubtful, however, whether any of the writers mentioned have really taken their criticisms of 'integrationist' and 'functionalist' theory far enough. The point of view from which they have made their criticisms is indicated by Coser's thesis 'The Functions of Social Conflict'. Coser pointed out that conflict may be studied not as a disruptive of social systems but as having a function within those systems. The conflict perspectives have been criticised on the basis of their inability to provide clear distinctions between conflicts, which do not contradict the basic assumptions upon which the relationship is founded and conflicts in which the contending parties no longer share the basic values upon which the legitimacy of the social system rests (Marx, K., 1971). The emphasis of the perspective only lies on the later type of the conflict than the former.

CONCLUSION

Sociological theorizing requires sufficient knowledge and understanding of the complexities of social scientific research, social constructionism and diversifying narratives of the major perspectives. Solving problems associated with sociological theorizing rests on the thrust of linking abstract theories with practice by citing several examples using contemporary phenomena as they exist in our social milieu. Sociological theorizing also requires in-depth understanding and comprehension of different types of theories, approaches, methods, themes and perspectives in sociology as a science and field of study that is theoretically driven. To overcome the difficulties of sociological theorizing as faced by most students nowadays, there is the need to carefully explain theories from the standpoint of basic assumptions, theoretical contents, mythology and critiques.

Data management and analysis, searching for themes, flagging themes and differential analysis of data, the essence of qualitative and quantitative approach is also emphasised in sociological

theorising. There is also the need to make deliberate distinctions between theory and hypothesis between construct and propositions and between variables and concepts, both abstract and referred. Of equal importance in sociological theorising is careful examination of the perspectives as most sociological theories are interconnected and interdependent, and with regard to methodology, most theorists implicitly utilised and alluded to the positivistic evolutionary methodology as their method of thinking which can be described as an inductive method of the Durkheimian School of Sociology.

Sociological theorizing and social scientific research are in each other's pocket and structural functionalist theory is seen as the first formal theoretical paradigm that has subsumed a wide range of sociological theories. It is important to deliberately explore of phenomena with a view to either explaining or describing contemporary social phenomena to enable the researcher make inference and/or generalisation and to theorise based on the interpretation of the bulk of data collected during observations. However, methodology should be the guide to the world of sociological theorising, and students who wish to be active in sociological theorising must familiarise themselves with understanding the dynamic nature of various methodology, logic and the epistemological foundation underlying particular methodology for theorising in order to overcome the problems facing theoretical development of sociological theorising, in particular, and sociology as a science and field of study in general.

REFERENCE

- Alavi, M. *et al* (2001) "Knowledge Management and Knowledge Management Systems," *MIS Quarterly* (25:2), March 2001, pp. 107-136.
- Analysis Sehriban Bugday (2015) 'Research Method: Grounded Theory Designs in Qualitative Analyses.
- Barney, J.B. (1991) "Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage", *Journal of Management* (17:1), 1991, pp. 99-120.
- Butler, J.E. *et al* (2001) "Is the Resource-Based 'View' a Useful Perspective for Strategic Management Research?" *Academy of Management Review* (26:1) pp. 22-40.
- Chambliss, W.S. (1971) "Law Order and Power" Reading Maddison Wisely.
- Coser (1959) 'The Functions of Social Conflict' in "Key Problems of Sociological Theory", Rex J. Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd, London.
- Coser, L. (1959) "The Functions of Social Conflict," Glencoe Free Press.
- Dahrendorf, R. (1959) 'Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society,' Stanford University Press.
- Durkeim, S. (1952) "Key Problems of Sociological Theory", Rex J. Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd, London.
- Durkheim, (1957) 'Professional Ethics and Civic Moral' in "Key Problems of Sociological Theory", Rex J. Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd, London.
- Eisenhardt, K.M. (1989) "Agency Theory: An Assessment and Review", *Academy of Management Review* (14:1), 1989, pp. 57-74.
- Engels (1955) 'Ludwig Feuerbath and the end of the Classical Germany Philosophy' in "Key Problems of Sociological Theory", Rex J. Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd, London.
- Fichman, *et al* (1999) 'The Illusory Diffusion of Innovation: An Examination of Assimilation Gaps', *Information Systems Research* (10:3), September 1999, pp. 255-275.
- Fichman, R.G. (1992) 'Information Technology Diffusion: A Review of Empirical Research', *Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Conference on Information Systems*, Dallas, 1992, 195-206.

- Giddens, A (1997) 'Sociology' Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Gioia, D.A. *et al* (1990) 'Multi-paradigm Perspectives on Theory Building', *Academy of Management Review* (15:4), 1990, pp. 584-602.
- Glukman (1955) 'Custom and conflict in primitive Society' in "Key Problems of Sociological Theory", Rex J. Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd, London.
- Haralambos, M. and Heald, R. (1980) "Sociology; Themes and Perspectives", New Delhi, Oxford University Press.
- Haralambos, M. *et al* (1980) "Sociology; Themes and Perspectives", New Delhi: Mamza Khan; Oxford University Press.
- Henard, D.H. (2001) 'Why Some New Products are More Successful Than Others', *Journal of Marketing Research* (38), August 2001, pp. 362-375.
- Herbert Blumer (1962) 'Society as Symbolic Interaction' in Peter Kivistor (2000) "Social Theory Roots and Branches". Rebury Publishing Company, Los Engels, California.
- John J. Macionis (1999) 'Symbolic Interaction' Paradigm pp. 10-20 Prentice Hall International (UK) Limited.
- Karl Manheim (1936) "Ideology and Utopia", Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd, London.
- King (2005) 'Understanding the Role and Methods of Meta-Analysis in IS Research', "Communications of the AIS" (16), 2005, pp. 665.686.
- Krugman, P. (2009) "How Did Economists Get It So Wrong," *New York Times*, Sept 6, 2009.
- Kuhn, T., (1996) "The Structure of Scientific Revolutions", University of Chicago Press.
- Marx, K. (1910) 'The Poverty of Philosophy' in "Key Problems of Sociological Theory", Rex J. Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd, London.
- Marx, K. (1971) 'Preface to a Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy' Tr. S.S.W. Ryanzanskaya, edited by M. Dobb. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Maxwell, J. A. (1996) "Qualitative Research Design: An Interpretive Approach. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McCracken, G. (1988) "The Long Interview", Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- McLuhan, M. (1965) "Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man". New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Merton, Robert (1973) "The Sociology of Science", University of Chicago Press, 1973.
- Micheal H. *et al* (2002,) "Sociology: the Core" 6th Edition, Mc Graw Hill Companies, New York.
- Mills, C. Wright (1940) 'Language Logic and Culture', *American Sociological Review* IV, 670-650, 1939.
- Morse, J. M. (1994) 'Emerging from the Data: The Cognitive Process of Analysis in Qualitative Inquiry' In J. Morse (Ed.), "Critical issues in Qualitative Research Methods" (pp. 23-43). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mostyn, B. (1985) 'The Content Analysis of Qualitative Research Data: A Dynamic Approach'. In M. Brenner, J. Brown, & D. Canter (Eds.) "The Research Interview: Uses and Approaches" (pp. 115-145). London: Academic Press.
- Moustakas, C. (1994) "Phenomenological Research Methods" Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Musa, A. (1997) 'Social Thoughts' Lecture Series, Department of Sociology And Anthropology, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Maiduguri, 1997.
- Newman, F.S. *et al* (1995) "A Guide to Authentic Instruction and Theory".
- Newmann, F. *et al* (1996) "Authentic Achievement: Restructuring Schools for Intellectual Quality", San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Newmann, F., Bryk, A., and Nagaoka, J. (2001) 'Authentic Intellectual Work and Standardized Tests: Conflict or Coexistence?' Chicago: Consortium on Chicago School Research.
- Olugogunika, (1998) 'Contemporary Sociological Theory' Lecture Series, Department of

- Sociology And Anthropology, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Maiduguri, 1998
- Peter, L.B. (1966) "The Social Construction of Reality", Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd London.
- Pisano, G. A. (1997) 'Dynamic Capabilities and Strategic Management', *Strategic Management Journal* (18:7), 1997, 509-533.
- Pressley, M. *et al* (1992) 'Encouraging Mindful Use of Prior Knowledge: Attempting to Construct Explanatory Answers Facilitates Learning'. *Educational Psychologist*, 27(1), 91-109.
- Redfield, D. L. and Rousseau, E. W. (1981). 'A Meta-analysis of Experimental Research on Teacher Questioning Behaviour'. *Review of Educational Research*, 51, 237-245.
- Roscoe, P. (1968) 'Social Control through the Law' The Powell Lecture, Hamden CT,
- Schaefer, R.T. and Lamm, R.P. (1998) "Sociology", USA: McGraw-Hill Company.
- Schmidt W. *et al* (1997) "A Splintered Vision: An Investigation of U.S. Science and Mathematics Education" Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Schmidt, W. (2004) 'A Vision for Mathematics'. *Educational Leadership*, Volume 61, No. 5, 6-11.
- Schmidt. W. *et al* (2002) "A Coherent Curriculum: The Case for Mathematics". *American Educator*, Volume 26, No. 2, 10-26.
- SehribanBugday (2012) "Research Method: Grounded Theory Designs In Qualitative"
- Sellin, T. (1938) 'Culture, Conflict and Crime' New York: Social Science Research Council.
- Senk, S., and Thompson, D. (2003). *Standards-based school mathematics curricula: What are they? What do students learn?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Shettima, A.G. (1998) 'Research method' Lecture Series, Department of Sociology And Anthropology, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Maiduguri, 1998.
- Shettima, A.G. (1999) 'Social Statistics' Lecture Series, Department of Sociology And Anthropology, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Maiduguri, 1999.
- Simmel (1900) 'Philosophie des Geldes' in "Key Problems of Sociological Theory", Rex J. Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd, London.
- Skoepol, T. (1980) 'State and Social Revolution A comparative analysis of france, Russia and China. Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, J., Lee, V. and Newmann, F. (2001) 'Instruction and Achievement in Chicago Elementary Schools'. Chicago: Consortium on Chicago School Research.
- Steinfeld, C.W. and Fulk, J., 'The Theory Imperative', in *Organizations and Communications Technology*, Janet Fulk and Charles W. Steinfield (eds.) Sage Publications, Newbury Park, CA, 1990.
- Stigler, J. and Hiebert, J. (1999) "The Teaching Gap" New York: The Free Press.
- Stigler, J. and Hiebert, J. (2004) *Improving mathematics teaching*. *Educational Leadership*, Volume 61, No. 5, 12-16.
- Stone, C. L. (1983) 'A Meta-analysis of Advance Organizer Studies'. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 54, 194-199.
- Straub, D.W. 'Validating Instruments in MIS Research', *MIS Quarterly* (13:2), June 1989, pp. 146-169.
- Tsai, W. (2001) "Knowledge Transfer in Intra-organizational Networks: Effects of Network Position and Absorptive Capacity on Business Unit Innovation and Performance", *Academy of Management Review*, 2001.
- Turk, A. (1969) "Criminality and Legal Order", Chicago, Rand McNally.
- Taylor, Lan, R. Walton, Paul and Young, J. (1988) 'The New Criminology' For a Social Theory of Deviance' *International Library of Sociology*, Rutledge.

- Vold, G.B. (1959) "Theoretical Criminology" Oxford University Press.
- Wallerstein, I.M. (1974) "The Modern World System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World Economy in the Sixteenth Century" New York Academic Press, Week 6: Organizational Theories.
- Wenglinsky, H. (1998) "Does it Compute? The Relationship between Educational Technology and Student Achievement in Mathematics". New Jersey: Educational Testing Service.
- Williams, L. *et al* (2000) 'Strengthening the Case for Pair Programming', IEEE Software, July/August 2000, pp. 19-25.
- Williamson, O.E. (1981) 'The Economics of Organization: The Transaction Cost Approach' American Journal of Sociology (87:3), 1981, pp. 548-577.
- Wright Mills, C. (1959) 'The Sociological Imagination' in "Key Problems of Sociological Theory", Rex J. Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd, London.