

UNIT – V

Theory for a KSLU lawyer — recap

Five lenses · Choosing a lens · Indian pair · 16-mark

Explanatory Lecture Slides

Recent Theoretical Perspectives in Sociology · Minor-II-3 · Semester III

RECENT THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES IN SOCIOLOGY

Topics covered in this unit

01

List the five lenses of this paper

02

Choose a lens without bigotry

03

Pair each with an Indian name

04

Pair each with a case

05

16-mark machine

06

What to carry into Year 2 law

How this unit is organised

01

Five lenses

02

How to choose

03

Indian names

04

Cases

05

Machine

06

Carry forward

Five lenses

Function, conflict, interaction, late-modern (risk/capital), Indian (Ambedkar/Srinivas from paper II).

- A 20-mark 'recent theoretical perspectives' is a guided tour of four, with India in every other sentence.

Five lenses

SYSTEM

- Function.
- Conflict.

SITUATION / LATE

- Interaction.
- Risk / Bourdieu.

How to choose a lens in an answer

A riot: conflict + labelling. A family ritual: function + interaction. A chemical leak: risk. A campus: Bourdieu + caste conflict.

- Do not marry one church.
- The valuator wants to see you can pick, not that you 'believe in Marx'.

How to choose a lens in an answer

PICK

- What the question's object is.

THEN

- Add one rival lens in the last paragraph.

Indian names to park under theory

Srinivas under function; Ambedkar under conflict; a courtroom ethnographer's eye under interaction; Mehta under risk.

- Ghurye does not need to reappear unless Indology is asked.

Indian names to park under theory

FUNCTION

- Srinivas's village.

CONFLICT

- Ambedkar.
- Desai.

Case table

Kesavananda (system), Indra Sawhney (conflict), Navtej (label/stigma), Mehta (risk), Vishaka (feminist conflict), Sunil Batra (total institution).

- Six cases, six lenses.

Case table

MUST

- Mehta.
- Navtej.
- Indra Sawhney.

IF TIME

- Batra.
- Vishaka.

16-mark machine

Name the perspective, two theorists, two concepts, one Indian illustration, one criticism, one case, close.

- Works for every unit of this paper.

16-mark machine

TIME

- 20 minutes.

UNDERLINE

- The concept-words: AGIL, habitus, latent function, stigma, risk.

Carry into the law years

You now have a way to read a statute: what it claims to do (manifest), who it serves (conflict), how it is done in the room (interaction), what late-modern risk it meets.

- That is a professional skill, not a BA leftover.
- Clinical ethics and drafting will need the interaction and conflict eyes every week.

Carry into the law years

KEEP

- Four questions: function, beneficiary, encounter, risk.

DROP

- The urge to quote ten theorists in a contract problem.

Case table

Kesavananda (system), Indra Sawhney (conflict), Navtej (label/stigma), Mehta (risk), Vishaka (feminist conflict), Sunil Batra (total institution).

- Six cases, six lenses.

Cases a KSLU answer should name

CASE	CASE	CASE
M.C. Mehta <i>(1987) 1 SCC 395</i> Risk.	Navtej Singh Johar <i>(2018) 10 SCC 1</i> Stigma / label.	Indra Sawhney <i>(1992) Supp (3) SCC 217</i> Conflict over the State's equality machine.

Provisions & materials to quote

Art. 14–17

Conflict and function at once.

Art. 21

Risk and dignity.

EPA 1986

Risk.

PoA Act

Conflict.

JJA 2015

Labelling.

10 / 16-mark frames from this unit

Q1

Compare functionalist and conflict perspectives with Indian illustrations.

Q2

How would an interactionist and a Marxist each read a criminal trial?

Q3

Write short notes: habitus; latent function; risk society; stigma.

Q4

'Theory is a toolbox, not a faith.' Discuss for this paper.

Unit recap

- 1 Four questions: function, beneficiary, encounter, risk.
- 2 Match Srinivas/Ambekar/Goffman/Beck to those four.
- 3 Six cases, four concepts underlined.
- 4 Never 'believe' a theory in the hall; use it.
- 5 This BA paper is a way of reading every later statute.