

The morphogenetic approach and immanent causality: A spinozian perspective*

Karim Knio 

Institute of Social Studies (ISS), Erasmus University Rotterdam, The Netherlands

Correspondence

Karim Knio, Institute of Social Studies (ISS), Erasmus University Rotterdam, The Netherlands.

Email: knio@iss.nl

Abstract

The morphogenetic approach as powered by analytical dualism offers an appealing account of the processes whereby people – through their reflexivities – reflect back on structures and cultures during the double and triple morphogenesis of agency. However, in order to further specify an account of social change, this paper argues that it would be helpful to provide an account of what occurs in the other direction as well: from the direction of structures and cultures, between each other *and* towards people, also at the points of double and triple morphogenesis of agency. This article is therefore a theoretical piece that proposes a reading of the morphogenetic model imbued with an enlightened understanding of immanent causality, driven by the Spinozian doctrine of parallelism and operationalized by his understanding of the two expressive roles of ideas.

KEYWORDS

analytical dualism, dispositions (capabilities), immanent causality, role of ideas, structure/agency debate

Margaret Archer's morphogenetic approach is currently one of the most eminent and highly esteemed accounts of structure and agency in the social sciences. By referring to the concept of

*I would like to thank Professor Archer for commenting on an earlier draft of this article. I also would like to thank Aleksandra Piletic for her assistance in preparing this article. All misrepresentations and omissions are my own.

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License, which permits use and distribution in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made.

© 2018 The Authors Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour Published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd

emergence, the morphogenetic model offers a compelling account of the way that structure relates to agency. The centerpiece of the morphogenetic approach – analytical dualism – allows Archer to develop a framework that is centered around the “conditional and generative mechanisms operating *between* structure and agency” (Archer, 1995: 16). There is much merit to analytical dualism, particularly in terms of its explanatory potential and methodology, but over the years it has attracted a variety of critiques stemming from different ontological and theoretical standpoints.

On the one hand, certain scholars have argued that Archer's analytical dualism entails a “reification which can at all times be reduced to individuals and their interactions” (King, 1999: 222; Hay, 2002: 125) leading her to fall into a so-called “ontological dualism” (Hay, 2002; King, 1999; Piironen, 2014; Sawyer, 2001). Others have likened her model to Giddens' structuration theory, arguing that Giddensian duality is entirely compatible with her version of dualism (Stones, 2001: 183). In this sense, the morphogenetic model has encountered criticism from both sides of the ontological spectrum – both for employing a dualist ontology which fails to take the interplay between structure and agency seriously (King, Hay) *and* for employing dualism in a false and incomplete way, as a heuristic device (Stones).¹

In this article, I will take Archer's side in asserting that analytical dualism can neither be understood as ontological dualism nor as duality. In particular, I will do so by supplementing Archer's analytical dualism with the Spinozian notion of immanent causality. By arguing that the cause is not separate from its effect, but rather “explicated through its effects in a non-representative, non-resembling expression” (Diefenbach, 2013: 167), certain Spinozian scholars have laid the groundwork for a reconceptualization of the relationship between material and ideational as well as structure and agency. I will build on this understanding and argue that immanent causality can act as a further specification of the interaction between culture, structure and agency as mediated through people. In the next section, I will provide a clarification of three crucial features of the morphogenetic model which have been the target of criticisms over the years. I will then turn to the central contentions at the heart of analytical dualism and point to ways in which they would benefit from further analytical specification. In line with this, in the subsequent section I turn to Spinozian scholarship and the Spinozian understanding of immanent causality, as well as how it can serve to further elaborate the morphogenetic model. In the final section, I will specify the operationalization of the Spinozian perspective of the morphogenetic model à la immanent causality. I will conclude by referring to a number of implications that could be useful for further research in critical realism.

1 | SPECIFYING CRUCIAL FEATURES OF THE MORPHOGENETIC MODEL

In my reading of the morphogenetic model, Archer's critics fail to consider three of its distinct features at a deeper level. If taken collectively, these features are able to offer a comprehensive and coherent understanding of analytical dualism and its implications in articulating a complex interplay between structure and agency. In this regard, I propose a more in-depth specification of (a) the concept of emergence and emergent properties, (b) the important distinction between dispositions and dispositional capabilities (Archer & Elder-Vass, 2012; Ellis, 2002), and (c) the important role of internal relations, necessary/contingent relations as well as their stratification.

(a) On emergence and emergent properties

Emergence is generally defined as the “situations in which the conjunction of two or more features or aspects gives rise to new phenomena, which have properties irreducible to those of

their constituents, even though the latter are necessary for their existence” (Sayer, 2000). Emergence is therefore a phenomenon that signals a stratification of social reality whereby “different strata possess different emergent properties and powers” (Archer, 1995: 9).

Over time, emergence has been understood in a variety of ways, evoking considerable ontological divergences. Dave Elder-Vass for instance differentiated between different types of emergence, ultimately contrasting two (sub) types: temporal (diachronic) and synchronic emergence.² According to him, the former ‘lay usage’ of emergence refers to the “first appearance or initial development of some new phenomenon,” while the latter is concerned with “the relationship between the properties and powers of a whole and its parts at any single instant in time” (Elder-Vass, 2010: 16). In sum, he adopts the view that a (weak) relational version of emergence is inherently synchronic in nature and bases his understanding of emergence on the relationship between “properties and powers of a whole and its parts at any single instant in time” (ibid.: 5; 16).

However, it is clear that Archer’s understanding of emergence is not merely synchronic like Elder-Vass’, but is also inherently diachronic in nature (Archer & Elder-Vass, 2012). Unlike Elder-Vass, Archer insists that we must understand emergence as referring both to interactions between the parts and the whole at a specific moment *in time and over time*, acknowledging the heritage of ideas and culture left behind by previous rounds of socio-cultural interaction (ibid.: 95–6).

Archer’s diachronic *and* synchronic understanding of emergence is best illustrated through her treatment of the so-called ‘parts’ and the ‘people’ – i.e. her understanding of the relation between system integration and social integration (Archer, 1995: 183). Namely, she points out that “we can talk about ‘system integration’ conditioning ‘social integration’ which *necessarily* confronts the former, since ‘social integration’ always applies to the here and now (wherever that is situated historically), whilst ‘system integration’ is antecedent to it” (ibid.: 183; emphasis added). In other words, if we take Archer’s reading seriously, we must understand that ‘system integration’ – antecedent to ‘social integration’ and extant in its own right – is constituted of the legacies of previous rounds of structural and/or socio-cultural interaction.

As a result, ‘social integration’ is an emergent property of ‘system integration’. The latter precedes the former, while the former cannot be reduced to the latter. This is because synchronic/diachronic emergence between levels implies a thicker version of ‘contingent necessity’ whereby the lower stratum is contingently necessary to the upper stratum and the upper stratum is necessarily contingent on the lower one (see Brown, 2002). Let us now turn to dispositions and dispositional capabilities in order to flesh out the implications of this debate even further.

(b) On dispositions and dispositional capabilities

Differing understandings of emergence naturally have analytical implications for a variety of related debates, and the recent debate on dispositions and dispositional capabilities between Archer and Elder-Vass (2012) is a natural and fitting illustration of this. While Elder-Vass argues that ideas cannot exist in an external realm as they merely contain the “*tendency* to be understood in some ways rather than other” (Archer & Elder-Vass, 2012: 105), Archer insists that one must “acknowledge the objective capacity of ideas” (ibid.: 108). It therefore becomes clear that while Elder-Vass merely accounts for dispositional capabilities of ideas, Archer is making a much deeper argument: dispositional capabilities are necessarily preceded by dispositions, which are located on a temporally prior level (Archer, 1996).

From this, it follows that properties are dispositions or clusters of powers which represent an inheritance from past interactions; they belong to what Archer calls Structural and Cultural Systems (S.S. and C.S.), existing at the level of conditioning. Archer's understanding is in line with Ellis' argument that "dispositional properties are genuine properties, and intrinsic to the things that have them" such that "the essential properties of things always include dispositional properties" (Ellis, 2002: 59).³ Dispositional properties are also concerned with a sort of causal process, and the circumstances in which a disposition is displayed should be understood as the so-called 'triggering' circumstances (ibid.: 65). As such, "dispositional properties of things cannot ... be defined behavioristically, and ought not to be identified with the dispositions they are postulated to explain" (ibid.: 77). This must be understood in contrast to properties existing at the level of interaction for Archer (Structural Interaction S.I. and Socio-Cultural Interaction S.C.) where the 'double morphogenesis of agency'⁴ takes place. This again is in line with Ellis' distinction between dispositions and dispositional capabilities (ibid.: 76) with the latter being tendentially and behaviorally imbued once they have been triggered. As Ellis puts it himself, the "manifest, behaviouristically describable dispositions of things" tend to have a causal dimension and they refer to "how these things will, or be likely to *behave* in various circumstances" (ibid.; emphasis added).

Consequently, it should be clear that the debate on dispositions and dispositional capacities is directly in line with the understanding of emergence elaborated on above. Namely, while dispositional capabilities do exist in their own right, they are a product of both diachronic *and* synchronic processes. In other words, dispositional capabilities must be preceded by dispositions, clusters of powers which form the legacies of past – diachronic – interactions. Dispositional capabilities are therefore tendencies mediated by human beings that exist *in relation to* the properties generated through the system integration at previous stages of the process. As a result, when we talk about dispositions, we are referring to 'system integration' rooted within material and cultural systems of the past, while dispositional capabilities allow us to form a more solid understanding of 'social integration.'

(c) On internal relations, necessary/contingent relations and their stratification

In order to follow Archer's logic to its natural conclusion and offer a final round of specifications, we must now build on the distinction between dispositions (properties) and dispositional capabilities (tendencies). Namely, once we zoom into a deeper understanding of emergence and properties we are able to gain a more nuanced understanding of internal relations and their role within the morphogenetic model. In Archer's words, what distinguishes an 'emergent property' is its real homogeneity, i.e. that the relations between its components are internal **AND** necessary ones rather than seemingly regular concatenations of heterogeneous features" (Archer, 1995: 173; emphasis added). In other words, a property should be understood as being integral in relation to itself and self-sufficient in scope, and uniform because it is bound by a logic of necessary and internal relations. Readers of the morphogenetic approach should therefore be aware that internal relations are **specific** forms, i.e. whether these specific forms are necessary or contingent will depend on their position within the stratification of social reality.

In other words, whether forms are necessary and/or contingent depends upon their precise location with respect to the three phases of the morphogenetic cycle: the level of conditioning, the level of interaction and the level of elaboration/reproduction. At the level of conditioning in particular, we are able to see the relationship between necessary and internal relations most

clearly – it is here that Archer talks about necessary **AND** internal relations in themselves. On the other hand, the level of interaction fosters relations which are necessary **OR** contingent in scope. This second emergent order is therefore the one at which the previously mentioned dispositional capabilities can be located, i.e. where there is an agential element to the relations. Finally, at the level of reproduction/elaboration we can talk about purely contingent relations – what Archer calls the “results of the results of the results of social action” (1995: 325).

If we go one step further, the morphogenetic model fleshes out in detail Bhaskar's argument that “tendencies may be possessed unexercised, exercised unrealized, and realized unperceived (or undetected)” (2008: 7). In this vein, the level of conditioning speaks to structures that are either juxtaposed to each other (but resistant to change) and/or structures that are triggered, but relatively resistant to the triggering force (possessed unexercised and exercised unrealized⁸). In other words, these structures are necessary and enduring in and of themselves, leading them to being both necessary **AND** internal in nature. At the level of interaction, on the other hand, structures are triggered, activated and imbued with a degree of social action and conduct. This leads to a situation where the interaction between structures and people is necessary **OR** contingent (realized unperceived). Whether these realizations remain (un) perceived or (un) detected at the level of reproduction/elaboration depends on the empirical context and these are purely **contingent** issues.

It has been the aim of this section to point to several crucial aspects of the Archerian model which have caused a certain degree of confusion in the past. My three-step specification of the morphogenetic model has therefore (a) stressed the diachronic *and* synchronic nature of emergence, (b) the necessary and emergentist pre-existence of dispositions in relation to dispositional capabilities and (c) the important role of stratification in determining whether a relation will be necessary and/or contingent. These three points not only elucidate the role and position of analytical dualism, but they also allow us to build upon the morphogenetic approach as a whole. In order to drive these points further, I will proceed by arguing that it is necessary to develop a more thoroughly explicated understanding of the link between structure and agency. In the following section, I will therefore deal with pathways for moving the morphogenetic model forward.

2 | TAKING THE MORPHOGENETIC MODEL ONE STEP FURTHER

For Archer, a complex interaction between structure and agency⁵ cannot be viewed as mere hydraulics, but one which is mediated by people. Thus, in order to identify problems in operationalizing analytical dualism within the morphogenetic model, I will now turn to the way she tackles people as the link between agency and structure. Namely, Archer has extensively dealt with People Emergent Properties (PEPs), both in her more recent work (Archer, 2007, 2012; Archer & Donati, 2015) as well as in earlier studies (Archer, 1979). This has led her to pioneer her three-stage model, “one that gives both objectivity and subjectivity their due and also explicitly incorporates their interplay through the process of reflexive mediation” (Archer, 2007: 16):

1. “Structural and cultural properties *objectively* shape the situations that agents confront involuntarily, and *inter alia* possess generative powers of constraint and enablement in relation to

2. Subjects' own constellations of concerns, as *subjectively* defined in relation to the three orders of natural reality: nature, practice and the social.
3. Courses of action are produced through the *reflexive deliberations* of subjects who *subjectively* determine their practical projects in relation to their *objective* circumstances." (ibid.: 17).

Crucially, it is through the mechanism of internal conversations and reflexivity that Archer therefore relates structure to agency. She has identified two distinct loci for this mediation: double and triple morphogenesis. In particular, she evokes the 'double morphogenesis of agency' to denote where 'self-development' interacts with a variety of structures and cultures in action enabling her to distinguish between different modes of reflexivities: the communicative, the autonomous, meta-reflexive and fractured reflexivity (Archer, 1995, 2000, 2003, 2007, 2012). She ultimately locates these four different dominant modalities of reflexivity in relation to different situational logics of action: 1) contextual continuity (communicative reflexivity); 2) contextual discontinuity (autonomous reflexivity); 3) contextual incongruity (meta-reflexivity); 4) lack of contextual continuity (fractured reflexivity) (Archer, 2012). These situational foci of reflexivity then enable Archer to flesh out the 'triple morphogenesis of agency' where reflexive deliberations possessed by social actors relate structure to agency (Archer, 1995, 2000, 2003, 2007). Archer therefore uses these two agential junctures as the cornerstones for her methodological implementation of an analytical dualism-based morphogenetic approach.

The integration of PEPs in relation to Structural Emergent Properties (SEPs) and Cultural Emergent Properties (CEPs) has therefore allowed her to plot the intersection of structure, culture and agency via the mediation of people and their reflexivities. At times, however, it appears that Archer's emphasis on reflexivity and the role of the individual has inadvertently moved us away from certain fundamental features of the model. In order to be more rigorous and analytically robust, it is my contention that it is therefore necessary to perform the analysis in the other direction as well: rather than limiting our study to the way people relate to structure and culture via the two loci of interaction (double and triple morphogenesis), it is also necessary to conduct an analysis of the interplay of structure and culture with people. In this way, I am also considering the relation between SEPs and CEPs in their own right, as well as the relationship of structure and culture to people via the double and triple morphogenesis of agency. In particular, it is my understanding that Spinozian thinking and recent Spinozian contributions to the social sciences can operationalize a new perspective of the morphogenetic model. In the following section, I will elaborate on the benefits of deploying Spinozian thinking in relation to the morphogenetic approach.

3 | WHEN IMMANENT CAUSALITY MEETS THE MORPHOGENETIC APPROACH

Over the past three centuries, Spinozian scholarship has undergone a "number of renaissances" (Duffy, 2009: 111). From debates on atheism, pantheism and the nature of God in the 17th and 18th century, to Marxist interventions in the late 20th century, Spinozian thinking has made extensive contributions and enriched a variety of philosophical debates (ibid.). In recent years, there has been a renewed focus on Spinozian metaphysics, their intersection with the metaphysics of adjacent thinkers (e.g. Leibniz, Descartes and Kant) as well as their applications to contemporary political philosophy. Central to many of these contributions has been what Spinozian scholar Yitzhak Melamed calls "one of the most important scholarly

controversies in Spinoza scholarship of the past thirty-five years”: the question of whether Spinozian modes should be understood as inhering in substance or as depending upon it in terms of an efficient cause-type relation (2009: 18). While certain influential scholars like Della Rocca (2002) have insisted on Spinoza’s substance monism, others – primarily influenced by Deleuze (1988) readings – have inserted an ontology of difference into Spinozian thinking. Debates surrounding the Spinozian ontology and the relation between substance, attributes and modes have further spawned a variety of related discussions, particularly in relation to causality.

In recent years, one of the pre-eminent scholars dealing with the Spinozian understanding of causality and immanence has been Katja Diefenbach. Diefenbach’s starting point is the question of Spinoza’s treatment of transcendence vs. immanence in what she argues was his unique ability to unite the two in “a kind of trans-immanence in immanent terms” (2013: 167). Diefenbach bases this on an understanding of being that is differentiated in scope, and that “represents the immanent cause of all things” (ibid.: 169). In particular, she asserts that being “is not divided into parts, into species and genera, but is difference in itself: a single materiality in differential expressions, which are articulated in and by intensive degrees” (ibid.). What follows is an understanding of cause and effect that departs from the traditional model of efficient causality. Immanence allows us to conceive of the cause as “not absent but explicated through its effects in a non-representative, non-resembling expression” (ibid.: 167). In a way, the cause then becomes inseparable from the effect. Diefenbach argues that we are able to think about “quasi-transcendent questions ... in an immanent sense” (ibid.: 167). Thus, by employing an understanding of the immanent cause, a new perspective on the relationship between structure and agency as well as the ideational and the material can be further developed. However, in order to trace the ways in which Diefenbach’s argument can be understood within the context of the social sciences, I will now turn to several important contributions that have been made in this regard.

Namely, aside from the strand of scholarship dealing directly with Spinozian philosophy, a number of rich Spinozian interventions have also emerged in social science research. These contributions stem from divergent ontologies and research problematiques in their own right, but they have collectively succeeded in imbuing Spinoza with new life within contemporary International Political Economy (IPE) literature. The two most prominent contributors in this respect have been political theorists Lars Tønder and Andrew Brown. Tønder – located more on the ideational side of the ontological spectrum – has dealt with the pathways through which ideas cause political change (2010: 66). In particular, he argues that a Spinozian understanding of the *doctrine of parallelism* would permit a more thoroughgoing understanding of the role of ideas in “prescribing, shaping, constraining and guiding” the policy preferences of decision makers (ibid.: 56). On the other side of the ontological spectrum, Brown draws upon Spinoza to flesh out an understanding of thought and human activity whereby human practice is “vital to knowledge, inseparable from it” (2002: 183). He uses the Spinozian concept of *adequacy* to put forward the notion that knowledge and human practice should be understood in terms of a self-awareness, such that “[k]nowledge is guided, not by the thinking individual’s consciousness and will, but by the material objects of practice” (ibid.: 183–4).

In this paper, I will draw on Tønder’s three-fold understanding of Spinoza and supplement it with certain conceptual elements articulated by Brown. This model will represent a foundation of my renewed understanding of the morphogenetic model. Namely:

- (1) the doctrine of parallelism, which shows how the ideational and material are modally different yet ontologically equal;

- (2) the expressive quality of ideas – i.e. their self-explication – which shows how ideas possess agentive capacities that allow them to cause change in policy through their involvement with and explication of the circumstances from which they arise;
- (3) the notion of adequacy, which shows how the power of any idea depends on its ability to engage the world in ways that are persistent (Tønder, 2010: 68–9).

In the subsequent section, I will first turn to *why* immanent causality is complementary to the morphogenetic model, and then to *how* it can be used in this regard. In particular, the reason *why* immanent causality provides a useful contribution to Archer's model lies within the doctrine of parallelism: by offering an enlightened understanding of the material and ideational furnished by Spinozian thinking, we can fully elaborate on the crucial aspects of the morphogenetic model mentioned above. On another level – i.e. *how* we can employ immanent causality – the two expressive roles of ideas are able to provide us with a gateway for constructing a morphogenetic approach imbued with and enhanced by the doctrine of parallelism.

4 | OPERATIONALIZING IMMANENT CAUSALITY AND THE MORPHOGENETIC MODEL

i. The doctrine of parallelism

As previously mentioned, the Spinozian ontology contends that the ideational and the material exist parallel to each other, operating according to their own modalities (Tønder, 2010: 67). In this sense, 'parallel' is taken to mean that ideational and material are irreducible to each other and have independent causal powers. And although they have these different, variable but important causal influences, they are nevertheless intimately related to each other (ibid.). In particular, the material "empowers the ideational" while the ideational itself "is an idea of 'something'" (ibid.). "The point is," Tønder concludes, "neither to eliminate the material world from the purview of ideational analysis nor to diminish the distinctive causal powers of ideas; rather, it is to show how the material and ideational are part of the same explanation, one in which the study of causality is a matter of disclosing the many layers along which political change is evolving" (ibid.: 71).

The doctrine of parallelism should therefore be understood as the foundation of an emergentist configurational analysis of structure and agency that takes into account both the 'parts' and the 'people'. In particular, it allows us to acknowledge the ontological independence of both components such that "social reality is made of different strata, each with heterogeneous properties" (Archer, 1995: 133). At the same time, it is therefore possible to examine the crucial interplay between these different strata. Additionally, implicit within the doctrine of parallelism is a non-mechanistic understanding of matter which is, as Brown points out, complementary with the critical realist notion of emergence (2002: 182).

But then how do we operationalize this doctrine of parallelism? For Spinoza, the answer lies within the two expressive roles of ideas. In accordance with this, it is my contention that that these roles of ideas can take the morphogenetic model to its next logical step.

ii. The first expressive role of ideas – 'self-explication'

According to Tønder, ideas are expressive as a result of "their involvement with both the material and ideational world" (2010: 67). The expressive quality of ideas then shows that "ideas

possess agentive capacities that allow them to cause change in policy through their involvement with and explication of the circumstances from which they arise” (ibid.: 68–9). Therefore, the doctrine of parallelism allows us to consider ideas as those entities which put forth a particular understanding of the world such that they lock a particular interpretation of it into a specific “worldview” (ibid.: 67). Tønder’s understanding is further supplemented by Brown’s particular articulation of Spinoza’s “reconceptualization of the relation between knowledge (thought), human practical activity and the material objects towards which that thought and activity are addressed” (2002: 182). In other words, Brown’s understanding of praxis is cognizant of the notion that ideas are always aware of the “temporal form of the thinking body” (ibid.). It is here that ideas are then conscious of the immediate nature of their milieu, allowing Tønder to argue that they also reformulate themselves in relation to the form of the milieu itself. This not only allows the worldview to become entrenched within the ideational realm, but it also interacts with the material by making a particular response or policy option look more favorable in relation to others (ibid.).

The expressive quality of ideas and their ‘self-explication’, as proposed by Tønder and supplemented by Brown, can also be detected in the morphogenetic model. Surprisingly, however, Archer has never fully unwrapped the implications of such an understanding. I will now show the specific aspects of the morphogenetic model that reveal a complementarity with the Spinozian understanding of the relation between ideas and materiality. I will specifically focus on Archer’s understanding of cultural and structural morphogenesis/morphostasis at the systemic and social levels (1995: 303), i.e. the levels of conditioning and interaction respectively and point to ways in which it reveals a complementarity with the Spinozian model.

Namely, implicit in Archer’s work is that SEPs (belonging to the realm of the material) and CEPs (inherently ideational in nature) intersect at the interaction level of the model (ibid.: 305). She asserts that “we have to recognize that there is structural penetration of the cultural realm, and cultural penetration of the structural domain” (ibid.). This interpenetration of the two realms motivates different types of strategic action (ibid.: 216). Thus, in the realm of the second emergent order (or interaction) Archer juxtaposes necessary OR contingent relations of structures and cultures with compatible/complementary OR contradictory relations between structures and cultures. These juxtapositions (see Table 1) stipulate four different situational logics: protection, correction, elimination and opportunism (1995: 303). The logic of protection, for instance, refers to the juxtaposition of the necessary and compatible both in material and ideational terms. The logic of correction refers to the juxtaposition of necessary and incompatible

TABLE 1 Cultural and structural morphogenesis/morphostasis at the systemic and social levels (Adapted from Archer, 1995: 303)

	Contradictions		Complementarities	
	Necessary	Contingent	Necessary	Contingent
(Situational logic)	(Correction)	(Elimination)	(Protection)	(Opportunism)
CEPs				
C.S. level	Syncretism	Pluralism	Systematization	Specialization
S-C. level	Unification	Cleavage	Reproduction	Sectionalism
SEPs				
S.S. level	Compromise	Competition	Integration	Differentiation
S-I. level	Containment	Polarisation	Solidarity	Diversification

both in material and ideational terms, while the logic of opportunism is the juxtaposition of contingent and compatible both materially and ideationally. Finally, the logic of elimination occurs in relation to the juxtaposition of contingent and incompatible, also both materially and ideationally.

Upon closer inspection, this table also reveals how these situational logics are delineated across the conditioning and interaction levels. As such, Archer distinguishes between the Structural System (S.S.) and Structural Integration (S-I.) operating at the conditioning and interaction levels respectively. Equally, she distinguishes between Cultural Systems (C.S.) and Socio-Cultural Interaction (S-C.) operating again at the conditioning and interaction levels respectively. The reader should thus observe that each of the four logics expresses two agential movements – the first represents the jump from the C.S. level to the S-C. level, while the second is the movement from S.S. to S-I.

In other words, under the logic of protection and at the level of SEPs, *solidarity* (located at the S-I. level) envisages an agential movement in relation to *integration* located at the S.S. level above it. Thus, solidarity is a dispositional capacity of the disposition/property characterized by integration. Solidarity should therefore be understood as an emergent property of integration whereby solidarity is a *tendency* relating to the *property* of integration. In sum, solidarity is an emergent dispositional capacity/tendency of the disposition/property of integration. Similarly, at the level of culture (but also referring to the logic of protection), reproduction can be said to be an emergent dispositional capacity/tendency of the disposition/property of systematization.⁶

If the reader follows this particular understanding of the morphogenetic approach to its natural conclusion, it will become clear that properties must be understood as the results of previous rounds of interaction and that ideas, embedded within agential dispositional capabilities, are able to reveal the emergent properties that they come from. At the same time, it should be clear that dispositional capabilities cannot be reduced to the properties which they originate from (as they are emergent). Thus, dispositional capabilities have their own weight in empirical research, but they are never fully reducible to them. In other words, at the level of interaction – both with respect to culture and structure – we are able to empirically study whether the interaction between social structures (material or ideational) is necessary or contingent, compatible or not.

This is where the first Spinozian expressive role of ideas intertwines with the double morphogenesis of agency at the level of interaction: by virtue of their interactions with other structures, cultures and people, corporate agents become self-aware and conscious of the **forms** that characterize their milieu.⁷ This allows them to build a more well-defined strategy of action and identity, in accordance with the milieu that surrounds them. At this stage, however, they are not aware of ‘what must be there’ for the forms populating this milieu to exist in the way that they do. If we take the example above, corporate agents – acting in accordance with the logic of solidarity – become aware that a logic of integration must have existed at a preceding level. In other words, they are aware that integration (a property/disposition) is an internal relation (i.e. a form) that was also necessary at that stage. However, this does not necessarily imply that they also have knowledge of the particular necessity that lies behind this property/disposition. In this vein, primary agents are experiencing a shrinkage in relation to corporate agents (Table 2), and are not even aware of the form at this stage of the cycle. Thus, the action of corporate agents – in accordance with the prevalent logic at the level of interaction – allows them to become fully aware not only of the logic at that level, but also of the logic pertaining to the level of conditioning.

TABLE 2 Structure, culture, agency and people at the three levels of the morphogenetic cycle

	Structure	Culture	Agency	People
Conditioning (level 1)	Necessary and Internal material relations par excellence	Necessary and Internal logical relations par excellence	Social embeddedness in relations mostly populated by primary agents	First order of concerns (distinction of self from social self) and how it subjectively relates to the three orders of natural reality: nature, practice and the social.
Interaction (level 2)	Necessary OR contingent. Compatible or not compatible = four situational logics	Necessary OR contingent. Compatible or not compatible = four situational logics	Double morphogenesis of agency leading towards 'self-development.' Shrinkage of primary agents in relation to corporate agents	Second emergent order of concerns: through internal conversations distinction of a variety of modes of reflexivity: communicative, autonomous, meta reflexive and fractured.
Reproduction or elaboration (level 3)	Contingent upon the second level. Absences from the level of conditioning still persist	Contingent upon the second level. Absences from the level of conditioning still persist	Triple morphogenesis of agency: how social actors, influenced by structural and cultural actions in the previous level reflect upon their environment and reflexively aim to define it	Third emergent order of concerns (emotions as commentaries on concerns): Situating different modes of reflexivity within the situational logics of contextual continuity, discontinuity and incongruity.

In other words, it becomes clear that these generic depictions of properties (i.e. integration/systematization for the logic of protection; compromise/syncretism for the logic of correction; differentiation/specialization for the logic of opportunism and competition/pluralism for the logic of elimination) are *necessary and internal* relations or forms. In accordance with the tradition of critical realism, once the researcher asks ‘what must be there’ in order for the necessary and internal relations to exist, it is possible to start thinking about the absences, which are the real for Bhaskar, behind the forms (Brown, 2002: 171). The gateway for doing so is the concept of ‘adequacy.’

iii. The second expressive role of ideas – ‘adequacy’

Over the years, various understandings of the concept of adequacy have been employed in critical realism. For instance, in his theorizations on truth, Sayer has referred to the notion of ‘practical adequacy’ (Sayer 43). In this sense, practical adequacy should be understood as the extent to which expectations are generated “about the world and [the] results of our actions which are realized” (ibid.). Similarly, Archer also employs the notion of ‘adequacy’ to designate logical relations pertaining to the Cultural System. For instance, she points out that “assuming the adequacy of translation and the invariance of logic, it becomes possible to characterize the relations between [two items in the CS] as contradictory or consistent” (Archer, 1996: 139). While these understandings of adequacy are certainly useful for fleshing out relations at the level of conditioning, I will now turn to the Spinozian understanding of adequacy which proposes a substantially different usage of the concept.

As mentioned previously, Tønder and Brown tackle the notion of ‘adequacy’ as one of the two chief pathways for understanding the relation between ideas and materiality in Spinozian terms. Tønder in particular advances a convincing understanding of the concept, arguing that the notion of adequacy demonstrates “the power of any idea depends on its ability to engage the world in ways that are persistent” (2010: 69). In other words, the idea becomes powerful by showing how its expression of the world is able to persist (ibid.: 68). For instance, Tønder argues that “an adequate idea of fear is one that expresses knowledge of how this fear is able to persist through circuits of affective being” (ibid.). Adequacy therefore necessarily implies a knowledge of the position of the idea in relation to the immediate contextual surroundings, and more significantly, of the mechanisms at play at an even deeper level.

The significance of ‘adequacy’ for the morphogenetic model can be clearly identified at the third level, i.e. the level of reproduction/elaboration. Namely, for Archer, it is in the third phase of the morphogenetic approach that it becomes possible to identify whether structures/cultures undergo reproduction or elaboration. Additionally, this phase is concerned with the mechanisms by which these scenarios influence the types of reflexivity that social actors, embedded in corporate agents, exert on these structures/cultures. Archer thus refers to this level as ‘the result of the result of the result’ of previous rounds of interaction: the third level must necessarily postdate the social interaction that occurs at the second level. In this regard, I propose a study of four possible sociological derivations which are purely contingent on the results arising out of the types of situational logics highlighted in the prior level (i.e. level two). In my understanding of Archer’s morphogenetic sequence (1995) and her theorizations about reflexivity (2012), these four derivations are as follows:

1. *A junction between structural and cultural morphostasis*

Thematically, Archer refers to this as contextual continuity which influences social actors to

predominantly foster a communicative reflexivity (Archer, 2012: 17). This scenario is the ultimate example of morphostasis and it can be manifested via the following combination of situational logics: structural logic of protection with cultural logic of protection; structural logic of protection with cultural logic of correction; structural logic of correction with cultural logic of correction, structural logic of protection with cultural logic of protection

2. *A disjunction between structural morphostasis and cultural morphogenesis*

Thematically, she refers to this as contextual discontinuity influencing social actors embedded in corporate agency to foster a predominantly autonomous reflexivity. This scenario envisages a slow-paced movement of transformation (Archer refers to it as morphostasis/morphogenesis) and it can be manifested via the following combination of situational logics: structural logic of protection with cultural logic of opportunism; structural logic of protection with cultural logic of elimination; structural logic of correction with cultural logic of opportunism, structural logic of correction with cultural logic of elimination

3. *A disjunction between structural morphogenesis and cultural morphostasis*

Thematically, she refers to this also as contextual discontinuity influencing social actors embedded in corporate agency to develop a dominant autonomous reflexivity. This scenario envisages a faster paced movement of transformation (Archer refers to it as morphogenesis/morphostasis) and it can be manifested via the following combination of situational logics: structural logic of opportunism with cultural logic of protection; structural logic of opportunism with cultural logic of correction; structural logic of elimination with cultural logic of protection, structural logic of elimination with cultural logic of correction

4. *A junction between structural and cultural morphogenesis*

Thematically, she refers to this as contextual incongruity influencing social actors embedded in corporate agency to predominantly foster a meta reflexivity. This is a scenario where there is a complete morphogenesis and it can be manifested via the following combination of situational logics: structural logic of opportunism with cultural logic of opportunism; structural logic of opportunism with cultural logic of elimination; structural logic of elimination with cultural logic of opportunism, structural logic of elimination with cultural logic of elimination.

In my view, each derivation influences individual actors embedded in corporate agents, arguing that each scenario fosters a dominant mode of reflexivity. In this sense, Archer plots a relational interaction by taking into account both the scenarios that influence the actors *and* the way the actors act in response to these influences vis-à-vis their dominant reflexivity. In so doing, she delineates the development of the triple morphogenesis of agency. But what is it that anchors this relational interaction to the respective scenarios outlined above? More specifically: what is the background against which actors reflexively aim to redefine their institutional influences? This is an important link for understanding the reflexivity of agents and the mechanisms by which they act to reproduce or alter specific social structures.

This is where the concept of 'adequacy' becomes crucial, whereby I take 'adequacy' to refer to the persistent engagement of an idea within its milieu, exerted by a particular dominant reflexivity. Namely, at level three of the morphogenetic model, 'adequacy' helps us understand that corporate agents not only reflect on the internal relations (i.e. forms) of the actions (like at the previous level), but that they are also able to reflect on 'what must be there' for the present forms to exist as they do. In other words, if we look at the example used above, it is at this stage that the agents can reflect and construct their own positions and actions in relation to the *necessary* which is at the heart of the logic of integration, i.e. 'what had to be there' for the logic

of integration to manifest itself contextually. In other words, it is by contemplating on 'what must be there' that agents sometimes *orient* their behavior and their reflexivity. As such, the aforementioned anchoring of reflexivity to each respective derivation is represented by certain corporate agents' *subjective* understandings of the cause. From a critical realist point of view, this cause is *objectively* persistent and, in line with Spinoza, it has never even been separate from its effects. Once the subjective understanding of actors embedded in corporate agency towards a persistent object is institutionalized (objectified), this ensemble of intersubjectivities is effectively anchored against persistent objects. Finally, this feeds into the conditioning of the next cycle.

It follows here that the 'adequacy' of an idea depends not only on what has happened in a previous round of interaction but that it speaks to what must exist at a deeper level, i.e. with respect to certain necessary and internal relations. Furthermore, it refers to the types of properties that these necessary and internal relations have formed, as well as the kinds of tendencies that these properties exhibited when they were triggered and interacting with other structures and agents. It therefore follows that the necessary and internal relations of these properties might have changed in relation to the changing circumstances or interactions, but that the cause behind the property itself must necessarily still be there. Although the assumption may be that the cause is absent, it is not – on the contrary, it will always be present. Namely, if it were not present this property would not have existed in the first place.

In my view, the aforementioned elaboration of the notion of 'adequacy' – that is, my application of Tønder's understanding directly to the morphogenetic model – perfectly encapsulates the Spinozian understanding of immanent causality. Namely, 'what must be there' for the internal relation of a property to be necessary is transcendently immanent. Although this cause is inherently absent, and takes on many different forms throughout the different stages of the morphogenetic cycle, it is necessarily immanent in a transcendental way. The immanent cause – the anchor to which the corporate agents' reflexivities were adequate to – has never been separated from the effect as otherwise the property could never have existed.

5 | IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

In this article, I argued that immanent causality and the morphogenetic approach can mutually benefit from each other. In particular, it is my argument that the central tenet of the morphogenetic approach – analytical dualism – would benefit from a dialogue with the Spinozian doctrine of parallelism in order to take the approach to its natural conclusion. Additionally, it is my contention that the morphogenetic approach is a natural site for the operationalization of the doctrine of parallelism; by referring to the two expressive qualities of ideas, the doctrine of parallelism can be fully explicated in the morphogenetic model. Here is a closer look at the two implications of the intersection of the Spinozian doctrine of parallelism with the morphogenetic approach:

The first implication of the intersection of the morphogenetic approach with the Spinozian doctrine of parallelism is a conceptual one. To begin with, this paper acknowledges that the morphogenetic approach is able to plot a complex interaction between structures, cultures, agency and people. In her recent works, Archer shows how the reflexive subject relates to the manner in which structures and cultures *emerge, intertwine and redefine* one another via the double and triple morphogenesis of agency (Archer, 2012: 52; Archer & Donati, 2015). This

particular way of viewing the morphogenetic model, i.e. through analytical dualism, has its own merits as it shows that the potentiality of certain cultures and structures only conditions/nurtures complex subsequent interactions but does not determine them. Furthermore, the potentiality accrued from the first level posits a kind of emergent causality. This is the case because every single preceding level has bearing on the one that follows it, even though every level remains autonomous. While every level has its antecedents from the level before, it is still independent.

However, if we evoke immanent causality and start looking at the morphogenetic sequence the other way around as well – i.e. from structures and cultures to people via double and triple morphogenesis – it is possible to have a more nuanced and more thoroughly developed understanding of morphogenesis/morphostasis. Immanent causality allows us to understand that the model is about complex interactions of emergent properties across the three levels in relation to structure, culture, agency and people. As we have seen before, and depending on the precise stratified location of property, one can distinguish between different types of properties (i.e. dispositions at level of conditioning, dispositional capabilities at level of interaction and reflexivities at the level of reproduction/elaboration). In other words, it is now possible to plot a complex interaction between different emergent properties throughout the stratification – **within** levels, **between** levels and **across** levels. As such, the model fleshes out stratified emergence by plotting a complex interaction between properties (dispositions), tendencies (dispositional capabilities) and reflexivities. Therefore, instead of limiting the mantra of ‘when is when’ to when morphostasis and morphogenesis occur (Archer, 1995: 308), immanent causality embodies the mantra of ‘when is when’ in relation to the entire cycle. This then allows us to have a more nuanced account of stratified emergence understanding what different emergent properties do and how they interact with each other. At the same time, this should be understood as embodying a deeper, non-Humean type of causality, in the spirit of Critical Realism.

The second implication of my application of immanent causality to the morphogenetic approach refers to the usage of double and triple morphogenesis from the other direction – i.e. beginning with culture and structure, moving to agency and then to people – as well. Namely, within the morphogenetic sequence, Archer goes backwards from the level of elaboration to the interaction level in order to arrive at the level of conditioning (Archer, 2011). Similarly, Prandini (2011) proposes a reading of Bhashkar’s “DREI (C) model” which also implies a backwards methodological movement from the ‘description of behavior’ to ‘identification of generative mechanisms at work.’ While I do not dispute this as an agreeable way to begin research on a methodological level, I also propose a series of subsequent steps to render the research more thorough. Here I refer not only to retrodution and abduction but also to retrodiction: a mechanism which allows us to specify the causality behind different mechanisms (Collier, 1994).

The next steps in our investigation should therefore be to go *back* from the level of interaction to the level of conditioning, and then move from the level of conditioning to the level of elaboration. This should then be completed by a movement from conditioning to elaboration. The way that the doctrine of parallelism helps us in this capacity is first by distinguishing between the second (the level of interaction) and third (the level of elaboration) levels to define the various logics that exist between them. Next, by turning to the *first expressive role of ideas* and the way that corporate agents become aware of the form, we are able to make a methodological leap from level two to level one (the level of conditioning). At this stage, the corporate agents are aware of the form (**but not its content**), while primary agents are not

necessarily even aware of the form. The following step involves the *second expressive role of ideas* and the way that it allows actors embedded in corporate agency not only to be aware of the form, but also about the object that is there, making these internal relations necessary – this is the move from level one to three. This is then completed by a final move from the level of conditioning back to the level of elaboration – a move that is facilitated and defined by the Spinozian understanding of immanent causality. In the spirit of critical realism, the actors' subjective thinking guides us to the relational object of what is being studied.

Finally, we should keep in mind that the specifications of the role of ideas is also able to tell us about the way that interests figure within the morphogenetic model. Kemp (2012), for instance, was correct in arguing that the morphogenetic model has the potential to provide a valuable and interesting account of the concept of interests. Although I do agree with him on this point, I do not share his analysis which provides an understanding of interests as intersubjective constructs. The morphogenetic approach imbued with an understanding of immanent causality would in fact invite us to probe the relation between interests, ideas, dispositions/dispositional capabilities as well as reflexivities.

ENDNOTES

- ¹ Aside from these critiques, numerous other authors have dealt with various implications of Archer's analytical dualism. For instance, Hedström (2005) has tackled the question of emergence and the stratification of social reality, while Farrugia and Woodman (2015) and Decoteau (2016) have dealt with the question of reflexivity in Archer's work.
- ² Elder-Vass distinguishes between 'weak' and 'strong' accounts of emergence. Weak emergent properties are inherently relational since they are based on relations between lower and upper strata; strong emergent properties occur in situations where no clear or explicit relations between strata can be discerned. Within weak (relational) emergence, Elder-Vass distinguishes between temporal and synchronic emergence. While he does not deny the importance of the temporal, his argument focuses exclusively on the synchronic (Elder-Vass, 2010: 13–39).
- ³ Instead of using the terms 'disposition' and 'dispositional capability' to respectively refer to properties and their behavioral manifestations in tendencies, Ellis uses the terms 'dispositional property' and 'disposition' (Ellis, 2002: 76). This difference should be understood as a purely semantic one and to avoid confusion, I will retain the former usage of the terms, whereby 'disposition' refers to genuine properties at the level of conditioning and a 'dispositional capability' is a behavioral manifestation of such a disposition at the level of interaction.
- ⁴ The 'double morphogenesis of agency' refers to the process whereby "agency leads to structural and cultural elaboration, but is itself elaborated in the process" (Archer, 1995: 247). Double morphogenesis should be understood as the beginning of the process of making vested interests in society in such a way that they were "shaped and nurtured via previous rounds of conditioning, and reshaped by virtue of complex structural, cultural and agential interactions" (Knio, 2013: 861). At the double morphogenesis of agency, we can see a shrinkage of primary agents and the emergence of corporate agents, whereby primary agents are "inarticulate in their demands and unorganized for their pursuit," while corporate agents have "emergent powers of promotive organization and articulation of interests (such that they become party to negotiated societal transformations)" (Archer, 1995: 185). The 'triple of morphogenesis of agency' on the other hand occurs at the emergent stratum characterized by the "emergence of *Actors*" whereby "the particular social identities of individual social actors are forged from agential collectivities in relation to the array of organizational roles which are available in society at that specific point in time" (ibid.: 255–6).
- ⁵ The concept of social structure for Archer entails the distinction between Structural Emergent Properties (SEPs) and Cultural Emergent Properties (CEPs). It must be noted that when Archer talks about structures and cultures, she is referring to material and ideational structures respectively. Namely, SEPs refer to material structures and are characterized by necessary and internal material relations par excellence, while CEPs refer to the ideational realm and are characterized by necessary and internal logical relations (Knio, 2013: 858–9). Logical here refers to the laws of identity and contradiction (and is not to be conflated with any notion of rationality). The concept of agency for Archer refers to "the collectivities that share the same life chances" (Archer, 1995: 257) and the "process of grouping and regrouping that denotes these collectivities' positioning *vis-à-vis* the distribution of resources and the division of labour which circumscribes their daily practices" (Knio, 2013: 859). As a result, agency is always the 'agency of something,' and its metamorphosis can be traced through the category of People's Emergent Properties (PEPs) (ibid.: 858).
- ⁶ If we follow this logic, we are able to understand the three remaining situational logics in a similar fashion:

1. Logic of correction

Materially, containment is an emergent dispositional capacity/tendency of the disposition/property of compromise.

Ideationally, unification is an emergent dispositional capacity/tendency of the disposition/property of syncretism.

2. Logic of opportunism

Materially, diversification is an emergent dispositional capacity/tendency of the disposition/property of differentiation.

Ideationally, sectionalism is an emergent dispositional capacity/tendency of the disposition/property of specialization.

3. Logic of elimination

Materially, polarization is an emergent dispositional capacity/tendency of the disposition/property of competition.

Ideationally, cleavage is an emergent dispositional capacity/tendency of the disposition/property of pluralism.

⁷ As can be seen in Table 2, while corporate agents are not the only types of agents populating this level – some primary agents also remain here – they are not necessarily conscious or aware of their surroundings. This is in line with Archer's argument that corporate agents make things happen to other people, while things generally tend to happen to primary agents (Archer, 1995: 264–5)

⁸ Please note that 'possessed unexercised' should not be understood as the same as 'exercised unrealized'; this is best illustrated through an example like water, which may possess the capacity to dissolve salt without that capacity's being exercised (or triggered) or if it is triggered then being unrealized because counteracted somehow.

ORCID

Karim Knio  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6862-052X>

REFERENCES

- Archer, M. (1979). *Social Origins of Educational Systems*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Archer, M. (1995). *Realist Social Theory: The Morphogenetic Approach*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Archer, M. (1996). *Culture and Agency: The Place of Culture in Social Theory (Revised Edition)*. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press.
- Archer, M. (2000). *Being Human: The Problem of Agency*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Archer, M. (2003). *Structure, Agency and the Internal Conversation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Archer, M. (2007). *Making our Way Through the World: Human Reflexivity and Social Mobility*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Archer, M. (2011). Morphogenesis: Realism's explanatory framework. In A. Maccarini, E. Morandi, & R. Prandini (Eds.), *Sociological Realism* (pp. 59–94). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Archer, M. (2012). *The Reflexive Imperative in Late Modernity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Archer, M., & Donati, P. (2015). *The Relational Subject*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Archer, M., & Elder-Vass, D. (2012). Cultural System or norm circles? An exchange. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 15(1), 93–115.
- Bhaskar, R. (2008). *A Realist Theory of Science*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Brown, A. (2002). Developing realistic philosophy: from critical realism to materialist dialectics. In A. Brown, S. Fleetwood, & J. M. Roberts (Eds.), *Critical Realism and Marxism* (pp. 168–186). London and New York: Routledge.
- Collier, A. (1994). *Critical Realism: An Introduction to Roy Bhaskar's Philosophy*. London: Verso.
- Decoteau, C. L. (2016). The reflexive *habitus*: Critical realist and Bourdieusian social action. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 19(3), 303–321.
- Deleuze, G. (1988). *Spinoza: Practical Philosophy*. (R. Hurley, Trans.). San Francisco: City Lights Books. (Original work published 1970)
- Della Rocca, M. (2002). Spinoza's substance monism. In O. Koistinen, & J. Biro (Eds.), *Spinoza: Metaphysical Themes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Diefenbach, K. (2013). Althusser with Deleuze: how to think Spinoza's immanent cause. In K. Diefenbach, S. R. Farris & P. D. Thomas (Eds.), *Encountering Althusser: Politics and Materialism in Contemporary Radical Thought* (pp. 165–184). London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Duffy, S. B. (2009). Spinoza today: The current state of Spinoza scholarship. *Intellectual History Review*, 19(1), 111–132.
- Elder-Vass, D. (2010). *The Causal Power of Social Structures: Emergence, Structure and Agency*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, B. (2002). *The Philosophy of Nature: A Guide to the New Essentialism*. Chesham: Acumen Publishing.
- Farrugia, D., & Woodman, D. (2015). Ultimate concerns in late modernity: Archer, Bourdieu and reflexivity. *British Journal of Sociology*, 66(4), 626–644.
- Hay, C. (2002). *Political Analysis: A Critical Introduction*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hedström, P. (2005). *Dissecting the Social: On the Principles of Analytical Sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kemp, S. (2012). Interests and structure in dualist social theory: A critical appraisal of Archer's theoretical and empirical arguments. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 42(2), 489–510.
- King, A. (1999). Against structure: a critique of morphogenetic social theory. *The Sociological Review*, 47(2), 199–227.
- Knio, K. (2013). Structure, agency and Hezbollah: a morphogenetic view. *Third World Quarterly*, 34(5), 856–872.
- Melamed, Y. Y. (2009). Spinoza's metaphysics of substance: The substance-mode relation as a relation of inherence and predication. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 78(1), 17–82.
- Piironen, T. (2014). For “central conflation”: A critique of Archerian dualism. *Sociological Theory*, 32(2), 79–99.
- Prandini, R. (2011). Transcendental realism and critical naturalism in Roy Bhaskar: The return of ontology in scientific social research. In A. Maccarini, E. Morandi, & R. Prandini (Eds.), *Sociological Realism* (pp. 30–56). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Sawyer, R. K. (2001). Emergence in sociology: Contemporary philosophy of mind and some implications for sociological theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 107(3), 551–585.
- Sayer, A. (2000). *Realism and Social Science*. London: Sage.
- Stones, R. (2001). Refusing the realism-structuration divide. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 4(2), 177–197.
- Tønder, L. (2010). Ideational analysis, political change and immanent causality. In A. Gofas, & C. Hay (Eds.), *The Role of Ideas in Political Analysis: A Portrait of Contemporary Debates* (pp. 56–77). London and New York: Routledge.

How to cite this article: Knio K. The morphogenetic approach and immanent causality: A spinozian perspective. *J Theory Soc Behav*. 2018;1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jtsb.12181>