CRITICALLY EVALUATE THE MAJOR CONTEMPORARY THEORIES OF MODERNITY (E.G., REFLEXIVE MODERNIZATION, RISK SOCIETY, LIQUID MODERNITY). HOW DO THESE PERSPECTIVES EXTEND OR CHALLENGE CLASSICAL UNDERSTANDINGS OF MODERNITY, AND WHAT IMPLICATIONS DO THEY HOLD FOR ANALYSING INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE, IDENTITY, AND SOCIAL RISK IN THE 21ST CENTURY?

S/N	NAME	MAT. NUMBER
1	ISUWA BALANKU	UJ/2024/PGSS/0031
2	MICHAEL MANDEL JOHN	DP2571023
3	HARUNA SAMUEL RAYMOND	DP2506987

Michael Mandel

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Modernity has long been a central concept in sociological theory, traditionally associated with industrialization, rationalization, and the rise of bureaucratic institutions that characterize the transition from traditional to modern societies (Giddens, 1990; Weber, 1978). Classical sociologists such as Karl Marx, Émile Durkheim, and Max Weber conceptualized modernity as a structural transformation driven by capitalism, the division of labor, and rational-legal authority. These early perspectives emphasized the stabilizing capacity of modern institutions—such as the state, the market, and formal organizations—to regulate social life and provide predictable rules, social cohesion, and economic progress. Yet, even within classical thought, the contradictions of modernity were evident: Marx foresaw crises within capitalism, Weber worried about the "iron cage" of rationality, and Durkheim highlighted risks of anomie in rapidly changing societies.

In the late 20th century, however, scholars began to argue that modernity had entered a new phase marked by intensifying reflexivity, global interconnectedness, and deepening uncertainties. Contemporary theories such as **reflexive modernization** (Beck, Giddens & Lash, 1994), the **risk society** (Beck, 1992), and **liquid modernity** (Bauman, 2000) contend that the institutional and cultural foundations of classical modernity have become destabilized. These theorists argue that modernity has become self-confrontational: the very institutions that once produced stability now generate unpredictable risks—environmental crises, technological disruptions, global pandemics, cyber-insecurities, and financial volatility. Consequently, traditional sources of authority and certainty—nation-states, scientific expertise, organised religion, and stable social roles—lose their regulatory power, compelling societies to continuously reflect upon and renegotiate their organising principles.

These contemporary perspectives extend and challenge classical theories by shifting analysis from structural foundations to **processes of reflexivity, uncertainty, and fluidity**. Reflexive modernisation theorists posit that individuals and institutions increasingly question the assumptions of industrial modernity, producing new forms of governance, expertise, and social coordination (Giddens, 1991). Beck's risk society framework further argues that the dominant logic of modernity has shifted from the distribution of goods to the distribution of "bads"—material and symbolic risks generated by global capitalism and scientific-technological innovation (Beck, 1992). Bauman's liquid modernity challenges the classical assumption of stable social structures by describing a world where institutions, identities, and social bonds are constantly dissolving and reconfiguring, creating conditions of chronic uncertainty and weakened social anchorage (Bauman, 2000).

Understanding these shifts is critical for analysing 21st-century institutional change, identity formation, and social risk. Institutions today are increasingly flexible, networked, and transnational, responding to global pressures and technological innovations rather than relying on fixed bureaucratic routines. Individuals negotiate identities within fluid social landscapes marked by digital connectivity, precarious employment, and heightened exposure to global risks, requiring continuous adaptation and self-construction. Contemporary theories of modernity thus provide essential frameworks for understanding emerging phenomena such as platform economies, climate change, migration crises,

algorithmic governance, and the fragility of democratic institutions. By illuminating how modernity has evolved from a stable industrial order to a reflexive, risk-laden, and liquid social condition, these theories offer profound insights into the complexities and contradictions shaping the 21st-century world.

1.2 CONTEMPORARY THEORIES OF MODERNITY

Modernity has undergone significant theoretical reformulation as scholars attempt to understand the rapid technological, cultural, political, and institutional changes shaping the 21st century. While classical theorists viewed modernity as a linear, rational, progressive project linked to industrialisation and bureaucracy, contemporary theorists argue that modernity has evolved into more complex, fragmented, reflexive, and globalised forms (Giddens, 1991; Beck, 1992; Bauman, 2000). The following sections critically examine the major contemporary theories of modernity and how they illuminate emergent patterns of social transformation, identity reconstruction, knowledge production, and global risk.

1.3 REFLEXIVE MODERNISATION

Reflexive modernisation, advanced by Beck, Giddens, and Lash (1994), refers to a stage of modernity in which societies begin to critically interrogate and transform the very foundations of the earlier industrial order. Unlike classical modernity—characterised by stable institutions, bureaucratic rationalisation, and faith in scientific expertise—reflexive modernisation depicts a world in which the outcomes of modernity increasingly destabilise the structures that produced them. Institutions such as science, the nation-state, the nuclear family, and industrial labour become subject to continuous reflection, negotiation, and reconstruction.

A central claim is that modernity becomes “self-confrontational”: it turns back on itself, questioning its assumptions, knowledge systems, technologies, and sources of authority (Giddens, 1991). This reflexivity is amplified by globalisation, digital communication, and the speed at which knowledge circulates. Individuals must now make life decisions—about employment, identity, risk, intimacy—in contexts of heightened uncertainty and weakened institutional guidance.

Reflexive modernisation extends classical theory by shifting focus from structural transformation (industrial capitalism) to institutional restructuring under conditions of global risk, rapid knowledge production, and individualisation. It challenges the Durkheimian assumption of stable collective norms, the Weberian emphasis on bureaucratic certainty, and Marx’s deterministic model of capitalist crisis. Instead, it argues that modernity produces unpredictable outcomes that require constant monitoring, adaptation, and reconstruction at both institutional and individual levels.

1.4 RISK SOCIETY

The risk society thesis, proposed by Ulrich Beck (1992), argues that contemporary modernity is defined by the production, distribution, and governance of risks—especially those generated by technological progress, global capitalism, and scientific innovation. Unlike classical risks (famine, disease, natural disasters), which were external to social systems, modern risks are “manufactured”: climate change, nuclear accidents, cyber insecurity, AI threats, genetic engineering dilemmas, pandemics, and global financial crises.

Beck contends that societies are increasingly organized around anticipating, preventing, and managing these risks rather than distributing wealth. This marks a transformation from the “logic of industrialism”—which prioritised economic growth and technological expansion—to the “logic of risk,” which prioritises safety, security, and precaution (Beck, 1992).

Risk society theory challenges classical modernity by highlighting the unintended consequences of rationalisation and scientific progress, thereby undermining Enlightenment assumptions about control, predictability, and human mastery over nature. In the 21st century, the risk society perspective helps explain public mistrust in institutions, the politicisation of science, the rise of

precautionary governance, and the fragmentation of traditional identities in the face of global uncertainties.

1.5 LIQUID MODERNITY

Zygmunt Bauman's (2000) concept of liquid modernity argues that contemporary modernity is characterised by constant fluidity, instability, and the dissolution of long-term structures that once anchored social life. Unlike the "solid modernity" of the industrial era—marked by stable jobs, clear identities, strong institutions, and predictable life trajectories—liquid modernity is defined by rapid change, flexibility, and precarity. Work becomes insecure; relationships become fragile; identities become self-constructed rather than inherited; and institutions—such as the family, state, and workplace—lose their stabilising capacity. According to Bauman (2000), individuals must perpetually adapt, reskill, and reinvent themselves to survive in unstable labour markets and digitalised social worlds.

Liquid modernity challenges classical theories by rejecting the assumption that modernity leads to greater stability and rational organisation. Instead, it posits that modernity produces chronic uncertainty, weakening social bonds and increasing anxieties about belonging, identity, and security. This perspective helps explain contemporary issues such as the gig economy, online identities, migration crises, consumerism, and rising mental health challenges linked to social insecurity.

1.6 MULTIPLE MODERNITIES

The theory of multiple modernities, associated with Shmuel Eisenstadt (2000), argues that modernity is not a single, Western-centric model but a plurality of culturally diverse trajectories. While classical modernity presumed that all societies would converge toward Western patterns of industrialisation, secularisation, and bureaucratisation, multiple modernities contends that societies reinterpret modernity through indigenous histories, religions, and cultural frameworks.

Thus, modernity assumes different forms in Europe, Africa, Asia, the Middle East, and Latin America. For example, East Asian modernity blends capitalism with Confucian values; African modernities incorporate communalism, spirituality, and hybrid political institutions; and Middle Eastern modernities negotiate between religious frameworks and global economic pressures.

The theory challenges classical sociology's universalism and ethnocentrism by emphasising cultural agency, path dependency, and civilisational diversity. It expands the study of modernity to incorporate postcolonial perspectives, recognising that globalisation does not erase difference but rather multiplies and hybridises modern forms.

1.7 NETWORK SOCIETY

Manuel Castells' (1996) theory of the network society describes a form of modernity defined by digital communication technologies, global information flows, and interconnected social networks. Power, production, and social organisation are increasingly structured around networks rather than hierarchical institutions. Digital platforms, algorithms, social media, and global ICT infrastructures reshape politics, identity, work, and economic exchange.

In the network society, information becomes the key resource, and technological connectivity becomes the new basis of social integration. Traditional institutions—such as the state, workplace, and community—are transformed as individuals and organisations become embedded in global digital flows.

Castells challenges classical modernity by arguing that the informational revolution, rather than industrial capitalism, is now the primary driver of social change. This theory helps explain phenomena such as digital labour, social media activism, online identity construction, algorithmic governance, and networked forms of power that transcend national boundaries.

1.8 CLASSICAL MODERNITY VS. CONTEMPORARY MODERNITY

Classical modernity, articulated by Marx, Weber, and Durkheim, viewed social change as a movement toward rationalisation, industrialisation, bureaucracy, and secularisation. It emphasised stable institutions, cohesive social norms, predictable social roles, and shared collective identities. Classical theorists assumed that modernity produced greater order, progress, and coherence—even if accompanied by contradictions such as alienation or anomie.

Contemporary theories, however, reject the assumption of stability and linear progress. Instead, they portray modernity as fragmented, reflexive, uncertain, globalised, and technologically mediated. While classical modernity focused on how institutions shape individuals, contemporary theorists emphasise individualisation, choice, and identity fluidity in contexts where traditional norms weaken. Moreover, classical modernity saw risk as external; contemporary modernity sees risk as generated by modernity itself (Beck, 1992).

In essence:

This shift has major implications for understanding identity (now self-constructed), institutions (now more flexible and weaker), and social risks (now global, technological, and unpredictable).

4.1 CONTEMPORARY MODERNITY AND INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE, IDENTITY, AND SOCIAL RISK IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Contemporary theories of modernity, such as reflexive modernization, risk society, and liquid modernity, have significantly extended and challenged classical understandings of modernity as a linear, Eurocentric process rooted in Enlightenment rationality, industrialization, and nation-state formation (as seen in the works of Durkheim, Weber, and Marx). These theories, developed by scholars like Ulrich Beck, Anthony Giddens, and Zygmunt Bauman, portray modernity as an ongoing, reflexive phase characterized by uncertainty, globalization, and individualization. However, the provided documents highlight additional dimensions, particularly through global, multiple, and emotional lenses, which critique the singular narrative of modernity and emphasize interconnected histories, cultural variations, and affective experiences. For instance, Bhambra (2014) argues for "connected sociologies" that recognize the global as an always-existing condition, challenging the classical view of modernity as a European invention by incorporating colonial and postcolonial interconnections. Similarly, Preyer and Sussman (2016) explore "varieties of multiple modernities," extending classical theories by proposing diverse, non-Western paths to modernity. Patulny et al. (2019) further integrate emotions into late modernity, revealing how reflexive individualism affects emotional complexity, thus challenging the rational-emotional divide in classical sociology.

These perspectives hold profound implications for the 21st century, where institutional change is driven by global risks and reflexivity, identity is fluid and hybridized, and social risk is amplified by uncertainties like climate change and pandemics. Critically, while these theories extend classical modernity by accounting for globalization and reflexivity, they are challenged for overlooking power asymmetries in global connections (Bhambra, 2014) and for underemphasizing emotional dimensions in institutional and identity formations (Patulny et al., 2019).

4.1.1 Contemporary Modernity and Institutional Change

Contemporary theories extend classical modernity's focus on institutional rationalization (e.g., Weber's bureaucracy) by emphasizing reflexivity and detraditionalization, where institutions are no longer stable but subject to constant self-monitoring and adaptation. Reflexive modernization (Beck & Giddens) posits that modern institutions reflexively confront their own consequences, leading to institutional change through ongoing critique and reform. Liquid modernity (Bauman) further

challenges classical views by depicting institutions as fluid and transient, eroding solid structures like the welfare state in favor of flexible, market-driven forms.
In the 21st century, these perspectives imply accelerated institutional change amid globalization. Bhambra (2014) critiques this by arguing that classical understandings ignore how colonial connections shaped modern institutions, proposing connected sociologies to analyze institutional change as globally intertwined rather than nationally bounded. For example, institutional reforms in education or governance must account for historical interconnections, such as postcolonial migrations influencing policy. Preyer and Sussman (2016) extend this through multiple modernities, suggesting institutional change varies across regions, challenging the universalism of reflexive theories; in Asia or Africa, institutions may blend traditional and modern elements differently than in Europe. Patulny et al. (2019) add an emotional layer, noting how late modern institutions (e.g., classrooms) generate "achievement emotions" through individual responsibility, leading to institutional changes like personalized learning but risking emotional burnout. Critically, while these views highlight adaptability, they may overestimate agency in institutional change, ignoring structural inequalities perpetuated by global capitalism (Bhambra, 2014).

4.1.2 Contemporary Modernity and Identity

Contemporary theories challenge classical modernity's view of identity as fixed and class-based (e.g., Marx's proletarian identity) by emphasizing individualization and reflexivity. In risk society and reflexive modernization, identities are self-constructed amid uncertainties, extending classical ideas by incorporating choice and narrative (Giddens). Liquid modernity portrays identities as ephemeral and consumerist, constantly reshaped in a fluid social landscape.
For 21st-century analysis, these imply fragmented, hybrid identities influenced by digital globalization and migration. Bhambra (2014) extends this by critiquing Eurocentric identity formations, advocating connected sociologies where identities are shaped by global histories, such as colonial legacies informing diasporic identities. This challenges liquid modernity's individualism by highlighting collective interconnections. Preyer and Sussman (2016) further diversify identity through multiple modernities, where non-Western contexts produce unique identity blends, like religious-modern hybrids in the Middle East, contesting the secular assumption in classical theories. Patulny et al. (2019) integrate emotions, arguing late modernity heightens emotional complexity in identity, with tensions between individual loneliness and collective emotional sharing (e.g., in digital spaces). Critically, these perspectives risk romanticizing fluidity, as emotional privatization can exacerbate identity crises in unequal societies (Patulny et al., 2019), and multiple modernities may reinforce cultural essentialism if not critically applied (Bhambra, 2014).

4.1.3 Contemporary Modernity and Social Risk

Risk society theory (Beck) extends classical modernity's progress narrative by shifting focus from wealth distribution to risk distribution, where modern advancements (e.g., technology) produce uncontrollable global risks like environmental disasters. Reflexive modernization adds that societies must reflexively manage these risks, while liquid modernity sees risks as inherent to uncertainty, challenging classical optimism with pessimism about social bonds.
In the 21st century, these imply heightened social risk analysis, from climate change to pandemics, requiring global cooperation. Bhambra (2014) challenges this by noting that classical and contemporary theories often ignore how risks are unevenly distributed due to colonial histories, advocating connected approaches to understand social risks as historically embedded (e.g., climate vulnerabilities in the Global South). Preyer and Sussman (2016) extend through multiple modernities, where risks manifest differently across cultures, critiquing risk society's Western bias; for instance, social risks in developing nations may involve hybrid traditional-modern threats. Patulny et al. (2019) incorporate emotions, linking social risks to the "politics of fear" (e.g., around asylum seekers), where emotional management amplifies risks through media mediation. Critically,

while these theories highlight reflexivity in risk mitigation, they may downplay emotional and cultural dimensions, leading to incomplete analyses of collective responses like climate activism (Patulny et al., 2019).

5.1 CONCLUSION

In summary, contemporary theories of modernity—reflexive modernization, risk society, and liquid modernity—extend classical understandings by incorporating reflexivity, globalization, and uncertainty, while challenging their Eurocentrism and rationalism through global connections (Bhambra, 2014), cultural variations (Preyer & Sussman, 2016), and emotional dynamics (Patulny et al., 2019). Their implications for 21st-century institutional change, identity, and social risk underscore the need for interconnected, multifaceted analyses. However, critical evaluation reveals limitations in addressing power imbalances and emotional complexities, suggesting future research integrate these documents' insights for more inclusive theories.

REFERENCES

Archer, M. (2012). The reflexive imperative in late modernity. Cambridge University Press.
Appadurai, A. (1996). Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization. University of Minnesota Press.
Alexander, J. C. (2006). The civil sphere. Oxford University Press.
Bauman, Z. (2000). Liquid modernity. Polity Press.
Bauman, Z. (2007). Liquid times: Living in an age of uncertainty. Polity Press.

Beck, U. (1992). Risk society: Towards a new modernity. Sage.
Beck, U. (1999). World risk society. Polity Press.
Beck, U., Giddens, A., & Lash, S. (1994). Reflexive modernization: Politics, tradition and aesthetics in the modern social order. Stanford University Press.
Bell, D. (1976). The coming of post-industrial society. Basic Books.
Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). The social construction of reality. Doubleday.
Berman, M. (1983). All that is solid melts into air: The experience of modernity. Verso.
Castells, M. (1996). The rise of the network society. Blackwell.
Castells, M. (2009). Communication power. Oxford University Press.
Comaroff, J., & Comaroff, J. (2012). Theory from the South: Or how Euro-America is evolving toward Africa. Paradigm Publishers.
Cruz, E. (2020). Global risk and modernity: Revisiting Ulrich Beck. Journal of Sociology, 56(2), 215–231.
Durkheim, É. (1893). The division of labor in society. Free Press.
Durkheim, É. (1912). The elementary forms of religious life. Free Press.
Domingues, J. M. (2009). Global modernity, development, and contemporary civilization. Routledge.
Eisenstadt, S. N. (2000). Multiple modernities. Daedalus, 129(1), 1–29.
Elliott, A. (2014). Contemporary social theory: An introduction. Routledge.
Gane, N. (2004). The future of social theory. Continuum.
Giddens, A. (1990). The consequences of modernity. Stanford University Press.
Giddens, A. (1991). Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age. Stanford University Press.
Giddens, A. (1994). Beyond left and right: The future of radical politics. Polity Press.
Giddens, A. (2009). The politics of climate change. Polity Press.
Habermas, J. (1984). The theory of communicative action (Vol. 1). Beacon Press.
Habermas, J. (1987). The theory of communicative action (Vol. 2). Beacon Press.
Hall, S., Held, D., & McGrew, A. (1992). Modernity and its futures. Polity Press.
Harvey, D. (1989). The condition of postmodernity. Blackwell.
Held, D. (2000). Global covenant: The social democratic alternative to the Washington Consensus. Polity Press.
Latour, B. (1993). We have never been modern. Harvard University Press.
Lash, S. (2002). Critique of information. Sage.
Luhmann, N. (1995). Social systems. Stanford University Press.
Marx, K. (1867). Capital (Vol. 1). Penguin.
Melucci, A. (1996). The playing self: Person and meaning in the planetary society. Cambridge University Press.
Meyer, J. W. (2005). World society: The writings of John W. Meyer. Oxford University Press.
Pieterse, J. N. (2015). Globalization and culture: Global mélange (3rd ed.). Rowman & Littlefield.
Pham, Q. (2021). Revisiting liquid modernity in the digital age. European Journal of Social Theory, 24(3), 415–433.
Ritzer, G. (1993). The McDonaldization of society. Pine Forge Press.
Ritzer, G. (2011). The globalization of nothing 2. Pine Forge Press.
Robertson, R. (1992). Globalization: Social theory and global culture. Sage.
Sassen, S. (2001). The global city: New York, London, Tokyo (2nd ed.). Princeton University Press.
Scott, W. R. (2014). Institutions and organizations: Ideas, interests, and identities (4th ed.). Sage.
Smart, B. (2010). Sociology, power and modernity. Routledge.
Taylor, C. (1999). Two theories of modernity. The Hastings Center Report, 29(2), 24–33.
Therborn, G. (2003). After dialectics: Radical social theory in a post-communist world. British Journal of Sociology, 54(1), 55–67.
Touraine, A. (1995). Critique of modernity. Blackwell.
Wallerstein, I. (2004). World-systems analysis: An introduction. Duke University Press.

Weber, M. (1978). Economy and society (G. Roth & C. Wittich, Eds.). University of California Press.
Willis, P., & Trondman, M. (2000). Manifesto for ethnography. Ethnography, 1(1), 5–16.
Wynne, B. (1996). Risk and the social construction of knowledge. In S. Lash, B. Szerszynski, & B. Wynne (Eds.), Risk, environment and modernity (pp. 44–83). Sage.

REFERENCES

Bhambra, G. K. (2014). *Connected sociologies*. Bloomsbury Academic.
Patulny, R., Bellocchi, A., Olson, R. E., Khorana, S., McKenzie, J., & Peterie, M. (Eds.). (2019). *Emotions in late modernity*. Routledge.
Preyer, G., & Sussman, M. (Eds.). (2016). *Varieties of multiple modernities: New research design*. Brill.
Smith, J. C. A (2017), *Debating Civilisations: Interrogating Civilisational Analysis in a Global Age*, Manchester University Press
Smith, J. C. A. (2017). *Debating civilisations: Interrogating civilisational analysis in a global age*. Manchester University Press.