

Culture

Section of the American Sociological Association

Volume 10, No. 1 (Fall 1995)

From the Outgoing Chair
Ferments in the Field
Michèle Lamont, Princeton

It has been a good year. The most memorable part was undoubtedly the meeting at George Mason University that brought together cultural sociologists interested in meaning and measurement and symbolic boundaries. All those present witnessed the extraordinary energy and enthusiasm that came out of our working sessions. This same energy was present in the short organizational meetings that were held by research networks during the ASA meetings in Washington. Between 20 and 40 people attended each of these organizational meetings and manifested their interest in pursuing discussions over email or through other media during the academic year. This provides evidence that the members of the section are very active and very eager to participate in building a field that is vibrant and inclusive. The Culture Section is the second youngest section of the ASA—that is, one of the sections that contains the largest proportion of students. This bodes very well for our future.

Let me reconstruct briefly what happened between August 17 and August 19, 1995. On August 17th and 18th, the Program in Cultural Studies of George Mason University hosted a meeting of the network on Meaning and Measure-
(continued on page 2)

From the Incoming Chair
Fruits from the Field
Ann Swidler, UC-Berkeley

The Culture Session sessions at the ASA and the Meaning and Measurement Mini-Conference hosted by George Mason University really were exhilarating. The reason, I think, is that we are seeing increasing substance to our questions and the beginning of cumulative progress in our answers.

What a difference from even five years ago! Then, I confess, I used to feel that the "Sociology of Culture" was getting too popular too fast. We had a tremendous number of idiosyncratic, exciting pieces of work, but if one sat down to ask "Where are the central unanswered questions? What kind of work would make the greatest contribution to the field? Where are our central empirical and theoretical disagreements?" one would be hard pressed to say.

Let me give a few highlights from the recent meetings to illustrate my point. First, in preparation for the Meaning and Measurement Mini-Conference, more than a dozen participants prepared preliminary think pieces. Pete Peterson, Paul DiMaggio, and Steve Hart each wrote short essays on the difficulties in measuring cultural "stuff," Peterson focusing on measuring arts participation (both objects "consumed" and practices); DiMaggio focussing on "identities"; and Hart
(continued on page 2)

Models of Museums, Models of Art

Victoria D. Alexander, Harvard University

What is a museum? This is not a simple question. Is it a place where the best of the past is studied and preserved? This is a common definition, but behind it are many hidden questions. Why preserve cultural or historical artifacts at all? In most museums, this question would be met with blank stares. It's simply a good thing to preserve the past, why would you need to explain it? It's akin to asking business people why they make a profit. Leaving this aside, we may ask who decides what to preserve. People in museums know the answer. These decisions are made by experts called curators. They get to decide because they are scholars who study the subject matter at hand. Of course, this answer leaves aside real-life complexities and the extent to which other people make these decisions, as when lady bountiful donates her private collection. More importantly, it ignores what happens when curators' decisions don't mesh with societal trends. For instance, it is not uncommon to hear that muse-

ums honor the accomplishments of dead white men. So, are museums places where hegemonic control is crystallized and domination legitimized? If so, then are curators part of a privileged elite? On the other hand, museums can be sites for resistance when curators are more sensitive to the currents of identity politics than is the mainstream. Also, how should objects in the collection be used? For study or for display? What mix should there be of permanent and temporary exhibitions? And indeed, must a museum have a permanent collection to be a museum? Can't it be a museum on the strength of exhibits alone?

We might want to know how museums relate to their visitors. Are museums places where people go to learn, or where they *should* go to learn? Thus, are curators teachers as well as scholars? Or are museums places where people may be diverted from everyday cares, places to get out of the rain

(continued on page 3)

Elsewhere in this issue . . . Books of Note, p. 7 • Call—1996 Culture Sessions, back cover • Thesis Descriptions, p. 9 • Network and Section News, p. 10 • From the Editor, p. 11 • New Section Leaders, back cover • Business Meeting, p. 9

ment which was started by Ann Swidler at the last ASA meeting. This network includes a 30-person subgroup on Symbolic Boundaries that Ann had asked me to organize. The GMU workshop was the occasion to discuss research agenda in various areas. The Meaning and Measurement group divided into various subgroups that dealt with issues of identity, meaning structures, measurement, and individualism. The Symbolic Boundaries subgroup dealt with change in boundaries and multiple boundaries, cognitive and institutional structure, and the boundary between the public and the private. These groups came together at various points to put in common results from our discussions. Graduate students and faculty members from over 20 departments had the opportunity to learn more about what others are working on, and to explore similarities and differences across research projects and findings. This event was organized over email and did not cost a penny beyond lodging and food.

However, Bethany Bryson (Princeton), David Yamane (UW-Madison) and Mark Jacobs (GMU) played a crucial role in managing the flow of electronic information and in setting up facilities. There is a possibility that the New School for Social Research will host a similar event next August before the ASA, and that the Department of Sociology at UC-Santa Barbara will organize a conference on related themes next winter.

And on the 19th . . . This was Culture Day in Washington. Our business meeting attracted a crowd of 150+ people, a level of voluntary participation rarely witnessed in ASA sections. The famous culture party was very well attended despite not being held in the main convention hotel. The intellectual feast that Ann Swidler had prepared for us was followed by an organizational meeting for the various research networks that are now forming a very powerful basis of interaction within the section. A few networks were meeting for the first time. It was notably the case of the Culture and History network, the Culture and Gender network, and the Political Culture network, which all attracted big crowds. These networks are planning various activities, including common discussions of recently published articles over email, conferences, exchange of papers and syllabi, organization of sessions at the ASA, jointly with other sections. Networks that started their activities in the past year also met (e.g., the Culture and Religion network). Other networks, notably the Race and Culture network and the network on Science, Knowledge, and Culture, are still in the process of planning activities for next year (see this issue for specific information concerning network activities).

Chairing the section showed me that I am part of a rich and highly interactive intellectual community. It also confirmed what I knew already: that sociology is not in a state of crisis (at least not cultural sociology). Furthermore, the spirit of collaboration I found in the section—among the chairs and members of the various committees and the organizers of networks—and in working with Ann Swidler, Karen Cerulo, and Steve Hart is exemplary, and I want to thank all of them for helping me in various ways. □

concentrating on American public discourse (what we used to refer to as “attitudes, beliefs, and values”). The intellectual convergence in these three independent efforts was remarkable. All three suggested that better measurement depends on a richer, more precise analysis of “contexts.”

Contexts

What Pete Peterson suggests, for example, is that you can't know what going to the opera means to someone unless you know whether she goes with an old friend to remind herself of her upper-class upbringing, whether she goes with her elderly mother to express filial loyalty, or whether she attends the same kinds of event in different modes, sometimes alone for pure love of the music and sometimes with business clients to impress them. Thus the same musical objects may “mean” different things when consumed in different contexts, and what look like very different cultural practices may be nearly interchangeable when they are enjoyed in the same context. Steve Hart makes an almost identical point about the measurement of beliefs, attitudes, and values. He argues that standard surveys usually measure attitudes in “an atomized and ‘theoretical’ context.” He points out that “we need to get not only at explicit ideological structures, but also at the contexts in which Americans encounter cultural codes, the codes they encounter, how they appropriate them, and how these enter into their capacity to think and talk about public issues.” Steve suggests that survey questions may need to ask people not about what they think or believe in general, but about specific conversations they had at work, at home, or with friends in which they invoked particular cultural codes. Perhaps, he suggests, we may also need systematic ways of sampling naturally occurring conversations so that we get at the group contexts, from family, to workplace, to voluntary association, where people actually encounter and use cultural codes. One way to get at contexts would be to use vignettes to elicit socially-located cultural codes. Angela Aidala and Steve Hart have both experimented with vignettes that create a more “holistic,” grounded, contextual story or picture to locate what people are responding to. The aspiration of such work would then be systematically to vary particular elements of the vignette, to see what elements of the whole story were eliciting particular kinds of responses.

Paul DiMaggio again suggested attention to contexts in his discussion of ways of measuring “identities.” Among other useful notions, he suggested that the identities people express are probably evoked in particular contexts: “[if] most people (in complex societies) have repertoires of identities and . . . these repertoires are evoked in role relationships . . . then we need instruments that enable us both to compile a repertoire of identities available to respondents and to identify the situations that evoke the identities.” DiMaggio's memo also suggests that there are many different kinds of identities (or perhaps several different things we designate by the term identity). He suggests distinguishing (at least) “core identities” that are constant across situations; “strategic identities” that are “assumed for goal-oriented action”; “ludic identities” as-

sumed for play and sociability; and "imposed identities" that others impose. In principle, then, identity isn't unique and isn't something a person or group simply "has." Rather, identity would be studied at least in part by studying the contexts that evoke, make salient, or bring to the fore different kinds of identities.

The convergence of these three memos' stress on contexts is what I mean by progress and cumulation in the field. We can now see, from a variety of perspectives, what has been wrong with traditional measurement approaches that isolate variables from their contexts when applied to cultural materials. And it suggests that at least one of the challenges to current research is to begin explicitly to search for system-

atic ways of analyzing or categorizing contexts that determine the "meaning" of particular items of culture. Perhaps for arts consumption, attitudes and beliefs, and identities the relevant kinds of contexts are different, so maybe we should start there. But at least we are developing a more focussed sense of where the challenges lie.

There were many other exciting intellectual developments at the meetings, some of which Michèle Lamont has already described. I hope in future issues more of these will make it into the Newsletter's pages. What I feel away from the meetings is that we are thriving not only organizationally and socially but intellectually. There are many frontiers and a great deal of ferment, but that movement is definitely forward motion. □



Innumerable but not innumerate culturalists ponder meaning & measurement, symbolic boundaries at GMU, August 1995

Alexander on Museums

(continued from page 1)

on a Saturday afternoon? If so, this may make curators entertainers. And just what people are we talking about? Ideally, should everybody go to museums? Or just those people who have a deep interest in the subject matter? Or perhaps those who might have a shallow interest but who carry the price of admission in their pocket? We might also want to know how museums relate to their supporters. Should museums accept all donations of objects and funds? Or should they accept only certain types or from certain donors? And, to complicate matters more—and to bring us closer to the subject at hand—let us ask, what is an *art* museum? Well, it is a museum (whatever that is) of art. Which begs the question, what is art?

I have listed these questions because they are at the heart of fierce debates that have taken place in art museums over the past several decades and that are still sharply contested today. In this essay, I draw on my study of art museums (Al-

exander, in press a, b, c) to argue that changes in museum funding intensified these debates and to show that the debates are deeply rooted in cultural understandings. These findings may also give us some insight into what is happening in the arts now.

My study of art museums started with the question of how funding, from 1960 to 1986, affected the exhibitions mounted by museums. There was a major shift in funding patterns of museums (indeed, in all arts organizations) during this period. Institutional funders came to dominate exhibition support, reducing the influence of individual philanthropists.

When I started this project in the late 1980s, I made some straightforward assumptions. Funders have goals and these goals shape their giving patterns. There are notable differences between individual philanthropists and institutional funders. Individuals have (or at least had in the past) relatively stable, long-term relationships with the museums they support (they act as the museum's philanthropists), whereas corporations, government agencies, and foundations under-

(continued on page 4)

write specific projects or activities (they serve as the museum's funders). More important is the difference in focus. Institutional funders are especially interested in audiences. To oversimplify, government agencies stress wide public enjoyment and corporations are interested in public relations, while traditional patrons usually do not have goals that include audiences. I reasoned that the change in funding might have led to a change in exhibitions as new institutional funders pressed for different outcomes than had the philanthropists of the past.

People in museums have goals, too. Consequently, I expected that museums might try to resist or avoid these funder pressures. I figured that museums would be especially worried about funder desires that, if met, would challenge the museum's legitimacy. Museums, in other words, would be willing to forgo money when funders' demands were problematic—requests for shows of pabulum that pandered to the masses, for instance. (But, as some curators darkly hinted, the decision might go the other way, with museums selling out their integrity and prestige to Mammon.)

These are resource-dependency effects (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). Resource dependency suggests that those who control crucial resources can coerce an organization to meet their demands. Or, to put it differently, these are production of culture effects (Peterson, 1976; Becker, 1982). I wanted to see how the organizational arrangement of museums shaped their output (exhibitions). But what I found was richer, suggesting that it is necessary to understand culture (how people organize and understand the world) in order to understand both the arts and organizations.

There were some resource-dependency effects, but changes did not occur in individual exhibitions; rather, they occurred at a higher level, in the exhibition pool. Funders normally do not force museums to change single exhibitions. Nor do they press for explicit changes in exhibition policy. Rather, funders sponsor more of the exhibitions that suit their goals, thereby changing the overall mix of exhibitions. To put it differently, funders have an implicit portfolio of exhibitions they wish to fund, and museums have a portfolio of exhibitions they would like to mount. More exhibitions happen where these overlap.

Museum managers use a variety of strategies to maintain their autonomy and to avoid funder pressures. They creatively manipulate their environment and cleverly reshape the demands of funders. They are actors, not reactors. Nevertheless, there has been a broadening effect on exhibitions as institutional funders sponsor exhibitions that appeal to large audiences. Blockbusters, traveling exhibitions, and theme shows have notably increased as a proportion of the total shows.

Moreover, there have been profoundly cultural shifts within museums as changes in funding set in motion events that brought new views into museums, views that were at odds with traditional museum values. Institutional funders require more accountability from museums than individual philanthropists. This means that museums needed to hire more personnel (administrators, record keepers, and contact people) with specialties outside of art history (Peterson, 1986).

Successful museum efforts to tap external funding sources committed them to more expansive (and expensive) programs, ratcheting up their desire and need for additional funds. As a result, they established development departments and hired fundraisers. As museum programs grew, so too did the need for support personnel (secretaries, guards), managers, public relations agents, and a variety of other non-arts specialists. These factors, among others, increased the number and power of people in the administrative side of museums and encouraged business-world thinking. Museum missions broadened, as museums focused more on exhibitions, audiences, educational programs, public outreach, professional management, internal profit centers, and external fundraising than they had in the past. Traditional concerns—collecting, conserving and cataloging—while hardly ignored, made up a smaller proportion of museum activities.

These changes in exhibitions and missions did not please curators and led to increased conflict within museums. Curators clashed with their directors, feeling that the museum's integrity was threatened. A tension has long existed in museums between administrators and curators (Zolberg, 1986, 1981), but the tension was heightened by changes, induced by new funding patterns, that legitimated business logic and gave new power to administrative personnel.

Becker (1982: 135) argues that the vehemence with which aesthetic choices are argued "exists because what is being decided is not only an abstract philosophical question but also some allocation of valuable resources." The conflict between curators and administrators, however, is not merely a conflict over organizational resources. Rather, curators and administrators hold different beliefs about what a museum is, how it should operate, and how it should relate to the public. Curators view museums as places for quiet, serious scholarship and aesthetic pleasure. Acquisitions to the collection are of primary importance alongside conserving those pieces already owned by the museum. Museums should spend money on research leading to scholarly catalogues. Museum visitors should respect the dignity of the art on the walls. Preferably, these people will already know a great deal about art and will come to gaze upon the same objects again and again. The perfect way to display art is on a plain wall with only a small plaque containing identifying information. The room should be devoid of all didactic information since the extra words take away from the direct interaction between viewer and artwork.

Directors articulate a different vision: a place of lively activity, with special exhibits designed to draw in varied audiences and occasionally even crowds. Didactic information, such as wall essays on historical context, is seen as a way of attracting a variety of visitors, including those with little background in art. Funding is extraordinarily important in maintaining this brisk level of activity. Directors do not disparage traditional concerns; however, given the emphasis on additional functions, the traditional concerns are no longer first priority.

The "normative visions"¹ of museum workers are deeply-held beliefs about museum integrity that come from their background and professional training. Curators and directors draw on different normative visions of museums. More-

over, the models of museums each party holds are situated in a different institutional logic. Institutional logics are systems of institutionalized beliefs; "both supraorganizational patterns of activity through which humans conduct their material life in time and space, and symbolic systems through which they categorize that activity and infuse it with meaning" (Friedland and Alford 1991: 232). In museums, the new visions empowered by shifts in the environment draw upon a business logic, one geared toward managing an organization with the bottom line indicating success. The older, curatorial vision draws upon a professional, scholarly logic, analogous to the vision of professors in universities. In the scholarly vision, professionals should be free to pursue truth and beauty and to perform their jobs as they know best, without interference.

Today, museums are bigger and more lively than before. There are more curators and they have more work to do. In the past, curators had a great deal of power within the museum. Now they must share power with administrators, sometimes as actual subordinates to public relations and accounting personnel. Curators no longer call the shots and today's museum directors are less often culled from the ranks of curators (DiMaggio 1987a). Although curators have not been losers on an absolute level, they certainly hold less power and authority relative to other museum factions than used to be true, and they have less autonomy in their work. Curators interpret their absolute gain but relative loss as a clear loss. They have not been completely deskilled or deprofessionalized, but changes in funding have chipped away at curatorial control and discretion.²

These conflicts can only grow worse when funding diminishes, as recent studies of funding in the arts show (e.g. McNeely, 1993). In the future of arts organizations I see more conflict, less professional autonomy (for artists and curators), more market control, more attention to audiences (with associated trends of both popularization and politicization), and more business logic. The arts companies that survive will need to know how to position themselves and will have to make difficult choices, ones that may seem counter to ideals of pristine, untainted art. My research suggests that the influence of institutional funding on museums also contributes to broadening the definition of art, reducing the distinction between high culture and folk or popular culture.

As sociologists, we can stand back and see this through lenses provided by our colleagues. For instance, Abbott (1988) would call the conflict a jurisdictional dispute. DiMaggio (1987b) would see it as a shift away from professional and toward commercial classification of art exhibits. But for museums, these are difficult, nearly intractable issues. Seeing the point of view of the other camp is difficult and takes a lot of time and effort—and implies giving something up from your side. These conflicts embody the clash of two world views. Therefore, they are not easily solved by compromise, as either side will feel undermined and de-legitimized by giving up on their views. Compromise represents a distortion of the "right and proper" functions of museums. Further, the conflicts surround a reduction in the influence and status of the traditional winners in museums: art-historically trained curators. It is hard to satisfy people who are losing power and who feel undermined by their own institutions.

To get a sense of the difficulties involved, imagine compromising on deaccessioning (selling items from the permanent collection). A business logic would lend credence to the argument that third-rate and redundant pieces, which are as expensive to store and conserve as the best ones, should be sold. This would reduce costs and generate proceeds that could be added to the acquisitions budget or the endowment, or that could defray a deficit. But to curators there are serious moral implications to deaccessioning; collections are sacrosanct, and selling objects is anathema under art world logic. Solutions like selling a painting during this financial crisis, but not the next, won't work. Neither will selling half a painting.

This brings us back to the questions posed at the beginning. Consider a planning meeting in a museum. One way of thinking, a business world mentality, suggests that museums develop a marketing strategy to position themselves for future effectiveness. Business logic might put attracting visitors at the top of the agenda and frame the issue in the same way it would be for a profit-making industry: namely, as how to win customers. This implies that planning means competitor analysis, not scheduling research trips or catalog publications, and it suggests that museums should bend to audience needs, rather than attracting only those who will take the museum as is. Again, compromise and understanding can be stymied at the first step.

In essence, I have proposed a theory that paints a picture of museum conflicts as the clash of two normative models of museums based in competing institutional logics. The national debate over arts funding can be seen with the same lens of competing normative models. Though it is clear that some of the conservative attack on culture is cynical posturing—an attempt to irritate the liberal supporters of the arts establishment—some of it comes from sincerely held models of art at variance with the curatorial one. In our society, we do not have an established, consensual definition of art or of how art should relate to society. Should art be intellectual, complex, and challenging? Should it glorify society? Should it be beautiful? And what is "beautiful" anyway? The common view in our society, a view that is seen as naive by the art world, is that art should be sublime. It should uplift the viewer who will find pleasure in looking at it. Art might focus on high moral or spiritual sentiments, or in a more pedestrian vein, it might be pretty or cheerful; but in any case, it should be well-executed by someone who has "more skill than a five-year-old." This is not the definition of art that has taken hold in the contemporary scene.³ The art world *cognoscente* prefer artwork that is thought-provoking and striking—either visually, intellectually, or emotionally. Being "deeply moved" by a work can mean being enraged, shocked, or repulsed, not soothed or awed. These are very different models of what "art" means. Having taught a course on the sociology of art for many years, I can safely say that partisans from one camp are very rarely able to tolerate, let alone understand or sympathize with, the other camp's views. Pejorative terms like philistine, naive, schmaltz, or snobby, elitist, offensive are common.

Debates about art, of course, encompass more than two views. In addition to aesthetic values, arts controversies mix

(continued on page 6)

(and get mixed up with) conflicts over identity and power (Dubin, 1992). And combatants' gender, ethnic, and sexual identities combine with their political orientations on such issues as the role of government and limits on freedom of expression, to shape a complex variety of views. Still, it is useful to remember that the avant-garde art world has had the luxury to focus on its own debates, relatively unmolested, for the past hundred years. This is how it should be, according to people who view the artist as a creative genius and art as a form of creativity that must be taken on its own terms. In this view, artists should be given the freedom to express their views, no matter how repugnant to the mainstream. After all, almost the entire canon of modern art was controversial when it first appeared. This view is probably widely shared among sociologists of art, too. But it is not accepted by the public at large. They don't understand. And that is the point of the avant garde. People who aren't hip to the movement just won't get it.

But today, in debates over arts funding other stakeholders do have a say, whether they "get it" or not. Lay people claim that art should be beautiful and understandable. Business people say that art must be profitable and should be self-sustaining. Postmodernists have joined the debate, and have been accepted into the inner circles of the art world, where they argue that art legitimates dominant power structures, except when it is oppositional. And interest groups (largely, but by no means exclusively, conservative) weigh in against art that they find offensive. I don't have a solution to this debate (though, for the record, I support the NEA), so I will return to the safety of sociology, to end on a theoretical point.

To understand art, we must understand organizations, which also requires knowledge of how cognitively held ideas shape organizational actors (Zucker 1991) and how normative frames interact with external pressures to form an organizational response. When curators decry the increasing proportion of popular exhibits in museums, they are relying on their normative understandings of what an art museum is and what makes a museum legitimate. Museum curators respond to external pressures within a context created by their own personal and professional orientations. And they are no more shaped by their training and background than are museum directors—or other culture producers in different settings. The ideas in this essay draw upon organizational theory, specifically what I have elsewhere called strategic institutional theory (Alexander, in press, c). Institutional theory (DiMaggio & Powell, 1981; Meyer & Scott, 1992), with its focus on the cultural constructs that undergird human action and the construction of meaning, provides a good starting point. But institutional theory must also be understood as allowing for conscious choice and the ability of actors to adroitly use cultural tools for creating innovations. Power is important, and though institutions shape interests, interests also shape institutions. These ideas have been themes in recent institutional theory writing and in exciting work from the sociology of culture. In studying cultural products, we must not ignore the culture behind the arts.

NOTES

- ¹I chose this term to suggest DiMaggio and Powell's (1983) discussion of normative forces that create organizational isomorphism.
- ²Ironically, museums were controlled by art historians and not administrators when, clearly unaware of the potential long-term consequences, museums first endeavored to garner support from institutional funders.
- ³Both of these aesthetic views may be represented on museum staffs. It is interesting to note, however, that to the extent that museums focus on audiences, they must attend to (though not completely give into) popular notions of aesthetics.

REFERENCES

- Abbott, Andrew (1988). *The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Alexander, Victoria D. (In press, a). *Museums and Money: The Impact of Funding on Exhibitions, Scholarship, and Management*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press (1996).
- _____. (In press, b). "From Philanthropy to Funding: The Effects of Corporate and Public Support on American Art Museums," *Poetics: Journal of Empirical Research on Literature, the Media and Arts* (1996).
- _____. (In press, c). "Pictures at an Exhibition: Conflicting Pressures in Museums and the Display of Art." *American Journal of Sociology*, January 1996.
- Becker, Howard S. (1982). *Art Worlds*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- DiMaggio, Paul J. (1987a). *Managers of the Arts*. Washington, DC: Seven Locks Press.
- _____. (1987b). "Classification in Art," *American Sociological Review*, 52: 440-455.
- DiMaggio, Paul J. and Walter W. Powell (1991). "Introduction," in Walter W. Powell and Paul J. DiMaggio (eds.), *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 1-38.
- Dubin, Stephen C. (1992). *Arresting Images: Impolitic Art and Uncivil Actions*. New York: Routledge.
- Friedland, Roger and Robert R. Alford (1991). "Bringing Society Back In: Symbols, Practices, and Institutional Contradictions," in Walter W. Powell and Paul J. DiMaggio (eds.), *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 232-263.
- McNeely, Connie L. (1993). "Funding and the Transformation of the Professional Artist: Theoretical Extensions and Implications from the World of Dance," in Muriel Cantor and Cheryl Zollars (eds.), *Creators of Culture: Occupations and Professions in Culture Industries*, Volume 8 in the series "Current Research on Occupations and Professions." Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Meyer, John W. and W. Richard Scott, eds. (1992). *Organizational Environments: Ritual and Rationality*, 2nd edition. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Peterson, Richard A. (1986). "From Impresario to Arts Administrator: Formal Accountability in Nonprofit Cultural Organizations," in Paul DiMaggio (ed.), *Nonprofit Enterprise in the Arts: Studies in Mission and Constraint*. New York, Oxford University Press, pp. 161-183.
- _____, ed. (1976). *The Production of Culture*. London: Sage.
- Pfeffer, Jeffrey and Gerald R. Salancik (1978). *The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective*. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers.
- Zolberg, Vera L. (1986). "Tensions of Mission in American Art Museums," in Paul DiMaggio (ed.), *Nonprofit Enterprise in the Arts: Studies in Mission and Constraint*. New York: Oxford University Press, 184-198.
- _____. (1981). "Conflicting Visions in American Art Museums," *Theory and Society*, 10: 103-125.
- Zucker, Lynne G. (1991). "The Role of Institutionalization in Cultural Persistence," in Walter W. Powell and Paul J. DiMaggio (eds.), *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 83-107. □

Editor's note: Are you unhappy that your book hasn't been mentioned in Books of Note? If we haven't heard of it, we can't cover it. Send information on your book to Richard Peterson at the Department of Sociology; Box 1635, Station B; Vanderbilt University; Nashville, TN 37235; bitnet: petersra@vuctrvax.

Balfe, Judith Huggins, editor. *Paying the Piper: Causes and Consequences of Art Patronage*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. Authors of the fourteen carefully crafted case studies explore the impact of the patronage system in shaping the arts. Ranging in time from the late eighteenth century to the present, they show the influence of direct and indirect patronage by individuals, private organizations, city institutions, and national organizations.

Gross, Larry, editor. *On the Margins of the Art World*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. The art works and/or the artists are marginal for the authors of this remarkably fresh set of studies by Annenberg School of Communication students. Topics range from Polish artists in New York and the "woman artist" to graffiti, collectibles, and the documentation of Native American art.

Boudon, Raymond. *The Art of Self-Persuasion: The Social Explanation of False Beliefs*. Williston, VT: Polity Press. Boudon begins by showing that people often have good reason for believing false ideas and uses this insight to reinterpret many findings from the sociology of religion and the sociology of knowledge.

Schneirov, Matthew. *The Dream of a New Social Order: Popular Magazines in America, 1893-1914*. New York: Columbia University Press. With numerous illuminating quotes, Schneirov shows how the popular periodical magazines worked to create a bourgeois culture and critiques the ravages of capitalism in the later years of the nineteenth century and up through World War I. Practical lessons on the details of the new consumerism were interspersed with muck-raking essays showing that a new world order was being perfected.

Rojek, Chris. *Decentering Leisure: Rethinking Leisure Theory*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. In this text, Rojek shows that leisure is not about creativity, escape or freedom of choice; it is gendered, commodified, and simulated nostalgia.

Cerulo, Karen A. *Identity Designs: The Sights and Sounds of a Nation*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press. Cerulo explores the way national symbols are selected, the manner in which their

meaning is conveyed, and the sources of their long-standing power.

Farrell, Ronald A. and Carole Case. *The Black Book and the Mob: The Untold Story of the Control of Nevada Casinos*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press. By focusing on "the Mob" and selectively prosecuting notorious characters with Italian names, the Nevada state regulators protect the competing criminal interests in the gaming industry.

Ben-Yehuda, Nachman. *The Masada Myth: Collective Memory and Myth-Making in Israel*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press. Ben-Yehuda traces the many meanings that have been given over the centuries to the events on Mt. Masada by the people of memory as they rearrange their memories of themselves.

Altheide, David L. *An Ecology of Communication: Cultural Formats of Control*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter. Articulated through an interactionist perspective, Altheide shows how the new information technology and communication formats redefine freedom and justice, the very ground rules of social life. Case studies include the Gulf War, "missing children," "terrorism," and Gonzo justice—all before the O.J. Trial.

Cushman, Thomas. *Notes from Underground: Rock Music Counterculture in Russia*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press. Based on participation in the Leningrad underground rock scene in the latter days of the Soviet era and continuing in St. Petersburg after the fall, Cushman shows what happened to this vital and creative oppositional underground as it became just "entertainment." He details the commercialization of discontent.

Leppert, Richard. *The Sight of Sound: Music, Representation, and the History of the Body*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Classical music is taken to be a performance art in which the phallic works of the 19th century are interpreted as trying to rescue music from being a feminine pre-occupation. This picture may fit England but surely not Vienna, where "real men" of the aristocracy not only shot game, gambled, and rode horses, but competed in prowess in playing piano.

Leone, Bruno, editor. *Violence in the Media*. San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press. Leone has brought together recent articles representing several sides of issues including "Does media violence harm society?" "Does music promote violence?" "Should media violence be censored?" "Can the media regulate themselves?" Leone provides

no editorial perspective except through excluding the strongly worded arguments on all the issues.

Martin, Peter J. *Sounds and Society: Themes in the Sociology of Music*. Manchester: University of Manchester Press. Martin thoughtfully recalls a wide range of theoretical concerns about music from those of Weber, Lomax, and Adorno to the more recent work of Becker, Frith, DeNora, and Peterson without ever coming to terms with music, its makers, or its audiences.

Ferguson, Priscilla Parkhurst. *Paris as Revolution—Writing in the Nineteenth-Century City*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Ferguson examines city plans, guidebooks, journalistic essays, and novels of post-Revolutionary Paris showing the close link between the modernizing city and the literature of modernity.

Silber, Iliana Friederich. *Virtuosity, Charisma and Social Order: A Comparative Sociological Study of Monasticism in Medieval Catholicism and Theravada Buddhism*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press. Silber compares two societies in which ascetics were ascribed charismatic power and could become virtuoso celebrities.

Chase, Susan. *Ambiguous Empowerment: The Work Narratives of Women School Superintendents*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press. Drawing on intensive interviews with women who head schools, Chase shows their experiences of power and humiliation in the white male dominated profession. She shows how the women develop a range of narrative strategies to cope with the tensions between the gender- and race-neutral discourse about professional work and their contentious gendered and racialized experience.

Potter, Russell A. *Spectacular Vernaculars: Hip-Hop and the Politics of Postmodernism*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press. Potter sees hip-hop culture in general and rap music in particular as sites for testing postmodern theory because they appropriate tropes, technologies, and material culture to resist the dominant culture and to forestall commodification.

Kuenz, Jane, Karen Klugman, Shelton Waldrep, and Susan Willis. *Inside the Mouse: Work and Play at Disney World*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press. Their work will help students demystify their image of Disney World by showing something of what is sacrificed to keep the rodent's world squeaky clean.

(continued on page 8)

Blackwell's Five

Zukin, Sharon. *The Cultures of Cities*. This is a delightfully nuanced conversational close look at several elements of the symbolic life of New York and its suburbs from the Berkshires to Disney World. In each case study there is close attention to how people relate to the physical place through economics and culture.

Monti, Daniel. *Wannabe: Gangs in Suburbs and Schools*. A detailed look at gangs in suburban schools based on 400 interviews. Monti shows that youngsters use gangs both to show their disdain for an adult world and as a means of negotiating entry into that world.

Goode, Erich and Nachman Ben-Yehuda. *Moral Panics: The Social Construction of Choice*. The authors explore the genesis, dynamics, and demise of moral panics with illustrations from the Renaissance, modern Israel, and the U.S.

Maltby, Richard and Ian Craven. *Hollywood Cinema: An Introduction*. A very useful introduction to the Hollywood movie industry and its product.

Jordan, Glenn and Chris Weedon. *Cultural Politics*. A wide ranging and well illustrated introduction to the use of culture in the politics of class, race, gender, and other divisions of contemporary society. It ends with a look at the classroom in these same terms.

Teachers College Press' Four

Brown, David K. *Degrees of Control: A Sociology of Educational Expansion and Occupational Credentialism*. Brown shows how, over the past century, universities aligned themselves with government, corporate, and professional interests to become credentialing degree mills.

Janko, Susan. *Vulnerable Children, Vulnerable Families: The Social Construction of Child Abuse*. An ethnographic study of parents and children caught in the cycle of abuse, and how agencies established to help children engender violence against children.

Luebke, Barbara F. and Mary Ellen Reilly. *Women's Studies Graduates: The First Generation*. This study traces the post-college lives of women's studies graduates, showing what they have become and revealing the advice they have for current women's studies students.

Howley, Craig B. and Aimee, and Edwina D. Pendarvis. *Out of Our Minds: Anti-Intellectualism and Talent Development in American Schooling*. The authors explore the multiple intelligences of children and show how social class and race help deter-

mine the ways their intelligences are cultivated in public schools.

The Routledge Five

Ignatiev, Noel. *How the Irish became White*. Ignatiev shows how Irish immigrants to the U.S. "rose" from the ranks of racially oppressed to that of racial oppressor. His work is based on public and personal records as well as on a close study of the activities of labor unions, the Catholic Church, and the Democratic party.

Tester, Keith, editor. *The Flâneur*. New York: Routledge. The essays by Zygmunt Bauman, Janet Wolff, David Frisby, Priscilla Ferguson and others show the urban dandy as an emblematic figure of early modernity.

Gray, Chris Hable, Heidi J. Figueroa-Sarriera, and Steven Mentor, editors. *The Cyborg Handbook*. The authors show how the sci-fi image of persons who are part-human, part-machine is becoming more of a reality as increasing numbers of us live because of artificial body parts, cleansed body fluids, pacemakers, and the like.

Richie, Beth E. *Compelled to Crime: The Gender Entrapment of Battered, Black Women*. Richie shows that uneducated, poor, black women vulnerable to male violence are entrapped by their status into criminal acts for which they are punished.

Oliver, Melvin L. and Thomas M. Shapiro. *Black Wealth/White Wealth: A New Perspective on Racial Inequality*. Looking beyond earned income, the wealth of the well-to-do whites is far greater than that of even the most wealthy African-Americans.

Amit-Talai, Vered and Helena Wuff, editors. *Youth Cultures: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Moving beyond resistance and deviance, the authors use ethnographic methods to examine a wide range of youth cultures around the world.

Three from The Free Press

Kimmel, Michael. *Manhood in America: A Cultural History*. Using evidence from advice books, magazines, political pamphlets, novels, and films, Kimmel illustrates the social construction of manhood by showing how the idea of American manhood has evolved in this country over the past century.

Brown, David W. *When Strangers Cooperate: Using Social Conventions to Govern Ourselves*. Based on observations of queuing behavior and how people react in emergency situations, Brown returns to a classical sociological question to show the current conventions for cooperation in unstructured situations. He also shows how conventions can be purposefully created to address social problems. Let them eat cake.

Shachtman, Tom. *The Inarticulate Society: Eloquence and Culture in America*. We are told that today's news commentator uses a lexicon of about 5,000 words, down from 10,000 in 1963. What is more important, Shachtman argues, we have lost the ability to respond to other points of view—to argue with other people. Perhaps 1963 was a good year for words; I remember the "silent generation" of the 1950s when all debate ended with the word "com-symp."

Five from Greenwood

Schervish, Paul G. and Platon Coutsoukis. *Gospels of Wealth: How the Rich Portray Their Lives*. The rich show the difficulties of gaining wealth, the travails of being wealthy, and explain why they are willing to bear the burden.

Shupe, Anson. *In the Name of All That's Holy: A Theory of Clergy Malfeasance*. Shupe discusses sexual, psychological, financial, and emotional abuse, showing how the structures of religious groups lend themselves to the abuse of trust.

Free, Mary Moore. *The Private World of the Hermitage: Lifestyles of the Rich and Old in an Elite Retirement Home*. Free shows how the elderly rich of a small private Texas retirement home continue to wield power through the manipulation of their inheritances, remaining active as advisor-confidants, and forming alliances with their doctors in managing their decline.

Earle, Timothy C. and George Cvetkovich. *Social Trust: Toward a Cosmopolitan Society*. The authors show how trust can be engendered and nurtured in social situations.

Seven from Princeton

Ostrower, Francie. *Why the Wealthy Give: The Culture of Elite Philanthropy*. Based on interviews with nearly one hundred New York area charitable donors, Ostrower shows how philanthropy supports elite culture and reinforces group cohesion while at the same time it enhances their own personal identity and family status position.

Morawska, Ewa. *Insecure Prosperity: Small-Town Jews in Industrial America, 1890-1940*. Unlike their cosmopolitan brethren in large cities, the small-town Pennsylvania Jewish community created a tightly knit entrepreneurial niche in the local economy to enjoy the fellowship of their fellow congregants and protect their community from the vicissitudes of the local economy.

Brint, Steven. *In an Age of Experts: The Changing Role of Professionals in Politics and Public Life*. Brint shows that the claims for the independent-thinking enlightened technocratic "new class" have not come to pass. They, that is to say we, selfishly protect our own class position.

Lunbeck, Elizabeth. *The Psychiatric Persuasion: Knowledge, Gender, and Power in Modern America*. Between 1900 and 1930 American psychiatry transformed itself from a marginal medical specialty devoted to the care of the mentally ill into a powerful discipline devoted to analyzing the common difficulties of everyday life. In the process, male psychiatry muscled out the female social work profession which made claims to the same territory but with a much more social-critical agenda.

Schmidt, Leigh Eric. *Consumer Rites: The Buying and Selling of American Holidays*. Schmidt suggests that the commercial appropriation of all holidays in the decades since the Civil War was successful, in part because

the sacred expressive symbols were maintained and even heightened.

Zabusky, Stacia E. *Launching Europe: An Ethnography of European Cooperation in Space Science*. Zabusky examines the European cooperation in space exploration and argues that cooperation has not come from an urge for community unity but from well understood negotiations over age-old irreconcilable differences.

Lipovetsky, Gilles. *The Empire of Fashion: Dressing Modern Democracy*. The modern cult of appearance and superficiality serves the common good, Lipovetsky argues in a quick survey of 2000 years of fashion news. He argues that fashion moved from being an aristocratic privilege to become a popular expression with the rise of democratic values.

Libraries Unlimited's Three

Downey, Pat. *Top 40 Music on Compact Disc, 1955-1981*. Downey provides a guide to finding and assessing the sound quality of older single hit records that are now available in the CD format. Now at last you can hear "Transistor Sister" again.

Downey, Pat, George Albert, and Frank Hoffman. *Cash Box Pop Singles Charts, 1950-1993*. Cash Box charts are based on reported juke box plays, rather than on record sales or air play.

Brown, Lorene Byron. *Subject Headings for African American Materials*. Based on the Library of Congress Subject Headings, this work presents nearly five thousand headings relating to the African-American experience.

Dissertation Descriptions

To submit your thesis description, send the following to sahart@ubvms.cc.buffalo.edu: (1) the title; (2) a description (maximum 60 words); and (3) your name, institution, postal address, phone number (optional), and email address. The description should indicate (not necessarily in this order) the central issues being addressed, the kind of methods used, and the stage your work is at. We encourage descriptions of work just beginning (as long as a proposal has been approved), but they are welcome at any stage.

Multiplying Identities: Consolidation and Fragmentation in San Francisco's Lesbian/Gay Organizations, 1964-1994. The collective identities expressed in the names and mission statements of San Francisco's lesbian and gay organizations have grown increasingly elaborate since the early seventies. I will describe and explain this changing repertoire of collective identities using a database I have created of the names, founding and failure dates, and goals of the more than 1100 lesbian/gay community organizations extant in San Francisco between 1964 and 1994. I will argue that elaboration of organizationally expressed identity was sparked by the institutionalization in the early seventies of a "formula" or "template" for the construction of identity organizations. I am starting to write as of June 1995. Elizabeth Armstrong; Department of Sociology; University of California; Berkeley, CA 94720; 510/841-9583; armstron@uclink.berkeley.edu.

The Cultivation of African-American Identity. I am conducting qualitative analyses to determine conceptual boundaries of African-American identity in contemporary society, as represented by a sample of black film, black television, and national press on the present role of the NAACP in association with affirmative action. I am currently in the early stages of collecting data and writing the initial chapters of my dissertation. Monica D. Griffin; Department of Sociology; University of Virginia; Charlottesville, VA 22903; 804/979-5368; mds2b@uva.pcmail.virginia.edu.

Living Between Athens & Jerusalem: How Evangelicals and Roman Catholics Manage Their Public Lives in the Culture-Producing Professions of Journalism and Academic Social Science. This study draws on 40 interviews with

evangelicals and Catholics at the elite level of journalism and academic social science to look at how religious people stage manage their public identities in the purportedly secular and "value-neutral" occupations of the culture-producing professions. It is interested in documenting how the boundary between professional and religious worlds is culturally constructed through discourse. The dissertation draws on the sociology of culture, sociology of professions, media sociology, and the sociology of religion. Interview subjects include journalists Cokie Roberts, Fred Barnes, and E.J. Dionne, and social scientists Andrew Greeley, Maureen Hallinan, and George Marsden. Analysis will also focus on the writings of these journalists and academics. John Schmalzbauer; Department of Sociology; Princeton University; Princeton, NJ 08544; 908/247-3587; Johnsch@pucc.princeton.edu. □

Minutes—Section Business Meeting Karen Cerulo, Rutgers

The meeting was opened at 11:40 am by Michèle Lamont.

Elections: John Mohr announced the results of the 1995 elections. He introduced Robert Wuthnow as the new chair elect and reported that Barry Schwartz and Andrea Press had been elected to council.

Section Prizes: Winners of the culture section prizes for scholarly research were announced. Michèle noted a tie for the best article. Prizes went to Mabel Berezin, and Mustafa Emirbayer/Jeff Goodwin. The best book award was shared by Magali Sarfatti Larson and Michael Bell. Bethany Bryson and Stephen Ellingson shared the prize for the best student paper. (Ellingson's paper has been published in the *AJS*; Bryson's has been accepted for publication by the ASR.)

Membership: Michèle reported that the section's membership remains over 800. Over the past year, Tim Dowd, chair of the membership committee, contacted over 230 lapsed members, encouraging them to renew their membership. In addition, he wrote to selected members asking them to encourage new members within their departments. John Ryan and Richard Butsch contributed their efforts to this cause.

Newsletter: Steve Hart described new features of the newsletter such as the international series, reports from research networks, dissertation descriptions, and review articles of recent work in substantive fields. Steve also discussed his commitment

to keeping the newsletter representative of the general membership by publishing features of interest to the section's various constituencies.

Publications Committee: Michèle noted that Diana Crane's edited volume was doing well and had earned \$1032.68 for the section. Elizabeth Long's volume is forthcoming, and Michèle is finalizing the contents of her volume on race and ethnicity.

Syllabi: Magali Sarfatti Larson discussed a volume of culture syllabi that she is preparing with Diana Crane. She urged members to have colleagues submit additional syllabi to Diana Crane as soon as possible. (Address: 13 Rue Casette; Paris 75006; France.) Submissions should be on a 3.5" disk; hard copies of syllabi can be sent to Magali at Temple University.

Budget: Karen Cerulo submitted the following budget report (updated 9/6/95):

Balance on hand at beginning of year	\$ 172.22
Revenues	
Dues Income	996.00
Royalty Income	1032.68
Total Revenues	2028.68
Expenses	
Annual Meeting - reception.....	399.17
Annual Meeting - buttons.....	117.50
Newsletter	610.29
Other Publications (syllabi)	100.00
Awards	300.00
Total Expenses	1526.96
Balance on hand at end of year	673.94

Research Networks: Michèle invited network coordinators to describe the activities of the various networks. The following reports were made: Historical Analysis, by John Mohr; Culture and Theory, by Lyn Spillman and Anne Kane; Political Culture, by Paul Lichterman; Culture and Race, by Michèle in the absence of Craig Watkins; Culture and Religion, by Rhys Williams and Marcia Witten; Culture and Science, by Michèle in the absence of Chandra Mukerji; Meaning and Measurement, by Ann Swidler; and the subgroup on symbolic boundaries, by Michèle.

New Business: The Chair's gavel was passed to Ann Swidler. Ann reminded those present of the day's upcoming sessions. She then took nominations for the nominations committee. The nominees were Anne Bowler, Orville Lee III, JoEllen Shively, John Mohr, and Penny Becker. These individuals were unanimously confirmed. Ann also announced the chairs of the awards committees for 1996: "Best Book," Steve Brint; "Best Article," George Thomas; and "Best Student Paper," Anne Kane.

Ann went on to note several "in progress" projects. First, David Brain is preparing a "menu" of publication outlets for culture scholars. Second, Ann is exploring the possibility of a film series in culture—a listing of films (along with the possible viewing of films at ASA meetings) useful in teaching culture courses. Ann noted that her interests run parallel to those of Paul Lopes at Tufts who is exploring multi-media use in teaching sociology. Third, she thanked David Yamane for his help in putting the meaning and measurement group online and asked for more volunteers willing to tackle such endeavors. Finally, Ann introduced Karen Cerulo who announced a new research network devoted to the study of identity construction. Instructions on linking to the online component of the group were distributed.

Program 1996: Bob Wuthnow outlined the sessions slated for 1996, which include an invited session on new perspectives in the study of culture, a co-sponsored session on culture and

social movements, and a session on material culture. Bob also noted an effort to petition the ASA for a regularly scheduled session on identity and culture; his request is motivated by the overwhelming response to the 1994 and 1995 sessions sponsored by the section. If the request is approved, Bob plans to ask Karen Cerulo to organize the session. Finally, refereed roundtables are scheduled for the section.

Newsletter charges: The final point of new business involved the section newsletter. Ann reported that the ASA recently issued a charge to the section for the production of the section newsletter. Ann explained that the ASA typically covers production costs for four 6-page newsletters per section per year. The culture section has exceeded that allotment. In an effort to sustain the newsletter, yet ward off cumbersome charges, Ann is proposing that the culture section be allotted the true costs of producing and mailing four 6-page newsletters; the section would then re-apportion these moneys to cover the production and mailing of 3 longer newsletters. In this way, the section's allotment overages would be minimized, making it possible for the section to subsidize newsletter costs from its own budget. Ann also proposed doing some "fund raising" within the section in an effort to aid newsletter costs without raising section dues. Further, both Michèle and Ann urged that we investigate an online home-page for the section. Using a home-page, the section could effectively relocate some of the information typically assigned to the newsletter, thus leaving precious space for more intellectual features.

Party and conclusion: Michèle announced the time and location of the section party. Richard Peterson then called for a well deserved round of applause acknowledging Michèle Lamont's efforts as chair during 1995. The meeting was closed at 12:35pm. □

Network & Section News

For listings of section prizes and election results, see the Minutes.

—New Network Forms—

Since 1994, the Culture Section has sponsored two very successful sessions addressing identity construction. The response to these panels has been overwhelming. Organizers have received well over 50 papers per session and attendance has been spectacular. On the basis of this success, the section is initiating a new research network for those with interests in identity construction. Karen Cerulo will serve as the network coordinator.

One can imagine a variety of topics appropriately located within this group: i.e., cognitive processes of identity construction; the role of symbol systems in the creation and/or maintenance of identity; sites of identity (body/mind, individual/collective, person/place/object); technology and identity, etc. **All approaches to identity are welcomed!**

The new identity construction network already has an online component. To subscribe, send a message via email to: majordomo@email.rutgers.edu; the message should contain the text *subscribe id_cult [your email address]*. To send messages to the discussion group, simply email them to: id_cult@email.rutgers.edu. (Note: Once you have joined the network, you will receive a welcome message—one you can easily save—providing you with all the details you will need.) If you run into problems connecting to the online group, hate using email, or have further questions, please contact Karen Cerulo at: 908/317-9727, cerulo@rci.rutgers.edu, or Department of Sociology; Rutgers University; New Brunswick, NJ 08903-5072.

—Existing Networks Hard at Work—

Political Culture. The network had a lively meeting in Washington, attended by 20 people, and has now grown to 25 members. An email conference to discuss a common reading is scheduled for late November. The coordinators have assembled a directory of members and their interests and distributed this to current members. A collection of syllabi is in the offing. During our ASA meeting we discussed the possibility of a mini-conference, and of a collective writing project. If you would like to participate in future email conferences, receive a copy of our network directory, or join the network, please contact one of the coordinators: Paul Lichterman, Wisconsin-Madison, lichterm@ssc.wisc.edu; Nina Eliasoph, Wisconsin-Madison, eliasoph@ssc.wisc.edu; Andrea Press, Illinois-Urbana, press@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu.

Culture and Religion. The efforts of the past two years have come to a head, marked by several "on-paper" accomplishments, and the meetings in Washington began to put in place a set of people and ideas that will maintain ongoing relationships and activities. This will offer a home for many scholars interested in culture and religion.

Our major accomplishment in the past year was the completion of a special journal issue on cross-boundary work in the sociologies of culture and religion. The special issue will appear in *Sociology of Religion* (vol. 57, no. 1, Spring 1996). Contributors are Gene Burns, Michele Dillon, Steve Hart, Laurel Kearns, Fred Kniss, and David Swartz; guest editor is Rhys Williams. Also, Rhys wrote a short piece on network activities for the newsletter of the newly formed Sociology of Religion section.

Other ideas discussed in Washington were the establishment of an email network, sharing bibliographic information, informal consulting on methodological issues, and contributing short essays to other newsletters. If you are interested in participating in the network or joining the email network, or have ideas to offer, contact Rhys at willrhys@siucvmb.siu.edu.

—Meetings—

John Mohr and Roger Friedland are starting to organize a cultural sociology conference for Winter 1996-97, to be held in Santa Barbara. They are thinking of a series of workshops around important/controversial essays. Input about what good choices would be, about what seem the most salient issues to consider, or about other ways to organize a conference useful for facilitating discussion, will be much appreciated. Please send ideas to either mohr or friedlan@alishaw.ucsb.edu.

The 1997 ASA annual meetings (in Toronto) are beginning to be planned. Now is the time for submitting program suggestions. They should go by February 1 to Neil Smelser, Center for Advanced Study in Behavioral Science, 202 Junipero Serra Blvd., Stanford, CA 94305; fax 415/321-1192. They can also be emailed to asa_meeting_services@mcimail.com. □

From the Editor
Stephen Hart, SUNY-Buffalo

In 1995-96 we had three newsletter issues, canceling the summer one for financial reasons (see below). Each issue contained "Books of Note," by Richard Peterson, with an even larger number of books covered than usual. In our substantive articles, we inaugurated a new series, proposed by Michèle Lamont, on cultural sociology internationally. The first was

by Hans-Peter Müller, describing the German scene; the second, by Laurent Thévenot, dealt with recent developments in French social sciences. There are plans for three more articles in this series, on the U.K., Israel, and Brazil. In addition, we had articles by Karen Cerulo, David Halle, Lyn Spillman, me, and Michèle, and a report from Vera Zolberg on culture at the ISA meetings.

We initiated two new features, and have a third one in progress. The first that actually got going was a series of reports from our energetic research networks, starting a process of exchange of ideas among people doing related work. The second, with a similar intention, consists of descriptions of dissertation research. Rather than printing abstracts of essentially completed work, we publish descriptions when people are at early stages, so that there is time for cross-fertilization of ideas during the research process. The feature that is about to start is an occasional column on resources for teaching, with a focus on non-print media. Paul Lopes has agreed to be the preliminary contact person for this column.

I expect to continue to edit the newsletter in 1995-96, and plan to inaugurate a series on arts (including popular culture) and politics. Although I make plans for series, unsolicited articles are always welcome, and you should feel free to call or email me to discuss your ideas (email: sahart@ubvms.cc.buffalo.edu; phone and fax: 716/886-5592) Suggestions about the newsletter are also welcome; this publication is intended to serve the membership.

A large amount of my energy and that of the section leadership, unfortunately, has been consumed dealing with the issue of charges the ASA has recently started making for our "excess" pages—charges that would have put the newsletter as we know it out of business. But Ann Swidler, Michèle Lamont, and I have managed to negotiate a livable compromise, allowing us (by making a significant contribution out of our section budget) to continue to publish the kind of substantive articles that have made our newsletter famous. □

About the Newsletter

Culture is the official newsletter for the Sociology of Culture Section of the American Sociological Association. All articles and columns are copyrighted by their authors. *Culture* is indexed in *Sociological Abstracts*.

Deadline for Winter 1996 issue: January 1. Unsolicited contributions are welcome in all content categories (articles, announcements, section news, dissertation descriptions, comments on previous articles, letters to the editor). They should be sent to the editor by email or on DOS disk (disks should be scanned for viruses and will not be returned). Preliminary inquiries prior to formal submission are welcome, and can be made by phone, fax, mail, or email. Submission of material to *Culture* constitutes permission for abstracting and indexing of one's material. The editor reserves the right to edit all submissions. See "Books of Note" for information on getting books covered. Address all other inquiries to the editor:

Stephen Hart
Sociology Department • SUNY-Buffalo
Buffalo, NY 14260-4140
email: sahart@ubvms.cc.buffalo.edu
phone and fax: 716/ 886-5592

Call for Papers: 1996 Culture Section Sessions in New York City

The 1996 Program for our section includes an invitational session on new perspectives in cultural sociology and the following open-submission sessions. For all sessions, the deadline for submissions is January 10, 1996.

Culture and Social Movements (jointly sponsored with the Section on Collective Behavior and Social Movements)

Recently there has been a large amount of work on the frontier between culture and social movements. This includes (1) the cultural turn in social movement research, coming out of revisions and expansions in the agenda of resource mobilization theory and other traditions of social movement work; (2) work by cultural sociologists on public discourse, focusing specifically on social movements as a context but informed by the hermeneutic tradition; and (3) work on cultural movements and movements that have significantly cultural goals. Now is a good time for dialogue among these various strands of work. Therefore the ASA Sections on Sociology of Culture and on Collective Behavior and Social Movements are cooperating to hold two sessions at the 1996 meetings, open to papers dealing with culture and social movements in any of these three modes, or other ones not listed.

Submissions may be in the form of a completed paper, or of a detailed proposal (600-800 words). Submission of a proposal involves a commitment to submit a completed paper within 30 days after notification of acceptance. Send *two* copies of your paper or proposal to either organizer.

Organizers: Stephen Hart, Department of Sociology, SUNY-Buffalo, Buffalo, NY 14260-4140; and Mary Jo Neitz, 108 Sociology Building; University of Missouri-Columbia; Columbia, MO 65211. Address inquiries to Steve at sahart@ubvms.cc.buffalo.edu or Mary Jo at socmjn@mizzou1.missouri.edu.

Gender and Culture

While sociologists have long used cultural analyses to argue that gender differences are not natural or immutable, it is only in recent years that a number of studies have gone beyond simple socialization arguments to examine the multifaceted links between gender and culture. This session will focus on innovative studies that expand our understanding of the production and reproduction of gender, including research in the areas of gendered audiences and the gendered consumption of culture; the gendered production of cultural objects, cultural images, and cultural "scripts" for behavior; the intersections of race, class, gay/lesbian, and gender subcultures; and the logic and consequences of gendered meaning systems in local, national, and global contexts.

Organizer: Sharon Hays; Department of Sociology; 539 Cabell Hall; University of Virginia; Charlottesville VA 22903; 804/924-6517; email: sh2q@virginia.edu.

Material Culture (jointly sponsored with the Section on Science, Knowledge, and Technology)

In recent years, sociologists of science have given increasing attention to the place of artifacts and technical devices in

the construction of scientific knowledge. Sociologists of technology have given increasing attention to explicating the complex ways that technological artifacts are not socially constructed, but implicated in the construction of society itself, by the way that social relations are built into machines. In a parallel move, some sociologists of culture have developed renewed interest in the material forms of cultural artifacts, not only as expressions of meaning or reflections of broad cultural patterns, but as part of the way that a world of things is consequentially mobilized in the construction of social worlds. With these parallel (if perhaps not quite yet converging) tendencies in mind, the organizers of this session are interested in papers that offer a theoretical or empirical contribution to exploration of the importance of "material culture" (artifacts, technologies, systems of material practice) to social processes.

Organizers: David Brain; Division of Social Science; New College of the University of South Florida; 5700 N. Tamiami Trail; Sarasota, FL 34243; 941/359-4338; email: Brain@virtu.sar.usf.edu; and Peter Whalley; Department of Sociology; Loyola University; 6525 N. Sheridan Road; Chicago, IL 60626; 312/508-3453; email: pwhalle@luc.edu

Roundtables

Papers on the full range of culture-related topics are invited. We especially encourage papers treating: cultural theory, historical/comparative analysis, identity, political culture, race, religion and morality, symbolic boundaries, and measurement issues, as well as papers addressing this year's panel topics.

A full paper should be submitted to the organizers, but for the oral presentation we suggest that roundtable presenters summarize their papers' main arguments briefly, and offer one or two issues that roundtable participants can discuss, with coordination by the roundtable presider.

Organizers: Paul Lichterman; Department of Sociology; University of Wisconsin, 1180 Observatory Drive; Madison WI 53706; lichterm@ssc.wisc.edu; 608/263-4744; and Connie McNeely; Dept. of Sociology; University of California; Santa Barbara CA 93106; mcneely@alishaw.ucsb.edu; 805/893-2768. □

Section Leaders 1995-96

Chair: Ann Swidler, UC-Berkeley, swidler@uclink2.berkeley.edu

Past chair: Michèle Lamont, Princeton, lamont@pucc.bitnet

Chair elect (and program chair): Robert Wuthnow, Princeton, wuthnow@pucc.bitnet

Secretary-Treasurer: Karen Cerulo, Rutgers, cerulo@rci.rutgers.edu

Newsletter editor: Stephen Hart, SUNY-Buffalo, sahart@ubvms.cc.buffalo.edu

Council: Wendy Griswold, Chicago, wendy@cicero.spc.uchicago.edu; Andrea Press, UI-Urbana (Communications Research), press@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu; Magali Sarfatti-Larson, Temple, magalisl@temple.ocis.edu; Michael Schudson, UCSD (Communications), mschudso@weber.ucsd.edu; Barry Schwartz, Georgia; William Sewell, Chicago (Political Science)