Newsletter of the Sociology of

Culture

Section of the American Sociological Association

A Message from the Chair
Michael Schudson
UC San Diego

There is no city more intimately tied to sociology than Chicago. For all practical purposes, American sociology was born at the University of Chicago and has been nurtured there for a century.

Some of sociology's history at the University of Chicago took place inside the Department of Sociology and is justly famous. Some of it happened in the "College," especially in the general education core curriculum, and this latter history is not well known beyond the vicinity of South Ellis Avenue between 58th and 59th Streets. The core curriculum began in the mid-1920s in the era of Robert Maynard Hutchins, and came to a mature formulation in the 1940s.

For the sociology of culture, this second history is in some respects even more important than the first. It is enough to list some of the sociologists who taught in these core courses, especially in the one known as "Soc 2": Howard Becker, Daniel Bell, Reinhard Bendix, Richard Biernacki, Lewis Coser, Reuel Denney, Richard Flacks, Cesar Grana, Wendy Griswold, Joseph Gusfield, Elihu Katz, Donald Levine, C. Wright Mills, David Riesman, Gene Rochberg-Halton, and Barry Schwartz, not to mention the many anthropologists in the course who greatly influenced the sociological study of culture, like Robert Redfield and Milton Singer.

Most research universities evidence a tension between graduate instruction and undergraduate teaching, but nowhere else has it been so well marked institutionally as at Chicago. The graduate divisions and the College made separate faculty hires, although sometimes faculty would manage to participate in both worlds. The graduate faculty treated the College faculty with disdain; the College faculty

Also in this Issue ...

The Military-Media Complex
David L. Altheide
Arizona State University

"War is not healthy for children and other living things."
Anti-War poster, 1960s

"...the safety of the children of the world depends on it."
President Clinton's comment about bombing Iraq because of its interference with weapons inspectors.

I wish to address how propaganda as content has become fused with the entertainment format in forging a renewed relationship between news and entertainment, the major networks and the military, and foreign conflicts and domestic policy. Notwithstanding the great significance of history, context, and powerful interests of those directly and indirectly involved in "shaping the news," the comments to follow make several assumptions: (1) Media messages are reflexive of the processes which produce them; (2) Cultural forms tend to be reflected and constituted in communication practices; (3). Those who share information and media logics trade on common operating procedures and perspectives.

The Pursuit of Workplace Culture
Christena Nippert-Eng
Illinois Institute of Technology
Gary Alan Fine
Northwestern University

Over the past fifteen years studies of work and organizations have increasingly emphasized the significance of culture in the workplace. Beginning in the 1980s a number of management theorists — notably Peters and Waterman in *In Search of Excellence* or Deal and Kennedy in *Corporate Cultures* — argued that the most effective corporations could be assessed on the quality of their corporate culture and on how their culture contributes to worker satisfaction and innovation. While, of course, some earlier studies pointed to the role of group and organiza-

returned the disdain with interest. Joe Gusfield recalls that the end product of the departments was a correct answer while the end product of the College was "good talk," and the College faculty believed good talk to be the greater achievement. In the departments, the emphasis was on craft, in the College on cultivation; in the former, "dialogue was a means to an end, which was finding the right answer...in the College, it was its own end, an open form of intellectual play." Lewis Coser recalled, likewise, that "the divisions tried to produce answers, the College specialized in questions." For some, the College came to be seen as the home of true intellectual life as against narrow professional research. David Riesman, rooted in the College but, true to his wonderfully contrary ways, objected to the "College patriots" who, quite foolishly, he thought, alienated the graduate divisions by their alternative mode of arrogance.

Edward Shils had brought Riesman to Chicago in 1945-46 to teach in the College. Riesman had a law degree but no training in the social sciences. He learned social science while teaching Soc 2. "I had four children, I could not go get a Ph.D., this was a unique heaven-sent opportunity to learn on the job." Riesman was not alone in finding a social science education in Soc 2. Daniel Bell recalls, "My education began at Chicago. I'd be up till two, three, four in the morning trying to stay ahead of the students." He had read some Weber in graduate school, but no Freud, and little in economics besides Marx.

When Howie Becker taught in the Sociology Department, "all the students wrote down everything I said. But in Soc 2, you couldn't say what time it was without starting an argument." One day, the anthropologist Milton Singer, already a man whose wisdom was almost palpable, sat in on one of the young Becker's classes. At first he was quiet, but after awhile he entered the discussion. He took a position the class had gone over and found holes in during the previous session. "Someone started to criticize him," Becker remembers, "and then others joined in and before long the students were jumping all over him. He just sat back grinning."

It was common practice in the 1950s for instructors to sit in on the sections of colleagues. "I sat in on Riesman's classes frequently," Becker remarks. "He taught me an incredible lesson — there wasn't anything too dumb a student could say — everything he treated with respect and treated seriously." If some regarded Riesman as a model discussion leader, this did not mean Riesman himself felt secure in his own style. He recalls how aware he was that Dan Bell and Phil Rieff's sections were always the most heavily enrolled. Some section leaders were more spellbinding than others, and Riesman remembers mournfully that he could "hear the raucousness of Dan Bell's section through the thin walls of Cobb Hall."

Riesman's style was one he brought to Chicago from teaching at the University of Buffalo Law School. Others who came with him fresh from Harvard Law School, were ardent New Dealers eager to teach constitutional law and administrative law. Riesman chose property law and criminal law and a new course on "Ordinances of the City of Buffalo." He taught students, he recalled, "how to attach a refrigerator in New York State." He knew his students at Buffalo were headed for local law practice as solo practitioners, not toward cosmopolitan legal careers. But he did not see his focus on local ordinances as intellectual slumming. He was genuinely interested in both the nitty-gritty of the law and in the realities of the lives of his students.

By the time I came to the University of Chicago in 1976, already pre-socialized into "the College" as a student of both Riesman's and Bell's at Harvard, there were no longer separate appointments in the College. The graduate divisions initiated faculty searches for appointments to be made simultaneously in a department and in the College. Still, the divide between the two worlds continued. I had an early discussion with my Sociology Department colleagues, Edward Shils and Morris Janowitz, where they asked me what I was teaching in "Soc 2" in the College. "The usual," I said, "Marx, Weber, Durkheim, Freud." And one of them retorted — I now forget whom, but it was a sentiment to which they both gave assent — "You're still teaching them?"

It is rare that we think about the ways in which sociological scholarship is truly a community product as well as the work of individual scholars in lonely pursuit of their work. In graduate school at Harvard, I encountered both extraordinary teachers and fellow graduate students of remarkable talent, but I left without the slightest sense of sociology as a collective enterprise, let alone one with a humanly constructed tradition, let alone a tradition well worth nurturing. Certainly I absorbed nothing about the institutional infrastructure of the field of sociology. When I gathered together sociologists interested in "culture" at A.S.A. meetings in the late 1970s, I was completely ignorant of the "section" as an organizational form and an intellectual opportunity. A few years later, others, with a much stronger sense of how professional associations operate, brought this section into being.

Only when I came to the Department of Sociology at Chicago did I learn that sociology has a heritage. I learned to respect the department's sense of its own special mission in preserving that heritage and in nurturing the discipline as a whole. I did not learn personal affection for this mission, however. What I loved at the University of Chicago was located a quarter-turn around the quadrangle, where the Soc 2 staff held its regular staff meetings at the Social Science Collegiate Division. There, like others before me, I received my second graduate education, and it is that which I think of most fondly as the A.S.A. comes again to Chicago.[1]

[1] "Soc 2" is the subject of a fine collection of essays, John J. MacAloon, ed., *General Education in the Social Sciences* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992). My remarks here steal shamelessly from the essays in that volume — including those by Coser, Gusfield, Levine, MacAloon, Riesman, and my own.

Much has changed since social scientists like C. Wright Mills joined President Dwight D. Eisenhower in the 1950s in urging caution for an emerging military-industrial complex. Their concern was that the military and big weapons manufacturers were pursuing common interests to the detriment of the political process. The connections were managed as high ranking retired military personnel found lucrative jobs as lobbyists and advisors with major aircraft and arms manufacturers. The weapons industry was becoming a stronger lobby for the defense department, as well as fostering hard-line political decisions compatible with military deployment around the world. This has changed as the cold war ended, but also as more military brass retire to serve television and cable networks. While arms manufacturers still benefit from military buildups and wars, so do the news media.

The mass media played a significant political and cultural role in numerous social relationships, particularly support for the military. And conversely. The media and the military have been involved in a reciprocal relationship trading on entertaining topics for movies and news, on the one hand, as well as technological access and development, on the other hand. Jackall and Hirota's (1995) provocative account of George Creel and the role of the Committee on Public Information (CPI) at the start of WWI, and the amazing transformation of the role of public relations in public life led them to conclude in other work that ". . the rationalization of advertising and public relations in the twentieth century was largely a product of war."

Only on rare occasions, such as in the waning years of the Vietnam War, did major American media reflect displeasure with foreign policy and military operations. An adversarial relationship with the military was apparent in some media outlets until the 1980s when government censorship and restrictions first separated and then "reintegrated" the media. The Gulf War in 1991, "Desert Storm," was enthusiastically supported by most media outlets, with celebratory coverage of well-orchestrated, although often invalid, visuals of dramatic success and "kills," (e.g., the "impression" that most Patriot missiles hit their targets). The scaled down ("billion dollar special") four day version of missile attacks on Iraq in 1998 ("Desert Fox") was not hindered by Congressional hearings or media generated debates.

How did the media stance on military operations change from support to challenge to support in a mere two decades? This entails a very brief look at the role of the mass media, information technology, and the military in an era of unprecedented growth for entertainment as an industry and as a perspective.

The military-industrial complex was an artifact of the cold war era where the Congress, media and public took for granted that the Soviet threat and the numerous sparring bouts ("brush fire wars") needed constant military expenditures. Notwithstanding the significance of "yellow journalism" in promoting jingoistic adventures, the media were a minor— albeit a supporting— player in the rules and strategies of national and international dominance. Print and movie media served governmental interests, often as explicit propaganda outlets for hot and cold wars until the 1960s. Reliant on governmental licensing and regulations, the fledgling TV industry, save for a few journalists, lacked the markets and the infrastructure to boldly challenge governmental initiatives.

The military-industrial complex changed when the Soviet Union abdicated and lost to capitalism and its champion, the United States. Champagne celebrating the victory had hardly stopped bubbling when it became apparent that the arms industry would have to take another tact for its future growth and prosperity. The defense budget would be cut along with our "real enemies," a process that was exacerbated as an army of claimsmakers jumped on domestic threats of drugs and gangs to garner congressional and public opinion support for sundry "wars" on crime, drugs, gangs, and more recently, immigration. The major networks promoted such emphasis with a number of "reality" crime shows emphasizing crime, violence, fear and danger. One major change for U.S. arms merchants was to look "off shore" for customers, who were readily found in several dozen killer markets.

The debacle in Vietnam cost the U.S. some military credibility, and it took more than two decades of Hollywood movies and entertainment to bolster some claims that the U. S. actually won that war, or would have won it had it not been for the "political defeat" at home, referring to the domestic protests and the politicians' (e.g., Lyndon Johnson's) reluctance to "hit 'em with everything we had." The mass media, particularly TV journalism, was blamed by many for the public opinion and political decisions that led to U.S. withdrawal. It would take a number of military "victories" against adversaries like Grenada, Panama, Iraq, and Somalia to redefine losses as victories and to get the military back on target in public opinion and political influence.

"In the face of a 25% decline in defense spending since the end of the Cold War, and with the Joint Chiefs of Staff warning of readiness concerns, many military officials believe a robust public affairs operation is one of their best weapons in selling their needs to the public and Congress "Today, when you get an opportunity to stand up and represent your command, you've got to hit a home run," Army Maj. Bob Hastings told the students in his public affairs course" (Vogel 1998, p. 6).

The military-media complex is a feature of programming in an entertainment era dominated by popular culture and communication forms that share sophisticated information technology promoting visual media and evocative content. The media are a major player in this chapter. It was not until the 1960s that TV surpassed print media as a cultural force. With an expanding revenue base, the emergence of

the concept as well as actual "target audiences," and sophisticated marketing techniques, the mass media, and especially television, flexed its technology and discovered that not only did visuals sell products, but they also conveyed powerful messages about social issues, e.g., Civil Rights, that could sell products. A flood of information technology—from CDs to cable to VCRs to the internet—produced a popular culture inspired by entertainment forms and the visual image. These technological and organizational changes influenced the renewed convergence of military and the mass media.

Several parallel developments to the winding down of the cold war were critical for the resurgence of American military in foreign policy. Both are related to the media and information technology. One was the expanding use of satellites for military and commercial purposes (e.g., surveillance and communication). Another significant development was the rise of cable TV, particularly the rise of the "4th network"—CNN—and 24 hour news. During the 1990s the 4th network was followed by a 5th (Fox), as well as conventional networks expansion (e.g., MSNBC). Together these contributed to expanded global coverage, including the terrorism and war niche. With costs rising for the big three networks and mergers treading across bottom lines, ABC, NBC, and CBS sliced news staffs, relying on satellite feeds, as well as the work of "stringers" throughout the world rather than fully staffed "bureaus" abroad.

"A tightening economic climate for broadcasters has also led to cost-cutting initiatives at the major networks, diminishing their presence overseas. CNN, meanwhile, has staked out international news as its competitive turf, proudly noting that it is the only western TV news organization with a regular presence in Iraq, including five correspondents in Baghdad" (Lowry 1998, p. F1). International coverage declined, save for "reactive" "crisis" coverage, which was often "live."

The junior network(s) filled in and showed remarkable capacity to adapt with mobile units. As the "new" networks helped initiate and refine the cable/satellite information technology, they were essentially using very similar technology as the military whose increased use of sophisticated missile and other weapon systems relied heavily on satellite communication systems. The military operations changed with this technology, but so did their public relations and war broadcasting capability.

The Gulf War with Iraq in 1991 was very important for the resurgence of the military and the military-media connection in this post-journalism era, essentially defined as the blurring of distinctions in perspective and practice by sources and journalists. Despite initial proclamations by media pundits and some academics about media control and censorship, this war contributed to the shared use of entertaining visuals by the Pentagon and the major networks in the United States and throughout the world. Generals and journalists joked as they led global audiences in viewing bombsight videos of explosions, "hits," complete with "oohs" and "awes" and occasional laughter when, as in one case, a motorist crossed a bridge just moments before it exploded. CNN's round the clock live coverage of the missile and aerial bombardment of Baghdad helped establish it's future role as an important player in international affairs and coverage. Bob Murphy, ABC's senior vice president for news told the Los Angeles Times' Brian Lowry:

> While others cut back, we have grown and grown and continue to do so," said Eason Jordan, CNN's president of international networks and global news gathering. "CNN takes the world seriously, and that's one of the things that distinguish us from all competitors. (Lowry 1998, p. F1)

While the initial coverage was by radio, the presence of CNN changed how networks would cover war in the future. Critical, reflective pieces on war, and analysis of the consequences for foreign policy and the future all but disappeared. The 1991 Gulf War also changed how the enemy would operate with mass media, and perhaps most importantly, it altered how the military would interact with the press.

CNN's Gulf War coverage is significant in several ways. First, it operated in enemy territory, but with the full cooperation of the "enemy," the highly "demonized" Saddam Hussein. "Both sides" appreciated the role of the media and gave it privileged status in order to promote and use key visuals—a "dramatic hit" or "civilian casualties"—for their own purposes. Despite having its movements restricted, CNN became the signature network of the Gulf War, and over the next few years would add other campaigns to its resume. Second, the "real time" round the clock coverage meant that viewers associated it with "live" and "actual" coverage. Indeed, top Pentagon and governmental officials were told to "tune in CNN" to find out the latest about the Gulf War! Third, the technology of warfare combined the use of "target cameras" that could broadcast flight toward a target, as well as sophisticated aircraft cameras that could follow a missile and record its "hit". This made spectacular dramatic visuals that are the foundation for the entertainment format of TV. Such visuals contributed to the changing role of military press briefing. Fourth, the journalist's role shifted to commenting on the visuals being seen, and the technical aspects of weapon systems, rather than rationale and strategy for the entire operation.

This led to a major change in how the military handled the press.

> After watching some 600 of his troops float down with Russian MIG fighters flying cover above them, the U.S. commander, General John Sheehan, remarked: "It really is a different world." The general was referring to the new relationship with former cold war opponents, but he could very well have been speaking of the changed relationship between the American military and the media (Topping 1998, p. 58).

Less adversarial than the Vietnam War era, the press,

especially broadcast news, use new technology that make them somewhat less dependent on the military for access and information.

The bitter standoff extending over more than three decades has eased considerably. There has been a relaxation in the attitude of the military toward the press, but not simply as a consequence of some Pentagon revelation. With the end of the cold war and the development of ultra-fast satellite communications, old hard-fought issues such as military insistence on prior review of copy filed from war zones have become obsolete. Reporters roaming war zones equipped with portable satellite equipment are no longer dependent on military facilities to file stories or transmit photographs. Engaged now in peacekeeping and humanitarian operations, such as those in Somalia, Rwanda, Haiti, and Bosnia, the military have concluded that they must treat the media less as adversaries and more as partners. . . (Topping 1998).

Media logic, or criteria for effective mass media programming, essentially defined the format used by the journalists and the military. News organizations and their sources share knowledge of news criteria and the perspective of journalism. As Army Major Bob Hastings explained to *The Washington Post's* Steve Vogel (1998):

> . . .information officers must be ready to take advantage of "media moments" from gauging a reporter's perspective on a story to brushing dandruff off the general's shoulders and, most important, knowing how to get out the "command message": the information or story angle that commanders want the public to know.

The media-military partnership included shared information technology as well as perspectives on the "story," emphasizing weapons and strategies, which required military experts to narrate visuals. "Air time," or what was allocated to broadcast, emphasized the visuals of armaments, as did newspaper photographs. The dominant frames and themes of the coverage were about technology and weapons. *Los Angeles Times* correspondent George Black (1991) noted that news media treated the initial phase of Desert Storm as exactly what the military wanted, "a blur of meaningless press conferences, video-game images. . .and the illusion of news."

Traditionally, experts were used on a case-by-case basis, but the nearly 8 month planning for coverage of the Gulf War suggested a more permanent relationship between sources and journalists.

> To fill in the gaps left by the Pentagon, every network producer has a Rolodex full of military analysts and retired officers, many of them highly paid shills for the arms industry. CNN is perhaps the worst culprit here. In one egregious case, it turned for an opinion to Richard V. Secord, retired Air Force major general (Black 1991).

Following the Gulf War, numerous military officials and spokespersons became reporters, correspondents, and consultants to the networks (e.g., Pete Williams, Tony Cordesman, Chuck Horner, and Norman Schwarzkopf). General Schwarzkopf, who gave lectures for fees of $50 thousand and sold his autobiography for $6 million, was given his own TV show. In later years he would be interviewed by former subordinates who also worked for the networks. Most of the discussion about impending war would focus on strategies, military goals, and weapon systems. Seldom would lengthy analysis occur about the legitimacy of an operation, its foreign policy implications, etc.

On December 16, 1998, as the House of Representatives was conducting impeachment hearings against President Clinton, the United States again struck at Iraq with a four day missile and aircraft bombardment that resulted in hundreds of Iraqi casualties and may have cost more than a billion dollars. In opposition to the United Nations charter and all international treaties and agreements, the attack began hours before an official report had been received about Iraq's refusal to comply with UN mandated inspections for weapons of mass destruction. Except for some charges that the President had begun the bombing to detract attention away from his impending impeachment, there was virtually no media discussion or congressional debate about this decision, including a raid that was aborted some two weeks previous. Many of the countries that had comprised the "UN coalition" for the 1991 war withdrew support, and in several cases (e.g., France, Italy, China, former Soviet Union) condemned the assault.

The American news media benefited from the coverage of both events. CNN achieved its highest ratings of the year—up 448%, and highest ever since the 1991 Gulf War. Fox News Channel's ratings were up 212%, and MSNBC's climbed 118% between 5 and 8 PM. Notwithstanding the lucrative ratings, some viewers didn't feel that the coverage was as exciting as the last war. The war coverage was carried "live" with commentary from several network journalists, who could see "explosions in the distance," and held press conferences with Iraqi government officials, and in at least one case, visited a family under siege. Media-military people commented on problems with assessing the overall impact of the bombardment, the necessity to evaluate effectiveness, and undoubtedly that some "retargeting" would occur. Several opined that more must be done to get rid of Saddam, and that there would probably be more strikes in the future. One example is from Tony Cordesman, who, along with Chuck Horner, were two of the retired military people used by ABC News. The separate position of the journalist from the government was typically illustrated during the Vietnam War and most conflicts by referring to the "government" or the "United States" positions rather than "us" or "we." Cordesman's network's standpoint is typical of many of the spokespersons who worked for the networks since the first Gulf War. Replying to ABC's Peter Jennings about the targets in Iraq (ABC News, Dec.18, 1998):

> TONY CORDESMAN, ABC News Military Analyst: "Well, Peter, we do know a lot now about the kinds of targets and how many have been hit. We know that we've hit at the Republican Guards and army barracks.

We know we've hit hard at command and control facilities, including his intelligence headquarters. (My emphasis).

What "we" have seen develop post-Vietnam is an expansive media culture that provides communicative wraps that essentially dominate minor differences in content. It is entertainment that counts and it plays well. Certainly war movies continue to be popular. "Saving Private Ryan," heralded for its "realism" and celebration of the costs of violence, yet depicting war-as-heroic, motivated tens of thousands of tourists to storm the beaches of Normandy and seek the grave of "Martin," a fictitious character.

The military-media complex generates new reality. Riding the latest wave of jingoism on an expansive sea of commerce, NBC's anchor, Tom Brokaw, wrote a book—*The Greatest Generation*—about the WWII generation that was, of course, hyped on NBC. Rare is the critical comment about Brokaw's idyllic production, but there are a few. One columnist noted a number of shortcomings of the "greatest generation," e.g., racism, sexism, and then added:

> The greatest generation had to come from the United States, where it would get the greatest exposure. And reach the greatest number of consumers. And engender the greatest sense of nostalgia. And have the greatest chance of landing on the bestseller list (Montini 1999, B1).

The Gulf War productions were accompanied by other programs that had an overriding impact on social order. Playing on the discourse of fear that pervades domestic policies involving crime, drugs, gangs, domestic terrorism—and the need to protect "children"— President Clinton, with resounding approval from Congress, has promised to expand the Defense Budget, to take care of our brave men and women in uniform, even as the battle against the likes of "Saddam" continue. The latest twist, following from several popular movies about deadly "foreign" viruses, is to prepare ourselves for "biological, chemical and computer warfare." In a speech to the National Academy of Sciences (January 22, 1999), President Clinton proposed nearly $3 billion to defend ourselves against impending germ warfare and unscrupulous computer hackers, with the aid of a team of crack "cybercorps" of computer security experts, who can respond to a computer crisis. Assuring his audience

that civil liberties will not be trampled, the government will continue to organize its military intelligence, criminal justice and public health agencies to deal with the impending threats.

The reality of the moment is reflected in previous programs. The impeachment hearings of President Clinton, including the votes, were carried live by several networks, although audiences were not significantly larger than top prime time shows. A "split screen" format that had been developed for sports coverage enabled cable news viewers to see "live" explosions in Baghdad and listen to members of the House of Representatives vilify President Clinton for disrespecting the law. With a fireplace in the visual background, media consultant Schwarzkopf was asked what a difference the missiles just used on Iraq might have made in the Vietnam War. With a smile, he said that the politicians then may not have permitted the military to use them against Hanoi. Things are different now.

Citations

Black, G. 1991. "Rolodex Army Wages a Nintendo War: TV's Deskbound Generals Tune Out on the Crucial Issues—Morality, Economics, Values." *Los Angeles Times*, Jan. 27, Opinion: (M), p. 7.

Jackall, R. and Hirota, J. M.. 1995. "America's First Propaganda Ministry: The Committee on Public Information During the Great War." Pp. 137-173, in Robert Jackall (ed.), *Propaganda*. New York: New York University Press.

Lowry, B. 1998. "Brave New World for Iraq Coverage; Television: There Are Now Three all-News Cable Channels, Creating a Difficult Environment for Network News Operations." *Los Angeles Times*, Dec. 19, Calendar: (F), p. 1.

Montini, E. J. 1999. "Scamming a Great Generation." *The Arizona Republic* Jan. 17, 1999, B1.

Topping, S. 1998. "The Military and the Media Suspend Hostilities; Late-Breaking Foreign Policy, by Warren P. Strobel, United States Institute of Peace." *Columbia Journalism Review* March/April, p. 58.

Vogel, S. 1998. "Military Trains a Special Corps of Public Relations Troops; 3,500 Journalists a Year are Schooled at Brand-New Center at Fort Meade." *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel* Oct. 25, p.6 (Source: Washington Post).

Nippert-Eng and Fine: The Pursuit of Workplace Culture, con't.

tional culture (notably the work of Michael Burawoy, Melville Dalton, and Rosabeth Moss Kanter), these popular tomes made it apparent that organizational culture was "hot." In back-to-back volumes of the *Annual Review of Sociology*, Fine (1984) and Ouchi and Wilkins (1985) demonstrated the fruitfulness of this metaphor.

Over the years a set of case studies, including detailed ethnographies, depicted the cultures of particular firms. Beyond these, sociologists and organizational studies schol-

ars examined subsidiary issues, such as the role of narrative in organizations (notably Joanne Martin and David Boje), the impact of gendered expectations in the workplace (e.g. Cynthia Epstein, Kathleen Gerson and Christine Williams); the role of emotional work (e.g., Arlie Hochschild and Robin Leidner), the impact of technology on work culture (e.g., Stephen Barley, Julian Orr and Robert Zussman); and organization response to decision-making, conflict, failure and error (e.g., Robert Jackall, Calvin Morrill, Diane Vaughan

and Charles Bosk). This is no place for a literature review; our point is simply that the examination of organizational culture has become a central feature of the sociology of culture and of organizational studies.

Students of organizational culture argue that all organizations possess a distinctive and definable culture. In addition, depending upon the size and structure of a firm, there may be multiple group cultures (or "idiocultures") within the organization, grounded in close-knit interactional systems — a construct originally presented in 1979 by Fine to explain the different climates of Little League baseball teams. Each workgroup, — whether a research team, a department, members of a specific strata, a division, or an occupational group — shares common cultural elements with the broader organization. However, each group within the organization may also possess its own central, defining cache of thoughts, behaviors, and implements.

Accordingly, any employee may share in several idiocultures, as each group to which she or he belongs constitutes a cultural circle of influence. Unless it is an extremely small or new organization, there are bound to be a variety of cultures present, equal at least to the number of well-established groups. The presence of these distinct, competing, and sometimes antagonistic cultures and counter-cultures may have considerable impact on a firm, a group, or an individual employee.

Much of the analysis of organization culture has had a static point of view, taking the organizational form for granted. Yet, as has become increasingly evident, the nature of work as we approach the Third Millennium has altered significantly and will continue to be redefined. How might the study of workplace culture be affected by changes in the world of work?

Consider a few of the most obvious and dramatic changes now occurring. In the immediate future, sociologists of work can expect to see increased diversification in the conceptual and practical boundaries surrounding not only the workplace, but the workday, the employee, the manager, and the firm. In a short time we may see as much diversification in what these things mean and how we expect them to look as we currently perceive in the concept of work itself.

For instance, we see increased breaching of the conventional boundary that separates home and work. Policies, practices, and opportunities to integrate these worlds and to blur their traditional borders are increasing for numerous occupations, organizational strata, and collective bargaining units. Increasing amounts of remote work activity contribute strongly to this trend, whether the labor is now performed at home, in one's car, or at a client's office. Innovative "quality of life" programs also smudge the home-work boundary as on-site day care and elder care, after school programs, satellite schools, and other flex-time and flex-place programs are increasingly appearing in the workplace.

Of course, visions and manifestations of a sharp division between home and work still exist. In these, home and work are distinct and implicitly mutually exclusive realms. However, as Nippert-Eng argues in her work, never before have there been such varied, simultaneous, and often simultaneously competing, depictions of the home-work boundary. As a consequence, some of our most tenuously held assumptions of the conceptualization and practice of work are being tested; such images are enriched and made more complex in the process. Workers, managers, employment attorneys, and workplace researchers are increasingly unable to take for granted such "obvious" and "obdurate" concepts such as the "workplace" and the "workday"; what constitutes a "fair day's work"; the characteristics and roles of "co-workers"; rights to workplace privacy and freedom from surveillance; what it means to supervise or manage someone; what is a reasonable amount of technical, material and administrative support from an organization; the behavior of a "committed" worker (or family member); and the grounds on which organizational rewards and opportunities for future advancement are distributed.

Consider also the move towards teamwork in the workplace. Teamwork has been a buzzword for a long time in certain industrial and professional sectors. But in other domains, "silo" practices of each individual sitting in her or his separate space and completing assignments relatively independent of anyone else's efforts are being replaced by much more interactive modes of work.

New work teams often cut across departments, divisions, and occupations. They may also cut across organizational hierarchies, incorporating individuals from the assembly line to the administrative heads of divisions. Add a few consultants and/or clients and such teams may even include those whose roles are formally outside of the organization. Team-based work complicates employees' lives even more in matrix-type organizations, of course, where the same individual may serve on several teams, simultaneously.

In team work, an individual's job and day is more directly dependent on and embedded within others' work. The line between an individual's job performance and future, and that of the groups within which she or he labors, is becoming more difficult to determine. Visions of autonomous employees making or breaking their own careers on the basis of their own efforts are now complicated by collective practices of worker groups. Team work may demand not only new sets of skills, creating and refining new group cultures in the process, but it may demand new ways of conceiving and demonstrating workplace justice along with a new way of envisioning one's identity as a worker.

Accordingly, reward structures are being altered and complicated, too, as individuals are increasingly rewarded for the success or failure of their teams. Relatively new mechanisms range from profit sharing and individual bonuses and raises to "golden handcuff" project-linked incentives.

The blurring of the line between self and others is matched, however, by that surrounding the ever-more-elusive creature known as the manager. What, precisely, distinguishes managers from non-managers? The range of plau-

sible answers to this question becomes especially clear in work arrangements like self-directed or high-performance work teams. Here, the goal of daily life is to transfer managerial functions to front-line workers. What is the difference between these classes of people, then? It may be nothing more – or less – than a title, a credential, a benefits package, a parking space, a way of dressing, access to certain kinds of information, the right to belong to the union, or the right to blur other boundaries that the other worker cannot.

At the very least, we see yet another example of diversity in how this line is drawn. In one workplace, the managerial/non-managerial line is placed according to traditional, authoritarian models of supervisors and subordinates who are under their surveillance. In another, the line is based on who is the "road block remover" and who is actually trying to "build the road." In yet another, the distinction may be between a financial overseer (often untrained in the specifics of a particular industry or occupation) and the people who actually do the work. And in other workplaces, employee-owned and operated firms obliterate the conceptual and practical line between manager and subordinate in still other ways.

Finally, the increased reliance on consultants and other providers of out-sourced services, the utilization of part-time workers, and the closer linkages between vendors and their clients – especially in research and development and engineering firms – have led to much more amorphous and dynamic boundaries surrounding the firm. It is more difficult than ever to tell who works for whom, especially without a temporal qualifier. When workers are temporarily leased between Boeing and McDonnell-Douglas for years, even that qualifier may not be enough to determine who really works for whom. All of this occurs within an extraordinary environment of mergers and take-overs and alliances formed on a daily basis, each of which changes the borders of firms. In short, the boundaries of an organization will continue to become more dynamic, expanding and contracting more quickly and through more diverse avenues than ever before.

The study of workplace culture surely will be affected by these trends. Each of these aspects of work will be necessarily incorporated into future studies of workplace culture. The fact that we can no longer take for granted what is meant by these concepts means that any study of workplace culture will have to specify each of these dimensions and the roles they play in a particular organization.

For instance, figuring out what the workplace is, and exactly who belongs to it, is going to be increasingly problematic. However, if we manage to settle this question – at least for the purposes of a specific case study – this diversity promises to aid in sorting out what is and is not shared across the membership of a group. The varieties of configurations and permutations of organizations and their members should not only help identify workplace culture, but

also improve our assessment of its differential impact on the lives of employees, organizations, and perhaps even industries. An increase in the situations in which internal workgroup diversity and even interorganizational diversity is more visible will illuminate what is shared, what isn't, and how this affects employees and the organization overall.

In addition, these changes may force us to pay more attention to technological and communicative changes that have tended not to be adequate addressed by students of workplace culture. For instance, researchers should focus more on those interactional elements of organizational life that rely on telecommunications technologies. Telephone calls, e-mail exchanges, and faxes are becoming ever more important because the demand to interact with others – and to do it efficiently – is greater than ever. Further, we need to pay greater attention to interactions with people who are not on the organizational payroll, but who nonetheless have a powerful influence on the daily life of the firm. Since those interactions often occur outside the organization, ethnographers should necessarily travel to those places, too. Restaurants, homes, cars, hotel suites, conference rooms, and offices off-site need to be included as the "workplace."

These workplace changes will contribute to figuring out the types of organizational and industrial structures that may emerge in the future. When we add to the above changes two other trends now visible in the workplace, the importance of culture as an entry point for understanding structure becomes clear. First, we see an increased demand for employees to do more of the work for themselves. Organizations are redirecting more of the supportive costs and tasks of doing business onto employees not traditionally responsible for these costs and tasks. With fewer organizational resources to support their work, employees essentially must become a bunch of workplace Eagle Scouts, able to fix computers, create desk-top publishable reports, do person-hour estimates, answer phones and return messages, photocopy, write and mail correspondence, balance books, furnish offices, and host guests. Substantive expertise is no longer sufficient to be prepared for work each day. Combined with across-the-board downsizing (leaving fewer permanent employees doing the same work and having longer periods of time before workers are replaced,) the result may be a substantial change in the things that workers think about, discuss, and enact. These changes may actually be symptomatic of the virtual disappearance of numerous positions at the bottom of the organizational hierarchy.

Second, for some time there has been an increase in the number of organizational positions held by an employee over her or his career. Movement between organizations may include occupational switches, as well. By examining the culture of an organization, we may describe the impact of this on an organization's structure. Will we discover a homogenization of unique workplace cultures due to cross-fertilization? Will currently distinct organizational structures becoming increasingly isomorphic? Or will diversity increase

both in the structure and culture of organizations? Will the power centers of organizations remain unaffected by this transience, as gypsies – whether assembly-line workers, engineers, or CEOs – are pushed to the cultural periphery? Will a two-tiered structure of employees emerge, just as solidified as current schisms, but based on tenure within an organization?

Clearly this essay has raised far more questions than it has answered. However, in so doing, it underlines our point that the examination of organizational culture is and will remain a vibrant area. With each structural, organizational and technological change, internal cultures will change, reflecting and promoting the broader cultural shifts that impact the organization in multiple ways. Accordingly, this is an arena of social life that is richly, uniquely suited to the exploratory talents of cultural, especially ethnographic sociologists.

Studying Culture: Departments that Emphasize the Sociology of Culture

Editor's Note: *This article debuts a new feature in the newsletter. In this and future issues, I will include "self studies" provided by departments specializing in the sociology of culture. Please keep these issues close at hand during your undergraduate advising hours. They will provide a wealth of information as you guide your culture-minded students in submitting graduate school applications.*

Northwestern University

Northwestern has extraordinary strength in cultural sociology. A traditional area of emphasis in the Sociology Department, the culture/society linkage continues to be central to the research and teaching of many departmental professors and graduate students. Interpretive approaches, qualitative methods, and substantive concerns with race and gender and with the arts have long been distinctive to cultural research in this department. More recently institutional and organizational linkages, for example in explorations of the interplay between law and culture, and more quantitative research techniques have been added, making this department unsurpassed in the breadth of its cultural sociology.

Outside the department, Northwestern offers units like Radio/TV/Film, Performance Studies, Journalism, Communications Studies, and the Garrett Theological Seminar, which — along with the conventional arts-and-sciences departments — enrich the interdisciplinary explorations that cultural sociology often entails.

Below is an overview of some of these activities that enrich the graduate level study of culture from a sociological vantage point.

Courses: During any given year there are likely to be a half dozen courses in the sociology department that relate directly to cultural sociology. Over the next two years, for example, the following will be offered:

D06 - 1 Classical Theory in Sociological Analysis*
(Espeland)
D06 - 2 Modern Theory in Sociological Analysis*
(Espeland)
D06 - 3 Contemporary Theory in Sociological Analysis* (Lee)

* These three required courses typically have a heavy cultural emphasis.

D 20 - Introduction to Cultural Sociology /the Sociology of Culture (Griswold; Fine)
D 21 - Class and Culture (Beisel)
D 22 - Gender and Culture (Beisel)
D 23 - Race, Ethnicity, and Culture (Lee)
D 24 - Sociology of Art/Literature/Religion (Beck; Griswold)
D 26 - Special topics in cultural sociology: Cultural Studies (Lee)
D 26 - Special topics in cultural sociology: Collective Memory (Fine)
D 26 - Special topics in cultural sociology: Social and Cultural Landscapes (Griswold)
E 76 - The Culture and Society Workshop

Related courses that will be of interest to graduate students working on culture:

Field Methods (Fine)
Urbanization and Social Structure (Al Hunter)
Organizations and Environments (Brian Uzzi)

A large number of undergraduate courses offer opportunities for auditing or serving as a teaching assistant. These include Bernard Beck's "Sociology of Religion and Ideology," Mary Pattillo-McCoy's "Research Black Communities," Professor Fine's "Class and Culture," Orville Lee's "The Category of Race in America," and Wendy Griswold's "Sociology of Time and Space." In addition to being teaching assistants in such courses, advanced graduate students often teach their own courses, many of which relate to culture. Moreover, graduate students may take courses in other departments, and students interested in culture are particularly likely to pursue extra-departmental classes.

Workshops, Colloquia, Centers: The Sociology Department has a long tradition of weekly colloquia in which speakers from outside the university come in to present their research. A large number of these involve cultural sociology, reflecting the interests of the department. During the past year, for example, we have had Lynn Spillman talking about cultural and nationalism, Richard Peterson talking about fabricating authenticity in country music, John Mohr talking about discourse analysis, and Joshua Gamson talking about unconventionality sexualities and TV talks shows.

Newer and of considerable interest to advanced graduate students is the Workshop on Culture and Society. The

Culture and Society Workshop, a research seminar for advanced graduate students in the social sciences and the humanities, is a community of students and faculty from a variety of disciplines who meet weekly to further their individual research agendas and to develop their understandings of the linkages between, and mutual constitution of, social structures and cultural forms. Three types of activities take place during the weekly meetings. First and foremost, the Workshop is a forum where participants present their research in various stages of development. For example, students present drafts of articles, early stages of their dissertation proposals, recently completed chapters, final theses, or practice job talks. Faculty members present their current work as well. Second, the workshop sponsors visiting scholars to read papers and exchange ideas with participants. Third, the workshop conducts discussions of readings and topics of common interest.

In addition to the Workshop, Northwestern has a large number of interdepartmental programs and centers, and these are often appropriate ways through which to pursue cultural studies. Examples include the Center for International and Comparative Studies, the Women's Studies Program , the Program for African Studies, and the Center for the Humanities, to mention just a few.

Dissertations and other graduate student research: Northwestern professors have worked with graduate students writing dissertations in a wide variety of culture-related topics. These dissertations include:

— the dramatic rise of home schooling in the late twentieth century;
— law, ritual, and politics in same-sex marriages;
— feminist rhetoric in the family leave debate;
— culture, gender, and reproduction among Mexican immigrants;
— black nationalism and the emergence of Afrocentricity;
— Indian-Americans' marital decisions as "doing culture";
— white slavery and racial purity;
— symbolic uses of space in a white working-class community;
— gender and power in Senegalese religious cults;
— urban spaces and the Chicago blues.

This variety suggests that students are able, and indeed are encouraged, to pursue an endless range of research topics, so long as the pursuit be rigorous.

Cultural research does not begin at the dissertation stage, however. Many first and second-year graduate students undertake research projects, often in conjunction with the second-year paper, which may result in professional presentations, publications, and dissertation topics. Current pre-dissertation research involves:

— images of learning and wisdom in black popular music;

— the reproduction of ethnicity in German-American schools;
— generational differences in the meanings attributed to the "Star Wars" films;
— the legal construction of black women's bodies.

Collaborative research between faculty and graduate students is routine, and frequently such work produces co-authored articles.

Faculty: The professors most involved in cultural sociology are Bernard Beck, Nicola Beisel, Wendy Espeland, Gary Fine, Wendy Griswold, Albert Hunter, Orville Lee, and Mary Pattillo-McCoy. Information about their specific research interests may be found on the departmental web-site.

--Bruce Carruthers

Princeton University

Cultural sociology became a formal part of Princeton's graduate program a decade ago. Although department faculty had long shared interests in theoretical aspects of culture and its role in such institutions as religion and the arts or in comparative development, the present shape of cultural sociology was molded chiefly by the confluence of interests among professors Paul DiMaggio, Michele Lamont, Robert Wuthnow, and Viviana Zelizer.

DiMaggio has been interested in sociology of the arts and arts administration, the role of culture in neoinstitutional analysis of organizatioins, cognition and culture, and cultural conflicts. Lamont has been interested in symbolic boundaries, status, and inequality; racial identity and social membership; collective and national identity; definitions of excellence in higher education; and cultural theory. Wuthnow has been interested in the cultural aspects of religion and spirituality, the comparative history of cultural movements, and the cultural construction of work and money, morality, and civic commitment. Zelizer has been interested in situating presumably rationalizing structures and processes in concrete cultural and social settings, past and present; her work has included the study of life insurance, valuation of children, social meaning of money, and compensation systems.

The Princeton program has self-consciously attempted to bring diverse methods to bear on the study of culture and to expose its students to these differing methods. Historical methods, including evidence from court cases, newspapers and periodicals, publications, and secondary sources, has been important in DiMaggio's, Wuthnow's, and Zelizer's work. In-depth qualitative interview data has been emphasized in some of Lamont's and Wuthnow's work. Surveys and other statistical data have been used extensively by DiMaggio and Wuthnow, while DiMaggio, Lamont, Wuthnow, and Zelizer have all employed content analysis and other methods of analyzing texts. The common denominator is a strong emphasis on the empirical study of culture, including efforts both to examine the content of

culture itself and to relate this content to the institutional contexts that produce and legitimate it.

Cultural sociology at Princeton is integrated with faculty and student interests in other areas of sociology, such as the study of economic processes, organizations, inequality, social change, and historical sociology. It is one of several "clusters" in which graduate students can specialize. Clusters are broad areas of specialization in the department. The culture cluster builds on students' work during their first year in classical and contemporary theory, quantitative and qualitative methods, and statistics by providing students with seminars and reading courses in which to study influential books and articles in the sociology of culture.

Students interested in cultural sociology typically write one or both of their pre-generals papers on some aspect of culture. In the fall of their third year, as part of their general examination, these students identify cultural sociology as one of their three areas. Preparation requires developing and mastering an extensive reading list that includes both general and theoretical works, as well as more varied substantive and empirical works. In each year of their graduate studies, students in cultural sociology participate in one or more workshops in which they present and discuss research-in-progress. Most students interested in cultural sociology also gain strong preparation in at least two others of sociology, such as economic sociology, political sociology, social movements, gender, or stratification.

Graduate students from Princeton have written on a wide variety of topics for their dissertations and many of these have subsequently been published as books or articles. For instance, Karen Cerulo's *Identity Designs*, on national anthems and flags, grew out of her dissertation on this topic. It employed quantitative methods to code musical and visual symbolism and to relate these structures to other variables. Timothy Dowd's dissertation on the popular music industry also used quantitative methods to code musical structures and relate them to industry characteristics. John Evans' dissertation on genetic engineering made use of quantitative content analysis of bioethics citations, articles, and testimony. Qualitative analysis has been featured in other dissertations. Marsha Witten's *All Is Forgiven* analyzed the rhetorical structure of mainline Protestant and fundamentalist sermons to understand how they construct and delimit meanings. Maureen Waller's dissertation analyzed interview data to show how poor black and white non-residential fathers and single mothers understand the meaning of fatherhood. Libby Schweber's dissertation on the rise of demography in France and vital statistics in England examined a large number of scientific studies from the late nineteenth-century to determine how disciplines began to assert themselves and how disciplinary assertion was influenced by relationships with state agencies. Matthew Chew's dissertation compared the importation of western philosophy in Japan and China at the beginning of the twentieth century, based on extensive archival research. John Schmalzbauer combined quantitative and qualitative methods in his dissertation on journalists and social scientists, as did Bethany Bryson in studying debates about multiculturalism.

Current graduate students' research reflects efforts that have been made in recent years to provide extramural funding (e.g., through the Center for Arts and Cultural Policy or the Center for the Study of Religion), as well as innovative ideas about how to study questions of wider interest in the discipline. Jason Kaufman has coded information from late nineteenth-century city directories to develop measures of voluntary social capital and to relate these to changing municipal social policies. Brad Wilcox has combined data from large national surveys with qualitative interviews in churches to examine the changing relationships between religious beliefs and fathers' family and child-rearing behavior. Michael Moody has done extensive interviewing and participation among water-rights interest groups in California to determine how constructions of public goods and private interest are developed and deployed. Abby Saguy's comparative study of sexual harassment laws in the United States and France illustrates the department's interest in encouraging cross-national investigations of cultural issues.

Princeton faculty and students have been actively involved in the Culture Section of the ASA. Section members are frequent guests at the department's Culture and Inequality Workshop and at the Religion and Culture Workshop. Professors Lamont, DiMaggio, Wuthnow, and Zelizer also serve as editors of the Princeton University Press Series in Culural Sociology.

--Robert Wuthnow

Editor's Note: *Would you like your department featured in this column? Please contact me at cerulo@rci.rutgers.edu*

Election Results, 1999: Culture Section of the ASA

Chair: *Eviatar Zerubavel*
Secr./Treas.: *Bethany Bryson*
Council: *Nina Eliasoph; Robin Wagner-Pacific*

Renew your membership or start a membership by sending $12 (regular) $10 (<$20,000) or $5 (student) to: American Sociological Association; 722 N Street NW; Washington DC 20036 ... or contact membership secretary Laura Miller at LAMILLER@vassar.edu for more information.

DeVeaux, Scott. *The Birth of Bebop: A Social and Musical History.* Berkeley: University of California Press. Scott DeVeaux's Birth of Bebop is one of those rare books that, remarkably free of science jargon, humanist posturing, and partisan aesthetic blinders, explores the creative process in the interaction of small groups of practitioners caught in a web of class, race, style, generational, "art," and commercial conflicts. Richly documented through biographical detail and musical notation, DeVeaux, a professor of music, powerfully exemplifies what Mills long ago called the "sociological imagination." Here is something of what cultural sociology can be.

Cetina, Karin Knorr. *Epistemic Cultures: How the Sciences Make Knowledge.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. By comparing two specific arenas of scientific advancement, Cetina deftly shows the ways that laboratory cultures and their emergent vocabularies of motive shape the production of new knowledge. Thinking of this and the DeVeaux book together, it would be wonderful to understand these science fields in terms of the richly textured outside world in which they are imbedded; it would be great fun to see the development of jazz through the lens of epistemic culture.

Wolfe, Charles K., A *Good-Natured Riot: The Birth of the Grand Ole Opry.* Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press. Solid historical description. Wolfe reveals the early days of this icon of country music as the outcome of a set of halting and often contradictory activities by 1920s individuals and groups, none of whom would be welcome on the stage of the twenty-first century Opry.

Merrim, Stephanie, *Early Modern Women's Writing and Sor Juana Ines de la Cruz.* Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press. This book maps the field of seventeenth-century women's writings in Spain, England and France focusing on the proto-feminist writings of Sor Juana.

Austin, Joe And Michael Willard, editors. *Generations of Youth: Youth Cultures and History in Twentieth-Century America.* New York: New York University Press. A culture critical excursion through the youth worlds of the Boy Scouts, Native American boxers, Malcolm X in a zoot suit, femininity in fan clubs, lesbian, bisexual, and lesbian internet culture, Chicano lowriding, African-American hip-hop, graffiti writing, and Native-American youth powwows. Generations of Youth remembers the ways in which young people's autonomy and "youth" itself is produced in negotiation with adult authority and institutions of socialization.

Inness, Sherrie A., editor. *Delinquents and Debutantes: Twentieth-Century American Girls' Cultures.* New York: New York University Press. The authors examine the myriad ways that a wide variety of discourses and activities, from popular girls' magazines and advertisements to baby-sitting and Girl Scouts, help to form girls' experiences of what it means to be girl and later a woman.

Hazlett, John Downton. *My Generation: Collective Autobiography and Identity Politics.* Chicago: University of Wisconsin Press. A collection of autobiographical accounts of the rise to consciousness of the intensely self-important boomer generation. Abbie Hoffman, Jerry Ruben, Tom Hayden, Jane Alpert, Peter Collier, David Harris, Todd Gitlin and others. What about Pete Townsend, Janis Joplin, Jimmi Hendrix, Charles Manson?

Smith, Sidonie and Julia Watson, editors. Women, *Autobiography, Theory: A Reader.* Chicago: University of Wisconsin Press. This is a collection of reflections on women writing about themselves. Apparently for most of the men in the book above it's a question of reconstructing what one did. Here it is about process.

Pick, John and Malcolm Anderson. *Building Jerusalem: Art Industry and the British Millennium.* Newark NJ: Harwood Academic Publishers. The authors conclude that in spite of the state planning of Britain's "leisure industries," the country is nevertheless in

a state of cultural confusion. The book is most instructive in its comparison of the free-market chaotic cultural economy of the nineteenth-century with the boring state-dependent culture of today.

Rosen, Charley. *Scandals of '51: How the Gamblers Almost Killed College Basketball.* New York: Seven Stories Press. The model of gambling in amature athletics was set at CCNY in 1951. Rosen identifies the players, coaches, gangsters, clergymen, and politicians that made up the elaborate network controlling the outcomes of many college basketball games and protecting those involved.

Kayton, Bruce. *Radical Walking Tours of New York City.* New York: Seven Stories Press. While standard guidebooks to NYC celebrate the Rockefellers, the Trumps, and the Helmsleys, Bruce Kayton offers twelve walking tours of the sites of some of the pivotal events in the history of organized labor, civil rights, gay rights, free expression, and world peace. See Wall St. from the other side of the street.

Nixon, Paul. *Sociality-Music-Dance: Human Figurations in a Transylvanian Valley.* Gotenberg, Sweden: University of Gotenberg Press. Nixon shows how Marxist-Leninist theories evolved into grotesques perpetuating age-old hatreds between Gypsies, Romanian-speaking and Hungarian-speaking Transylvanians. In the words of Thelonius Monk, folk culture ain't no sideshow. Today Kosovo, tomorrow Transylvania!

Kohn, Al and Bob Kohn. *Kohn on Music Licensing.* New York: Aspen Law and Business. A text on how music is made into money. It's both stunning and chilling.

Frank Cass' Four

Booth, Douglas. *The Race Game: Sport and Politics in South Africa.* Booth details the important role that sports played in helping to forge the New South Africa. In the 1970s, inter-

national sports federations banned South Africa from competition because of its strict segregation policies. The political leaders ignored the boycott for some time, but in the early 1980s they began a series of compromises that amounted to ending racial discrimination and bringing South Africa into the International sports community.

Dauncey, Hugh and Geoff Hare. *France and the 1998 World Cup: The National Impact of a World Sporting Event.* The authors detail the efforts of the French government to be the host country for the 1998 World Cup of soccer. They show the changes on the local public infrastructure needed to support the world event. And they outline the links between sports, business, and politics that are mobilized. Finally, they show how the World Cup illustrates the distinctive elements of French culture and national policy.

Beck, P.J. *Scoring for Britain: International Football and International Politics, 1900-1939.* By examining the record of the first decades of the century, Beck brings into question the truism that there was a clear separation between politics and sport in Britain.

Collins, Tony. *Rugby's Great Split: Class, Culture and the Origins of Rugby League Football.* In the late Victorian and Edwardian times class conflict tore rugby apart, and the result was two distinct sets of rules for the sport. In the process, what was an amateur game for the male youth of the elite, became a professional sport patronized primarily by the working class of the North of England.

Three from Cambridge Univ. Press

Smith, Philip, editor. *The New American Cultural Sociology.* A tasty sampler of selections by many who have made the "new" cultural sociology in America over the past several decades. Gaye Tuchman, Niki Beisel, Paul DiMaggio, Gary Alan Fine, Wendy Griswold, Steven Seidman, Jeffrey Alexander, Barry Schwartz, Robert Wuthnow, Michele Lamont, William Gamson, and William Sewell are among those included. I wonder what comprised the "old American cultural

sociology?"

Martinez, D.P. editor. *The Worlds of Japanese Popular Culture: Gender, Shifting Boundaries and Global Culture.* This group of anthropologists considers topics from sumo, karaoki, manga, and women's magazines, to soccer and morning television.

La Fontaine, J.S. *Speak of the Devil: Tales of Satanic Abuse in Contemporary England.* Fontaine finds there is a good deal less here than meets the eye. In her detailed study of a number of notable cases, she finds no evidence of devil worship. Behind the hysteria, she finds a social movement comparable to the witch hunts of the 16th and 17th centuries.

Univ. of Minnesota Trio

Dirks, Nicholas B. *The Near Ruins: Cultural Theory at the End of the Century.* A celebration of the fruits of a quarter century of post-modernist literary criticism.

Fenster, Mark. *Conspiracy Theory: Secrecy and Power in American Culture.* Fenster explores the workings of America's fascination with conspiracy theories as exemplified in the militia movement, The X- Files, and Christian apocalyptic thought.

Land, Jeff. *Active Radio: Pacifica's Brash Experiment.* In April 1949, KPFA in Berkeley, California began to broadcast an utterly new combination of political discussion and cultural discussion. Land explores the story of Pacifica's role in the cultural politics of the 1960s and details this practical alternative to commercial radio.

Four from Sage

Miller, Toby, and Alec McHoul. *Popular Culture and Everyday Life.* An anomaly in the Sage series, this review of cultural studies takes issue with the perspective's prevailing emphasis on speculation rather than research and its smug focus on the spectacular, the titillating, the wordy, and the grotesque. In their text-like presentation, the authors focus readers' attention on the mundane and everyday routines of popular culture to better explore the workings of power and resistance.

Hetherington, Kevin. *Expressions of*

Identity: Space, Performance, Politics. Based in the new social movements perspective that focuses on enthusiasms organized around expressive behavior, Hetherington offers a number of ways of looking at identity politics. In the process he challenges the view that social movements are historical agents of change.

Rogers, Mary F. *Barbie Culture.* A rigorously random walk through many of the topics exciting Barbie researchers: her origins as a German sexual fetish, the obsessions of her fans (young-old, female-male, gay-straight, etc.), her manufacture in Asian sweatshops, the seductions of collectability, the soap-opera-like dynamics of Mattel, and the corporation's unflagging efforts to control the meaning of Barbie. Cited sources are wide-ranging but many obvious ones are ignored as well.

Davis, Larry E., editor. *Working with African American Males: A Guide to Practice.* While Barbie must be taken seriously, these authors don't take African-American men seriously but see them as objects of their professional expertise.

Altamira Press Quartet *(Altamira is a vigorous young branch of Sage with a tilt toward scholarship.)*

Min, Pyong Gap and Rose Kim, editors. *Struggle for Ethnic Identity: Narratives by Asian American Professionals.* The editors provide a wide array of observations of the complexities of the experience of 1.5 and second generation Asian immigrants to the US. On the one hand they are privileged professionals, on the other, outsiders; on the one hand they have strong family ties, and on the other, these distance them from other Americans.

Champagne, Duane, editor. *Contemporary Native American Cultural Issues.* The authors explore the issues faced by peoples newly identified as Native American who are trying to find a way out of a life of poverty and isolation without giving up their newly-found Native-American identity.

Smeins, Linda E. *Building an American Identity: Pattern Book Homes and Communities 1870-1900.* Smeins

makes excellent use of a set of house pattern books published between 1870 and 1990 to explore the rapidly evolving notion of the characteristics of an American house plan and exterior design.

Dunaway, David. *Aldous Huxley Recollected: An Oral History*. Dunaway focuses on the American period of Huxley's life usually dismissed by critics as wasted years. Using sources ranging from commentaries of contemporaries in Hollywood, analysis of early drafts of his movie scripts, and the extensive files collected by the FBI, Dunaway provides a clear view of the way Huxley worked and how cinematic conventions influenced his art.

Three from the Univ. of Texas Press

Prince, Stephen. *Savage Cinema: Sam Peckinpah and the Rise of Ultraviolent Movies*. Prince provides a celebration of the techniques of ultraviolence designed to control the moviegoers repose.

Baty, S. Paige. *E-mail Trouble: Love and Addiction @ the Matrix*. According to the advert for the book, "in this daring post-modern autobiography S. Paige Baty recounts her search for love and community on the Internet. Her book stands as a vivid feminist critique of our culture's [I would say "her"] love affair with technology and its dehumanizing of personal relationships."

Marlane, Judith. *Women in Television News Revisited: Into the Twenty-First Century*. Carrying on the work of her 1976 study *Women in Television News*, in this book Marlane asks 70 of the foremost women in television news to reflect on their successes, the personal and professional sacrifices that purchased those successes, and the barriers still confronting women in the news business.

Six from Aldine de Gruyter

Ferrell, Jeff and Neil Websdale, editors. *Making Trouble: Cultural Constructions of Crime, Deviance, and Control*. What a delight to see criminologists take seriously the prime tenant of cultural sociology that crime and deviance are created by those who make and enforce the law. Even better, the authors anthologized by Ferrell and Websdale play out the implications of this observation across the full range of topics traditionally in the purview of deviance and criminology.

Fishman, Mark and Gray Cavender, editors. *Entertaining Crime: Television Reality Programs*. Some of the chapters are devoted to authors' interpretations of the violence, power, and morality displayed in cop dramas and reality crime shows. Some report how police workers or the viewing public view crime on TV. There are articles on French and Dutch television crime shows as well.

Paillard, Bernard. *Notes on the Plague Years: AIDS in Marseilles*. Paillard was sent to Marseilles in 1988 to study the spread of AIDS there. More reflexive narrative than research report, the report of his four-year study documents the waves of moral panic that swept the city as successive subpopulations were affected.

Miller, Gale. *Becoming Miracle Workers: Language and Meaning in Brief Therapy*. Miller sees "brief therapy" as thoroughly post-modern. Rather than seeing clients' problems as having causes rooted deep in the past, this perspective focuses on their problems as social constructions, negative stories told by and to patients that keep them from taking control of their own lives. Brief therapy focuses on constructing positive stories that emphasize clients problem-solving skills. Gale ignores the other new factor, the battery of new drug therapies that eliminate the negative symptoms thus making it possible for people to believe the positive stories.

Lowe, Gary R. and P. Nelson Reid, editors. *The Professionalization of Poverty: Social Work and the Poor in the Twentieth Century*. The authors of this anthology deal with the consequences of a dilemma of contemporary professional social work practice. While social work developed to minister to the poor and lead them to prosperity, but most professional social workers today do not work in agencies primarily concerned with poverty clients, and those who do work with the poor have administrative or supervisory roles rather than delivering services directly to the poor.

Bush, Lawrence. *The Eclipse of Morality: Science, State, and Market*. Using historical examples drawn from the past two centuries, Busch shows how ideas originally proposed by Bacon, Hobbes, and Adam Smith became reified as what Busch calls scientism, statism, and marketism. He then goes on to show that proponents of these three views have failed and in the process have created disorder and despair.

Five from Scholarly Resources

Walker, Nancy A., editor. *What's So Funny? Humor in American Culture*. The authors of these fifteen essays provide a historical overview of the evolution of humor in American culture. The changing locus of humor shows the tensions of this society over ethnicity, gender, violence, family, change, and geography.

Williams, William H. *Slavery and Freedom in Delaware, 1639-1865*. Williams shows the shape of slavery outside the plantation system detailing its place in commerce, farming, and manufacturing.

Marten, James, editor. *The Civil War in Children's Magazines*. Marten provides a provocative view of slavery directed to children in the Northern states during the Civil War. Employing the heroic stories of young people, he shows how adults tried to explain why the nation was at war with itself.

Weber, Ralph E., editor. *Spymasters: The CIA Officers in Their Own Words*. Deadly serious, it plays as comedy, it plays as farce. It costs us all a lot of money, so enjoy.

Reis, Elizabeth, editor. *Spellbound: Women and Witchcraft in America*. Beginning with the "witches" of colonial America, the authors extend the focus through the nineteenth century to involve women's involvement in alternative spiritualities, and culminates with examinations of contemporary feminist neopagan and Goddess movements.

The Cultural Territories of Race: Black and White Boundaries, Edited by Michèle Lamont

A few years ago, the Culture Section inaugurated a new tradition: former chairs agree to edit a volume and give royalties to the section. In the past, these in-kind contributions have allowed us to increase our activities in various ways. Two volumes have come out so far: Diana Crane's *The Sociology of Culture: Emerging Theoretical Perspectives* (Blackwell, 1994) and Elizabeth Long's *From Sociology to Cultural Studies* (Blackwell 1997). A third volume published this time by the University of Chicago Press and the Russell Sage Foundation, has just become available: *The Cultural Territories of Race: Black and White Boundaries*, edited by Michèle Lamont

Contributors to this volume include confirmed and younger cultural sociologists, cultural anthropologists, and culture-sensitive political scientists working at the forefront of the race literature. The introduction by Michèle Lamont presents the objectives of the volume:

"This volume is offered with the goal of sharing close and empirically grounded analyses of the vast cultural territories of race. This goal is grounded in the conviction that it is possible to use the tools developed by cultural sociologists and cultural anthropologists productively to move beyond the politicized dichotomies of structure vs. culture. A growing number of scholars working in these fields have come to conceive of cultural tools as systemic, structural properties of the environment, or as available repertoires or scripts. This has important implications for the examination of the cultural dimensions of race: If culture consists of scripts, to say that the underprivileged (whether as members of a class or a racial group) have cultural understandings that help to reproduce their status is not necessarily conservative nor does it blame the victim. Furthermore, to understand racist beliefs as part of a grammar of argument does not mean that racism has to be viewed as asystemic or as the doing of isolated individuals. Of course, these theoretical shifts do not abolish class or racial inequality the way the creation of good stable jobs would. However, these shifts can make a difference by providing a more complex understanding of the cultural territories of race, i.e. of the place of cultural strategies of action, cognitive classification, identity politics, and developing ideologies, in the reproduction of racial inequality. Hence the importance of turning a new page and of focusing our attention on studies such as those included in this volume, which, although they generally do not address directly the presumed structure/culture divided, do take culture seriously."

Essays examine the cultural territories of race through topics such as blacks' strategies for dealing with rac-

ism, public categories for definition of race, and definitions of rules for cultural memberships. Empirically grounded, these studies analyze divisions among blacks according to their relationships with whites or with alternative black culture; differences among whites regarding their attitudes toward blacks; and differences both among blacks and between blacks and whites, in their cultural understandings of various aspects of social life ranging from material success to marital life and to ideas about feminism. The essays teach us about the largely under-examined cultural universes of black executives, upwardly mobile college students, fast-food industry workers, so-called deadbeat dads, and proponents of Afrocentric curricula.

Table of Contents

Culture Day at ASA 1999 -- Announcement from the Chair

"Culture Day" this year falls on Monday August 9 and Tuesday, August 10, the final days of the convention. The section sponsored sessions are as follows:

8/9 -- 2:30PM: *The Individual Experience of Culture: Personality, Cognition, Emotion, Identity.*

8/9 -- 4:30PM: *Perspectives on American Culture: Personal and Theoretical Reflections.*

8/10 -- 8:30AM: *Media and the Arts in Postindustrial Culture.*

8/10 -- 10:30AM: *Conservative and Progressive Voices in the Sociology of Culture.*

8/10 -- 12:30PM: *New Developments in Organizational Culture.*

8/10 -- 2:30PM: *Refereed Roundtables*

8/10 -- 3:30PM: *Business Meeting*

Dinner In Chicago: When section sessions fall on the final days of the convention, attendance often tends to be low. To encourage participation in these sessions and to reward the hardy souls who stay for them, the Culture Section will schedule a dinner Tuesday night at a restaurant (still to be designated) within a 10-minute cab ride of the convention hotels. (My Chicago culinary consultants are so far divided between Chinese, Greek, and Italian cuisine.)

Graduate student dinners will be partially subsidized by a number of the incredibly well paid senior faculty in our section. Whether we have a brief program to go along with dinner is also to be arranged.

If you would like to attend the Tuesday dinner, please contact Michael Schudson at: mschudson@ucsd.edu. When arrangements are made, you'll be contacted by return email and a final announcement will be made at the section business meeting. *--Michael Schudson*

Mark Your Calendars for a Special Conference !
Toward A Sociology of Culture and Cognition

In recent years, a small but growing chorus of voices has argued for the utility of a sociology of the mind. Proponents of this agenda, a group rooted primarily in the study of culture, contend that targeted sociological work on cognition would significantly enhance the existing literatures addressing human thought.

At present, the sociological voice registers as a mere whisper in the realm of cognitive science. Cognitive and developmental psychologists, linguists, and neuroscientists prove much more vocal in the study of the human mind. Representatives of these disciplines favor a universalistic frame in their research. Thus typically, cognitive scientists prioritize issues of mental uniformity; they probe the common denominators involved in human thought.

To be sure, such a focus has taught us much about the mind. Indeed, such works have unearthed the universal aspects that characterize complex cognitive processes such as awareness, information processing, classification, conceptualization, schematization, symbolization, and information retrieval. Yet for all of the virtues and strengths inherent in such work, cognitive science's current emphasis on "sameness" leaves us with many unanswered questions.

For example, cognitive science has convincingly documented the human propensity for classification. Yet, such literature is nearly silent regarding the variable salience of classification categories across different communities and cultures. Similarly, cognitive science has probed extensively the universal human practice of schematization. However, the field has told us little about the elements that drive humans to apply or withhold specific schemas at different historical moments or within different cultural contexts.

The answers to these questions and others like them demands that we augment current studies of the mind. Such questions urge us to move beyond issues of sameness and toward a deeper engagement of difference and distinction; such questions urge us to move toward a study of the mind that simultaneously considers culture and cognition.

In order to firmly establish a coherent sociology of culture and cognition, I am organizing a two-day national conference designed to engage this topic. This conference, along with a series of post-conference materials, are intended to define and "grow" the field. It is my hope that this event will launch a new network of scientific collaboration and stimulate new lines of sociological research.

This conference, entitled "Toward a Sociology of Culture and Cognition," will take place on November 12-13, 1999. The event will be held on the Rutgers University campus. The conference will consist of both formal panels and informal discussion sessions. In this way, participants will have the opportunity to engage in lively and in-depth discussion of issues.

Some of the speakers scheduled for formal presentations include: Albert Bergesen, Craig Calhoun, Karen Cerulo, Paul DiMaggio, Gary Alan Fine, William Gamson, John Martin, Carolyn Marvin, Joshua Meyrowitz, John Mohr, Barry Schwartz, Diane Vaughan, Jerome Wakefield, Harrison White, Robert Wuthnow, Viviana Zelizer, and Eviatar Zerubavel. Among those featured in discussion sessions will be David Altheide, Anne Bowler, Kathleen Carley, Larry Griffith, Doug Harper, James Jasper, Robert Kubey, Magali Larson, Matthew Lawson, Melinda Milligan, Ann Mische, Libby Schweber, Lyn Spillman, Robin Wagner-Pacifici, Richard Williams, and Robert Zussman.

For details on registration, the program, hotels, etc., contact me at: (908) 317-9727 or cerulo@rci.rutgers.edu I look forward to hearing from you! *—Karen Cerulo*

American Sociological Association

1307 New York Avenue NW, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20005-4701