Taste at Work

ON TASTE AND ORGANIZATION IN THE FIELD
OF CULTURAL PRODUCTION

Jenny Lantz
Taste at Work
*On Taste and Organization
in the Field of Cultural
Production*

Content

.

PART I

Introduction

A man with his occupational provenance in the organization at the center of this study, an integrated film company, puts it quite succinctly:

Taste is one of the most difficult things in this job. If you really love a certain kind of films and you get films that you personally don't like, it's really difficult.

This dissertation is concerned with taste in an organization in the cultural production field. "Taste" here encompasses more than everyday preferences in terms of music, art, clothing, food, design, etc; the employment of "taste" centers on its particular relevance for cultural production. Indeed, the citation above lays bare one of the peculiarities of the field of cultural production (cf. Bourdieu 1984) or "the creative industries"[1] (cf. Caves 2000): the significance of taste. Another way of putting this is that many people in the cultural production field share a concern for artistic achievement. They care about the product in terms of, for example, originality, artistic expression and technical qualities. Sometimes these feelings of aesthetic commitment are very strong.

However, cultural production requires diverse skills. Though very pertinent to some people in the field, taste and artistic expression are only secondary to others. Many people are rather indifferent to both employer and task (as long as the latter falls within the confines of the worker's competence). Indeed, this section of the workforce could be described as "being in for the money". Along these lines, economist Caves (2000) distinguishes between "creative" and "humdrum" inputs[2], where only the former can be characterized by an aesthetic commitment.

Thus, organizations in the field of cultural production bring together people of varying backgrounds, role perceptions and aspirations, a diversity that may lead to

13

conflicts regarding, for example, priorities and taste. Accompanying these differences are two competing principles of legitimacy.

Many organizational researchers address issues of legitimacy (see for example Meyer and Rowan 1977, Pfeffer and Salancik 1978, DiMaggio and Powell 1983, Dobbin 1994, Suchman 1995). Legitimacy may be said to refer to "a generalized perception or assumption that the actions of an entity are desirable, proper, or appropriate within some socially constructed system of norms, values, beliefs, and definitions" (Suchman 1995, p. 574). Much of this strand of research concerns how organizations gain legitimacy through the incorporation of rationalized institutional rules (see for example Meyer and Rowan 1977, DiMaggio and Powell 1983, Zucker 1987, Brunsson 1989, Dobbin 1994).

However, a basic assumption of this study is the distinctiveness of organizations in the field of cultural production. It can be summarized through the field's two competing principles of legitimacy, the cultural and the economic pole, based on, respectively, cultural and economic capital (Bourdieu 1993). My study of how the economic logic intersects with the cultural logic revolves around "taste". Thus, this dissertation presupposes the importance of taste[3] in an organization operating in the field of cultural production (see Becker 1982; Bourdieu 1984, 1993). However, it is not only the significance of taste that varies, as Caves suggests by his distinction between "humdrum" and "creative" labor, but the actual constructions of taste can vary across the organization.

14

By endorsing a social constructionist perspective, I base my study on the idea that the meaning of taste is continually constructed in the interaction among people. In the case of an organization in the field of cultural production, I regard the organization as an arena for the construction[4] of taste (and, naturally, of an abundance of other "things" such as leadership, gender, sexuality, deviance, competency, skills, etc (see for example Weick 1979, 1995; Liska 1981; Hosking 1988; Wahl 1992; Höök 2001a; Sjöstrand, Sandberg and Tyrstrup 2001; Wahl et al. 2001)).

The overall ambition of this study is to understand an organization located in the field of cultural production through the notion of taste. My rationale for this particular focus rests on the idea that taste is something every organizational member in the field must relate to in his or her work. Hence, this study calls for a closer look at the construction processes and uses of taste in organizations in the cultural production field. As a researcher, I too take part in constructing taste in the organization in question, through my preconceptions and theoretical choices. I problematize taste and organization in a *certain* way. In addition to the two intersecting logics presented above, this study is informed by select notions of taste.

Notions of taste

Taste can be conceptualized as an operationalization of cultural capital, as a medium for *distinction*, and is, accordingly, highly valued by the cultural pole in the field of cultural production (Bourdieu 1984). This kind of distinction can involve any cultural objects in the cultural consumption field (for example, art, music, literature, food, leisure activities), i.e., not just the product at the center of the organization. Based on the clear divide

between popular and "legitimate" taste, preferences for certain cultural products may be used to form symbolic boundaries around groups of people, boundaries which serve to include some and exclude others (see Bourdieu 1984, Lamont and Fournier 1992, Holt 1997). Symbolic boundaries may thus function as impediments to attaining certain positions within organizations.

It has however been demonstrated that not only can cultural objects be used as a basis for the formation of symbolic boundaries (as a medium for power), but they also can be employed in "least common denominator" conversations as a valuable *interaction medium* (Douglas and Isherwood 1979, DiMaggio 1987) in line with Simmel's sociability concept (Simmel 1950). By adding an organizational context to the study of taste, I automatically introduce a new set of conditions not present in other social contexts where the distinctive aspect of cultural objects might dominate. The role of taste in organizations in the field of cultural production is most likely not solely a question of distinction, not only because of the two principles of legitimacy, but also because of the organizational arena itself. Although power and domination is important, cooperation is a defining feature of organizational life. I know of no study that is explicitly concerned with both taste and organizations, but there are studies on organizations and the use of cultural products that may have implications for the study of taste as well (e.g., Erickson 1996).

Furthermore, and perhaps more importantly, at the center of organizations in the field of cultural production stand *cultural products* (for example, cds, films, books, art works, magazines), which organizational members inevitably have to relate to. In light of the varying degrees of *aesthetic commitment* among organizational

16

members, I would like to raise questions about how organizational members "use" taste with regards to the products at the business core. This is particularly interesting considering the fact that some organizational members presumably use cultural objects as a basis for distinction and most probably care about their artistic expression. How, then, do they deal with the fact that the products around which their work revolves may not always be in line with how they would like to present themselves or with their artistic preferences?

With a goffmanian perspective, I am interested in the organizational members' uses and conceptions of taste solely *in the organization*. Because social interaction in organizations is often asymmetrical (Sjöstrand 1997), I also call attention to the *power structures of organizations* when asking about the uses and constructions of taste at work. Those in dominant positions will have the interpretive prerogative, determining to a great extent how one should relate to taste. In other words, when exploring constructions of taste in the organization, the significance ascribed to the specific use of taste or construction of taste will depend on the power relations of the interactants.

Intersecting all fields, gender – a thoroughly studied basis for power (see for example Delphy 1984, Hirdman 1988, Wahl 1992) – is most likely crucial to the construction and use of taste. It is difficult to find statistics on the gender structure in the field of cultural production alone, but Regnö (2003) shows that in the year 2001, men held 64% of the management positions in organizations in recreation, culture, and sports. Many studies in the field of gender and organization focus explicitly or implicitly on organizations in the economic field (see for example Kanter 1977, Game and Pringle 1984, Walby 1986, Brown and Pechman 1987, Acker 1988, Adler

17

and Izraeli 1988, Wahl 1992, Höök 2001b, Holgersson 2003). Although there are reasons to believe that many of the gendering processes (see Acker 1988) in these organizations are applicable to organizations in the field of cultural production, there are some factors that make the latter type of organizations particularly interesting when highlighting gender. Since femininity and masculinity, just like economic and cultural capital, are dichotomously constructed, one could, for example, expect organizations in the cultural production field to have more women at the top near one of the poles. These organizations are nevertheless still often male dominated at both poles (see, for example, Alvesson and Köping 1993, Hermele 2002, Lauzen 2002, Kalmteg 2003, Birgerson 2005, Carp 2005, Lantz 2006a). As taste is supposedly central to the field of cultural production (Bourdieu 1984, 1993), I would like to further explore the significance of gender in organizations in this field by concentrating on the *relation between constructions of taste and gender*.

I shall conclude this section by calling attention briefly to the ways I, as a researcher, employ taste in this dissertation. Somewhat tangentially, the above problem area delineates two ways of interrogating taste. First, I stress the theoretical conceptualization of taste. In other words, I draw on the significance of taste according to central theories in the field of sociology of culture, and then apply these theories to the organizational setting of mixed principles of legitimacy and cultural products at the business core. The other issue is the constructions and practices of taste in the organization; what is taste, from the point of view of organizational members? In what respects do different organizational members use taste in the organizational arena? How are these practices constructed? I particularly address the role of gender in relation to taste.

Thus, it is my ambition to challenge the dichotomy between theory and practice (see Bourdieu 1990a, and chapter 6, p. 108) by using the theories on taste as a *tool-kit* for the purpose of addressing my research questions. In other words, despite a theoretical conceptualization of taste I will still be open to empirical constructions of taste among the organizational members.

MY OBJECTIVE AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Without further ado, I can now present the overriding objective of the study at hand:

To explore and develop concepts and theories regarding how organizational members in an organization in the field of cultural production relate to taste in their work, and how these relations are gendered.

Thus, a concern for the role of taste in organizations in the field of cultural production pushes me toward questions on the constructions and uses of taste in the organizational arena and in everyday work and questions on the relation between gender and taste in the same context:

What are the constructions of taste in an organization in the field of cultural production? How can these constructions be understood theoretically?

How, and for what purposes, is taste used in an organization in the field of cultural production? How can these uses be understood theoretically?

How do constructions of gender relate to constructions and uses of taste in an organization in the field of cultural production?

Before proceeding, there are some caveats and limitations to the study that should be mentioned. First, this dissertation revolves around an organization. Without denying the unquestionable importance of studies on fields, as proposed by Pierre Bourdieu, this study seeks to explore the meaning of taste in an *organization*. Thus, I will leave aside the wider picture of the struggles taking place in a specific field. Instead, I will draw upon Bourdieu's field theory in order to understand the organization as residing primarily in the field of cultural production and comprising competing logics. Accordingly, there will be different struggles going on simultaneously within the boundaries of the organization.

Second, this book centers on one organization in the field of cultural production. There is a range of companies within this section of the industry, many of which probably demonstrate close similarities. However, there will also be great differences between these sorts of organizations. Some of the idiosyncrasies derive from field or subfield, from location in fields (i.e., a dominated or a dominant position), and from organizational culture. As a case study based on theoretical sampling (see p. 196), the aim of my endeavor is to *explore and develop concepts and theories* regarding how organizational members relate to taste in their work in an organization in the field of cultural production. For this purpose, I have chosen to study an organization which I locate somewhere in the middle of the field of cultural production.

Third, by narrowing the study to taste in an organization, I attempt to control the social influence. Viewing taste from a goffmanesque perspective, audiences for the presentation of self will in this case be restricted to the *orga-*

nizational setting. Moreover, since my main objective is to address how organizational members relate to taste in their work, I do not assign any importance to the undisclosed taste of closet fans (for example, someone who loves listening to Elvis when alone or at home, but never talks about it at work). Such hidden taste profiles cannot play any role in the organization as there is no shared knowledge of them. This is consistent with my earlier claim not to study entire fields but only the specific parts of the fields which intersect with the organization.

Having hedged my claims, I will now turn to the study itself.

THE STUDY

At the center of this book is Sandrew Metronome, an integrated film company (i.e., it encompasses everything from production to screening, and also DVD, VHS, and cable television sales). An exposé of the company's history in Björkegren (1994) described a "cultural business strategy". While the company carries a wide assortment of art house films[5], it also has a substantial number of blockbusters[6]. A profile pointedly summarized as "the best selection of feature films" in the company's vision statement.[7] This study was conducted during 2001-2002, and the description of the organization in this book is confined to this time period. The organization has undergone considerable changes since then.

Industry-specific statistics from Sweden present figures in which the gender order manifests itself. For example, in 2000, men accounted for producer credits and director credits in, respectively, 72% and 76% of the films produced (Hermele 2002).[8] Similarly, in the film industry at large, only two out of 19 CEOs are women (Lind-

stedt 2003).[9] Before embarking on this study I also knew that the management group of Sandrew Metronome was male-dominated. Thus, gender is obviously an important basis for power within the organization.

As I started this work I had the idea of exploring taste as an organizing principle. Alongside organization theory, I had studied sociology of culture, and I wanted to focus on how the individuals in the organization formed structures based on taste. I have not, however, retained that initial project, as is apparent from my objective and research questions stated above. The notion of taste as an "organizing principle" is very complex. While it will be elaborated on in chapter 6, I want to reserve as a basic premise for this study that taste is an organizing principle (see for example Bourdieu 1984). What this study step by step became was less an account of the structures of taste in an organization than of the management of taste from the perspective of individuals and of the organization.

My presentation is not to be regarded as a strict account of the research process; it reflects rather the interplay of theory and practice. In doing so and in meeting my theory-development objective, great weight is placed on the theoretical Part I. The selection of theories there presented is in turn partly a result of the interview study; inspired by both prior theoretical readings and the interviewees' descriptions of "taste" and their uses of it in the organization, I develop an analytical model to understand how organizational members relate to taste in an organization in the field of cultural production.

I have taken the conjunction of Bourdieu's field theory (1996) and Goffman's theories on self and the nature of social life (1959, 1967) as a point of departure for con-

ceptualizing taste in the organization. Having written extensively on the social construction of taste, and taste as a basis for stratification, Bourdieu was an obvious candidate. Occupied with micro-level interaction, Erving Goffman provides a conceptual link between agency and structure by emphasizing the notion of role. As I focus exclusively on the individuals' roles in the *organizational arena*, and the dramatic aspects of organizational life, Goffman's work presents a useful theoretical framework. Furthermore, the goffmanesque perspective of viewing social life as drama is particularly amenable to the study of face-work in fields where people struggle to improve their positions.

About to explore a different dimension of taste than most other studies do, i.e., the use of taste, I also turned away from the theoretical conceptualization of taste for a moment. More precisely, I expanded the range of social constructionist theories in order to understand the constructions and gendered practices of taste in the organizational arena. Central to this dimension of the study are researchers such as Berger and Luckmann (1966), Gayle Rubin (1975), Stevi Jackson (1999), Yvonne Hirdman (1988, 1990), Karl Weick (1995), and feminist organizational theories such as Joan Acker (1992), Gerd Lindgren (1992), and Anna Wahl (1992).

In probing how organizational members relate to taste in organizations in the field of cultural production, I undertook three separate studies, all of which were carried out at Sandrew Metronome:

An interview study
A brief questionnaire providing background information
A collaborative photographic study

Detailed accounts of these studies can be found in chapter 9.

My dissertation proceeds in three broad steps. Part I presents my theoretical framework and my analytical model (chapters 4 – 7). Since theory development is part of the objective of this dissertation, the analytical model is a vital component of this study. Here, I not only position myself theoretically but also combine and build upon the aforementioned theories in order to conceptualize *taste performances* in an organization in the field of cultural production. Chapters 2 and 3 are devoted to my epistemological position, focusing on the social construction and gendering of reality. Drawing on Georg Simmel, chapter 4 considers *form* and *content*, a distinction that turns out to have bearing on the use of taste in the organization. In chapter 5, I go into detail regarding Goffman's theories on the production of the self and the nature of social life. These theories provide me with a framework for conceptualizing taste *performances* in the organization. Preceded by chapter 6, a description of the field theory of Pierre Bourdieu where I emphasize his notion of *taste*, I complete my analytical model with chapter 7, a selection of theories in the field of gender and organization. The latter serve to problematize the *relation between constructions of taste and constructions of gender* in an organization in the field of cultural production. Although my analytical model ends with chapter 7, the theoretical Part I is extended to include a chapter that comprises studies of mainly empirical interest. Thus, chapter 8 provides an account of studies in arts management and cultural production. I bring Part I to a close with a chapter on methods and methodological considerations, where I also reflect on my role as a re-

24

searcher. Part II begins with chapter 10, where I present the organization. It is followed by chapter 11, which is devoted to a discussion of the *impact of the various fields and principles of legitimacy on the organization*. Chapter 12, then, concerns *taste performances by organizational members*. A final discussion about *taste management* and my contributions can be found in chapter 13, Part III of the study. Accordingly, I start out with some general theories on social reality, social interaction and social structures, and proceed towards organization theory. This order permits me to refer back to the sociological theories when addressing organizational issues.

1. By "creative industries" Caves refers to industries that supply goods and services "that we broadly associate with cultural, artistic, or simply entertainment value. They include book and magazine publishing, the visual arts (painting, sculpture), the performing arts (theater, opera, concerts, dance), sound recordings, cinema and TV films, even fashion and toys and games." (Caves 2000, p. 1). Since Caves' concept of "creative industries" does not relate to my theoretical framework, I prefer to draw on Bourdieu, with whom I feel greater theoretical affinity, and his notion of "the field of cultural production" when not explicitly referring to Caves. In chapter 6, I will elaborate on the field of cultural production. Empirically speaking, the latter is more or less synonymous with "the creative industries."

2. "Inputs" is another word for "workers" in economics.

3. An extended discussion of various theorizations of "taste" follows in chapter 6. Still, I will endorse open concepts à la Bourdieu, amenable to a social constructionist perspective (see Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992). For now, suffice it to say that by "taste" I refer to preferences for certain cultural objects or to aesthetic judgments.

4. Throughout this dissertation I will resort to the conjugations of the verb "construct" rather than the fashionable "(re)produce". This is solely a question of writing style preferences; I dislike wrapping a part of a word in parentheses. However, I accept the idea that reality is continuously reconstructed (see chapter 2), something that the "(re)" add-on supposedly signals a little more clearer.

5. The term "art house films" refers to "films, often low budget, that are acknowledged as having artistic merit or aesthetic pretensions, and are shown in an art house theatre; usually includes foreign-language films, independent films, non-mainstream (sometimes anti-Hollywood) films, shorts, documentaries, explicitly-erotic films, and other under-appreciated cinema of low mass appeal; began to appear in the 1950s and provided a distinct contrast to commercial films". Information retrieved June 12, 2005 from *Cinematic Terms: A Film-Making Glossary*, http://www.filmsite.org/filmterms2.html.

6. The term "blockbuster" refers to "a movie that is a huge financial success – usually with box-office of more than $200 million (the new benchmark by the early 2000s) upon release in North America; ticket lines for blockbusters literally go around the 'block'; also known as box-office hit; the term may also refer to a costly film that must be exceptionally popular in order to recoup its expenses and make a profit". Information retrieved June 12, 2005 from Cinematic Terms: A Film-Making Glossary, http://www.filmsite.org/filmterms2.html.

7. From Sandrew Metronome power-point company presentation.

8. These figures include a wide range of films: documentaries, children's films, feature films and short films. In other words, films that have been shown in movie theaters in Sweden.

9. This non-scientific study is based on the eleven largest production and distribution companies, the three largest regional film centers, the four largest theatrical exhibition companies, and the Swedish Film Institute.

Social constructionism

It will be both convenient and necessary to introduce the theoretical framework by specifying my stance with regard to philosophy of science. Although already implied in the questions I posed in the first chapter, this positioning is required for what is to follow; it determines what sort of theories I draw upon, which theories I am able to combine legitimately, and what type of answers I aim for. For this reason, I will leave out various theories dealing empirically with organization and taste. Likewise, I will only address critique of the theories that I employ if the criticism rests on the same epistemological principles as the theories criticized.

This chapter serves to inform the reader about my ontological and epistemological stance (with an emphasis on the latter). Famously, the founders of social constructionism are said to be interactionists Berger and Luckmann (1966). It is indeed primarily their theoretical groundwork that I present in this chapter. In addition to the description of the dialectical process that constructs the social world, there are quite a few theoretical strands that I will later make use of when I chart those theories of Erving Goffman (above all, the notion of role) and Pierre Bourdieu (in particular, the concept of field) that will constitute my theoretical conceptualization of taste (chapter 4 – 7).

ONTOLOGICAL AND EPISTEMOLOGICAL STANDPOINTS

I will begin by stating that, like most of my colleagues within Swedish organization studies, I adopt a social constructionist position (see Sandberg 2001a). Thus, in line with Berger and Luckmann (1966), I believe that *our knowledge and perception of reality is socially constructed*. However, in an effort to mitigate the confusion

surrounding the concepts of "objectivity" and "subjectivity", I would like to begin by turning to the work of the American philosopher John Searle. Here, his work serves to outline the differences between ontology and epistemology.

Objectivity and subjectivity

In his work on the construction of social reality, John Searle contends that there is an objective reality, independent of our social institutions (Searle 1995). In the interest of brevity, I will give a concise account of his take on the objective – subjective distinction, in relation to which I will subsequently position myself. Searle elucidates the contrast between objective and subjective by differentiating between *epistemic* objectivity and subjectivity, and *ontological* objectivity and subjectivity. Epistemically, objectivity and subjectivity refer to *predicates of judgment*. Thus, the truth or falsity of an epistemically subjective statement is not a matter of fact but depends on certain attitudes, feelings, and points of view of the holders and the hearers of the judgment. An example would be "Tindersticks is a better band than U2" (no matter how close to a fact this statement may appear to some of us). An epistemically objective statement, on the other hand, is true or false due to facts of the world independent of anybody's attitudes or feelings about them. Searle exemplifies such an objective judgment with the statement "Rembrandt lived in Amsterdam during the year 1632" (Searle 1995, p. 8). This must not be mistaken for ontological objectivity (e.g., the ontological status of the year 1632 is still subjective). Searle stresses that the distinction between epistemic objectivity and subjectivity is a matter of degree. Ontologically, "objective" and "subjective" function as *predicates of entities and types of entities*, which ascribe modes of existence.

For example, "I have a headache" is in Searle's terms an epistemically objective fact (it is not dependent on the opinions and attitudes of others) about an ontologically subjective entity. Accordingly, Searle reminds us that "we can make epistemically subjective statements about entities that are ontologically objective, and similarly, we can make epistemically objective statements about entities that are ontologically subjective" (ibid., p. 8).

I espouse Searle's distinction between ontological objectivity and subjectivity. In other words, I believe that there is an objective reality, ontologically speaking. However, I do not claim that humans are capable of attaining objective knowledge about this reality. To reiterate, I think that our knowledge and perception of that reality is socially constructed. Consequently, I reject Searle's idea of epistemic objectivity. I would hold that what appears to be epistemic objectivity is in fact intersubjectivity, a topic I will return to below. One reason for my rejection of Searle's position is that he introduces the notion of "collective intentionality" in order to locate "social reality within our overall scientific ontology" (ibid., p. 8). While he embraces methodological collectivism, I will combine both methodological individualism and methodological collectivism[10] along the lines of constructionists like Berger and Luckmann (1966).

My point here was to emphasize the difference between objectivity and subjectivity from an epistemic and an ontological standpoint, respectively. In my empirical study, people often talk about "objectivity" and "subjectivity", and I will thus return to the topic in Part II, however, in exclusively epistemic terms.

Having clarified these basic notions concerning object-ivity and subjectivity, I will now move on to focus solely on epistemological questions. Many scholars have writ-ten in the tradition of social constructionism (see, for example, Berger and Luckmann 1966, Silverman 1970, Bourdieu 1977, Kessler and McKenna 1978, Giddens 1984, Gergen and Davis 1985, Weick 1995). According to Sandberg (2001a), social constructionists reject four premises that have long dominated the social sciences: 1) a dualistic view of reality where the individual exists independently of reality and vice versa; 2) an objective view of knowledge, i.e., reality exists independently of human consciousness; 3) an individualistic view of knowledge, i.e., the belief that knowledge originates in the individual, and is stored in the individual (a view that implies a focus on the individual as the primary object of inquiry); 4) the notion of language as a representation of reality.

To approach the issue of social constructionism, I will con-centrate on Berger and Luckmann's (1966) seminal *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Building on a synthesis of insights of the classical sociologists Emile Durkheim and Max Weber, i.e., respectively, the notion of social facts as things and the idea of actions expressing subjective meanings, Berger and Luckmann articulate the following question: "How is it possible that subjective meanings become facticities?" In other words, it is a question that asks whether it is possible to integrate two seemingly disparate strands of social thought, namely methodological collectivism and method-ological individualism. This is, for them, the most essential issue for sociological theory, a question that calls for the study of the construction of reality.

Berger and Luckmann present a thoroughly elaborated theory on the construction of reality which, to a large extent, is compatible with the theories I employ in the subsequent theoretical chapters. However, the two authors focus a great deal on the dialectic between the individual and society. Inherent in this view is a dichotomy between the individual and society, a view criticized by Norbert Elias among others. Elias' criticism is echoed in the work of Pierre Bourdieu who prefers to talk about the agent and the specific field rather than the individual and society. I will take up this discussion again in chapter 6 (see p. 111). Furthermore, I will not employ Berger and Luckmann's distinction between primary and secondary socialization. In addition to considering primary socialization issues (à la Berger and Luckmann) irrelevant to my study, I prefer Bourdieu's concept of habitus to Berger and Luckmann's division of socialization into primary and secondary socialization. I think Bourdieu's concept better underscores the impact of power (see chapter 6) and the continuous, but constrained, construction of self. Nevertheless, some of Berger and Luckmann's thoughts on socialization are of interest to my study and I will give an account of them below.

OBJECTIVITY AND SUBJECTIVITY REVISITED

What follows is a description of the dialectic process consisting of objectivation, externalization, and internalization, so fundamental to the creation of reality, according to Berger and Luckmann (1966).

Everyday life

Before we explore the formation of "objective reality" I

would like to linger a little on everyday life experiences. The nature of the knowledge that is the center of attention for Berger and Luckmann is not narrowly defined to theories or ideas, but refers to everything that people can possibly come to know about reality in their everyday lives; i.e., "pre-theoretical knowledge". Shared by others, the reality of everyday life is an intersubjective world. Alfred Schutz, who introduced the concept of intersubjectivity, defined it as:

A category which, in general, refers to what is (especially cognitively) common to various individuals. In daily life, a person takes the existence of others for granted. He reasons and acts on the self-understood assumption that these others are basically persons like himself, endowed with consciousness and will, desires and emotions. The bulk of one's ongoing life experiences confirms and reinforces the conviction that, in principle and under 'normal' circumstances, persons in contact with one another 'understand' each other at least to the degree to which they are able to deal successfully with one another. (Schutz 1999 [1970], p. 319)

Berger and Luckmann take up the topic of intersubjectivity and further highlight the importance of knowing that in this everyday world, my meanings are matched with those of others so that an adequately shared reality is established.

In everyday life, where meanings are thus shared, the most rudimentary form of experience of others is in the face-to-face situation. Berger and Luckman in fact claim that "all other cases are derivatives of it" (1966, p. 28). In my view, Goffman has a much more thorough take on face-to-face interactions and their nature, pointing out the uniqueness of this type of social interaction (see chapter 5). Yet, on the topic of face-to-face situations, Berger and Luckmann write:

My and his 'here and now' continuously impinge on each other as long

as the face-to-face situation continues. As a result, there is a continu-ous interchange of my expressivity and his. […] This means that, in the face-to-face situation, the other's subjectivity is available to me through a maximum of symptoms. Only here (f-t-f) is the other's subjectivity emphatically 'close'. (Berger and Luckmann, 1966, p. 28)

In other words, the face-to-face situation is a prerequisite for intersubjectivity, for the sharing of meanings. The face-to-face situation and all other kinds of social interaction are subject to typifications. In turn, the aggregate of these typifications form social structures. Typifying is the label-ing of individuals or actions into categories on the basis of characteristics assumed to represent certain people and/or their actions. Ranging from "mother", "vegans" and "monarchists" to "Europeans" and "women", these typifications vary in degree of anonymity. In chapter 4, where I will go into detail on the theories of Erving Goffman, we will see that interactants often make use of typifications when attempting to define the situation.

The reality of everyday life is furthermore characterized by, and contingent on, the existence of objectivations. The process of objectivation implies that subjective processes are continually manifested in products of human activity and are made available to more people than just those participating in the face-to-face situation. Language functions as a vehicle for objectivation, as it makes my meanings available to others. Moreover, Berger and Luckmann remark that because language can con-vey meanings beyond "here and now", it functions as a gigantic collection of objective meaning and experience. These accumulations can be passed on to subsequent gen-erations. Not only does language assist in objectifying my own being, but also, it renders my subjectivity more real (to fellow interactants as well as to myself).

Before we move on to discuss objective reality further, I

would like to highlight Berger and Luckmann's claim that there are relevance structures in knowledge of everyday life. These may be determined by my situation "here and now" or by my situation in society at large. At certain places my relevance structures intersect with those of others, generating situations that are mutually "interesting". Knowing other people's relevance structures is vital to my knowledge of everyday life. These relevance structures are important in everyday social interaction because they often determine what sort of subjects will be dealt with. In an organization these sorts of structures influence what different people talk about and how they talk about it.

Society as objective reality

Departing from the notion that the relationship between humans and nature is not predetermined, Berger and Luckmann claim that instead of referring to human nature, "it is more significant to say that man constructs his own nature, or more simply, that man produces himself" (1966, p. 49). Likewise, social order is constructed by humans through continuous externalization. A thorough understanding of objective reality calls for a theory of institutionalization.

Any institutionalization is preceded by processes of habitualization. Intrinsic to all human activity, habitualization retains meanings of actions as routines that are part of the individual's general stock of knowledge. These routines are taken for granted by the individual in the present, and for the future. Institutions originate when actions involving social relationships are habitualized. Jointly typified by the parties involved, these habitualized actions are performed in roles. Some of them will be carried out in concert, others individually. The object-

ive facticities of institutions manifest themselves when the institutions are passed on to a generation that did not create them. They have been crystallized, to use a Durkheimian term. People then experience the institution as an external and constraining fact. Institutionalization is a dialectic process. This process consists of an interaction between subjective and objective moments.

Berger and Luckmann identify three dialectical moments in the process by which the social world is created. Occurring simultaneously, on an ongoing basis, the three moments are externalization, objectivation, and internalization. An analysis of the social world must include all three moments. Whereas externalization refers to the process by which humans produce social order, objectivation is the process that gives these externalized products the quality of objectivity. No matter how massive the institutional world may seem, it is a socially constructed objectivity. The "producers" are subject to the constraints of their product, the social world. Berger and Luckmann write: "despite the objectivity that marks the social world in human experience, it does not thereby acquire an ontological status apart from the human activity that produced it" (ibid., p. 60). Internalization is the socialization process by which the objectivated world is made available to human consciousness (see below). To conclude, to understand the emergence, and persistence of institutions, it is fundamental to understand this dialectical process consisting of these three moments and their relation to the social world:

Society is a human product. Society is an objective reality. Man is a social product. (ibid., p. 61)

In other words, institutions are human products while at the same time humans are products of their own creations.

Furthermore, all institutionalized conduct involves roles, i.e., types of actors, or typifications of actions based on the individuals' position within a specific institution. In other words, the proper object of attention is neither the particular individual who performs actions nor the various subjective processes these performing individuals undergo nor any further processes that these may give rise to. Instead, roles are central to the objective world of society. Berger and Luckmann assert that the reason sociologists should be concerned with the analysis of roles is that societies' stock of knowledge is structured according to its relevance for certain roles and to general relevance. Each role is accompanied by a socially defined body of knowledge. Through roles, individuals not only participate in the social world, but also internalize that same world (it becomes subjectively real). Due to division of labor, knowledge specific to certain roles is assumed to grow at a faster rate than that kind of knowledge that is applicable and accessible for everyone in a society (ibid., p. 77). Consequently, a study of roles may bring to light what realities/subuniverses are relevant to an individual. I will take up this topic when I elaborate on fields from the perspective of Pierre Bourdieu in chapter 6.

The institutional segmentation caused by the division of labor will, thus, lead to problems with regard to the provision of integrative meanings that include all of society and give individuals a framework for making objective sense of experiences and knowledge. Concomitant to institutional segmentation is the process of role specialization. If role-specific knowledge becomes obscure in light of the common stock of knowledge, socially segregated subuniverses of meaning are created. Society in its entirety will then be viewed from a number of different perspectives. Berger and Luckmann contend that the existence of subuniverses hampers the establishment of a

"stable symbolic canopy for the *entire* society" (1966, p. 86). This theme resonates with the work of Elias, and later, the work of Bourdieu, both of whom criticize the notion of "society" (see chapter 6).

In the context of institutionalization, Berger and Luckmann highlight the reification of social reality. Reification refers to "an extreme step in the process of objectivation, whereby the objectivated world loses its comprehensibility as a human enterprise and becomes fixated as a non-human, non-humanizable, inert facticity" (1966, p. 89). That is to say, one ceases to perceive human phenomena as human products. They are understood as things, either in non-human or in supra-human terms. For example, one may talk about gender relations, culture or emotions in a way that presumes their autonomy from human beings (implicitly or explicitly referring to natural laws, the guidance of providence, and the like). I also think it is easy for researchers to reify reality when attempting to define their objects of analysis. Despite the irksome complexity of trying to avoid reification when doing research, I believe the effort is worthwhile as it renders the limitations of the research methods and their premises more clear. Like institutions, roles are also subject to reification. Taking on a role has then resulted in an objectification of a portion of self-consciousness, and the latter is then recognized as something predetermined and unavoidable about which the individual can do very little.

Society as subjective reality: the case of secondary socialization

This section will deal with the internalization of reality, the third moment in the dialectical process. Heavily influenced by George H. Mead, Berger and Luckmann

outline two sorts of internalization; primary and secondary socialization. Socialization may be defined as "the comprehensive and consistent induction of an individual into the objective world of a society or a sector of it" (Berger and Luckmann 1966, p. 130). Primary socialization, by which the individual becomes a member of society, is followed by secondary socialization, by which the already socialized individual internalizes institutions or subworlds, and thereby obtains role-specific behaviors and knowledge. Considering this dissertation's focus on the organizational arena and performances within the organization, I have chosen not to expand upon the issue of identity. Nor will I take up the categorization of subjective reality as the product of either primary or secondary socialization (I prefer Bourdieu's notion of habitus, see chapter 6. Also, see the passage on Dorothy Smith's "institutional ethnography" in the next chapter, p. 55). Yet, regardless of the labeling, I believe Berger and Luckmann's insights into the notion of role and subworlds, under the heading of secondary socialization, are important to my study and its theoretical framework.

As secondary socialization entails the internalization of subworlds, the degree and type of secondary socialization depends on the closely linked issues of division of labor and social distribution of knowledge. A distinctive feature of secondary socialization is a sense of detachment: it is characterized by formality and anonymity. It only requires the degree of mutual identification necessary for any communication between human beings. The disconnection from one's "teachers" during secondary socialization implies that one only internalizes anonymous features linked to the generalized role. This also affects self:

This makes it possible to detach a part of the self and its concomitant reality as relevant only to the role-specific situation in question. The

individual then establishes distance between his total self and its reality on the one hand, and the role-specific partial self and its reality on the other. (Berger and Luckmann 1966, p. 142)

Given that affective identification with significant others is not necessary for secondary socialization, the individual can internalize realities with which he or she does not identify. Rather than it being the individual's *reality*, such a reality is relied upon as a setting for certain role-performances. These realities enable the individual to deliberately switch between different definitions of the situation and subsequent role-playing. I will resume this topic in chapter 5 where I present some of Erving Goffman's theories.

As socialization is never total and there is an intrinsic and permanent threat to subjective realities, society presents individuals with procedures for safeguarding a satisfactory correspondence between objective and subjective realities. The defense of subjective realities focuses on reality as it is held in individual consciousness. In general, Berger and Luckmann identify routines (as in the case of institutionalization) as vital to reality-maintenance. Not surprisingly, language and conversation are the most important vehicles for this process. By employing the same language, individuals assist in one another's reality maintenance. However, on a micro-level, in a subworld, there is often a prevailing "common language". Such a language may vary from regional and class dialects, to language used by a certain group of professionals, or by a circle of friends. The individual who returns to a group, with which he or she shares a common language, may experience a "return to reality"; i.e., the group-members understand his or her in-group references and know the dialectical idiom. Reality-maintenance is thus one reason for the tenacity of constructions in different subworlds.

43

As we will see, the subworld / field of cultural production is constructed in a certain way (see for example p. 178 in chapter 8). People in the industry act upon these constructions as the reality, and this reality is thus constantly externalized, objectified, and internalized. It is just that simple, just that complex. Indeed, it is precisely because these features are constructed, i.e., not inherent to the industry, that it is worthwhile to highlight them. The constructedness implies the possibility of change. By scrutinizing the construction processes we can perhaps find unwanted consequences of our actions and preconceptions. This is a topic I will resume in the next chapter when I introduce a number of feminist theories.

CHAPTER SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter I have addressed notions of objectivity and subjectivity. I have presented social constructionism according to Berger and Luckmann, and highlighted the dialectical process through which the social world is created. It will be expedient to end this opening chapter of the theoretical section with a reminder that the constructionist perspective is foundational to all theories in my analytical model. However, the theories presented in the next few chapters elaborate on constructionism in different directions. The remaining chapters in Part I will be more focused on the objective of the dissertation; the study of taste, organization, and gender.

10. In brief, methodological individualists hold that society is made up by individuals' behavior and way of thinking, whereas methodological collectivists presume individuals' behavior and way of thinking to be a result of social phenomena (social phenomena thus cannot be derived from individuals themselves) (Gilje and Grimen 1992, Rosenberg 1995).

A gendered reality

Since my objective includes a closer look at how the organizational members' relation to taste at work is gendered, and Berger and Luckmann (1966) only touch upon gender, I will draw on feminist theory and, later, theories in the field of gender and organization. The reason for the focus on *social* constructionism and the overall sociological slant to the study of gender is that I strive to present as coherent a theoretical framework as possible, in line with the epistemological stance I took in the previous chapter. Whereas I will position myself more thoroughly in the field of gender and organization in chapter 7, I will at this point position myself vis-à-vis various approaches to the study of gender in general.

This chapter reviews an assortment of feminist theories on gender. Rather than taking this body of theory as an overview of the field, it should be seen as a selection of the most germane theories for the purpose of my dissertation. After a brief introduction, I expand on the topic of the social construction of gender. A related topic is feminist epistemologies, which are covered in the subsequent section. A piece on the emphasis on the social in feminist theory is followed by a section on the gender order. The chapter ends with a brief discussion on men and masculinities.

INTRODUCTION

The interdisciplinarity of feminist research implies that there is a wide range of epistemological and (to a certain extent) ontological positions within the field. Common to feminist theories is an acknowledgment of male dominance and gender segregation in social organization, as well as a desire to change this state of affairs (see Flax 1990, Calás and Smircich 1996). Comprising descriptions, interpretations, and critical studies of the

meaning of gender in various social arrangements, feminist research is both empirical and theoretical (see Höök 2001b, Wahl et al. 2001). However, as I said, I will restrict this chapter on gendering processes and gender structures to feminist theories primarily in the fields of sociology and organization studies in order to maintain coherence with the other theories addressed in Part I.[11]

THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF GENDER

In 1952, De Beauvoir (1989[1952]) launched a social constructionist view, even if it was not called that, when she proclaimed that "one is not born but rather becomes a woman". Following the publication of Berger and Luckmann's *The Social Construction of Reality* (1966), sociologists took on the notion of "gender" and theorized about masculinity and femininity as socially constructed concepts (see for example Oakley 1972). A more comprehensive social constructionism arrived when the notion of "sex" was finally described as a socially constructed concept by various feminist sociologists, anthropologists and the odd biologist (see for example Kessler and McKenna 1979, Delphy 1984, Stanley 1984, Fausto-Sterling 1985). Evoking Berger and Luckmann (1966), Kessler and McKenna (1979) regard genders as social constructs originating from social interaction, in which they are "given their sense of objectivity and reality" (p. vii). Masculinity and femininity are in this view only meaningful within the social reality where they were constructed. In arguing that the world of two "sexes" is socially constructed through the pre-theoretical (to use Berger and Luckmann lingo) knowledge permeating everyday practices, they also highlight the centrality of gender assumptions in our everyday life; we go through our lives making assump-

tions that everyone is either male or female. In every face-to-face interaction gender is mutually attributed among the interactants. While making a distinction between sex and gender (where gender refers to the psychological, social and cultural sides of maleness and femaleness, i.e., masculinity and femininity, and sex comprises the biological sides), Kessler and McKenna say that they use exclusively the term gender (for both areas) in order to stress that maleness and femaleness are essentially social constructions. Although the use of terms varies between languages (see for example Widerberg 1998), there is a widespread emphasis on the socially constructed aspects of gender in feminist theories.

Kessler and McKenna's (1979) understanding of gender and gendering processes is consistent not only with the writings of Berger and Luckmann, but also with the work of Goffman (1959) (see chapter 5) and Garfinkel (1984 [1967]). Stressing gender as constituted in performances, they express ideas later echoed by, for example, Judith Butler (1990), who asserts that gender only exists "to the extent that it is performed".

Feminist epistemologies

A central theme in feminist research is the debate over whether or not it is possible, and productive, to define women as a group. This dispute between conflicting epistemological positions, primarily those of feminist standpoint and feminist postmodernism[12] (see Harding 1986), can be briefly summarized as follows: Studying any kind of gender problem from the perspective of women as a category (often subordinated), standpoint feminists encompass socialist, Marxist, and radical feminist approaches (see Harding 1986, Calás and Smircich

1996, Höök 2001b). According to Harding (1986) this epistemology:

[...] argues that men's dominating position in social life results in partial and perverse understandings, whereas women's subjugated position provides the possibility of more complete and less perverse understandings. (p. 26)

A general skepticism regarding the existence of *a* feminist standpoint when women's social experience is indeed contingent on class, ethnicity, and culture has followed. Building on this criticism, the postmodern approach questions the ontological and epistemological assertions of modern theories, arguing against universalism and essentialism, the existence of reason, progress, language, and a self (Weedon 1987, Flax 1990, Nicholson 1990). In interrogating knowledge and the notion of a "knowing subject", postmodern feminists thus also argue against the possibility of *a* category of women. Instead, calling attention to "the fractured identities modern life creates" (Harding 1986) and the ambiguity of gender, the postmodern approach focuses on

[...] a solidarity in our oppositions to the dangerous fiction of the naturalized, essentialized, uniquely 'human' (read 'manly') and to the distortion and exploitation perpetrated on behalf of this fiction. It may require rejecting fantasized returns to the primal wholeness of infancy, preclass societies, or pregender 'unitary' consciousnesses of the species – all of which have motivated standpoint epistemologies. (ibid., p. 28)

Harding cautions against the relativism that postmodernism may lead to, asking how can the emancipatory project of feminist theory be realized when women cannot be conceptualized as a group. In place of feminist standpoint and feminist postmodernism, Harding (ibid.) calls for an epistemology that takes into account the social context of inquiry and avoids relativism.

As should be evident from the previous chapter, I do not adhere to a postmodern epistemological stance. Rather, I argue that categories exist; they are socially constructed and typified to represent groups of people and their actions. These categories are constantly externalized, objectivated, and internalized in our everyday life. Hence, it is important to take into account the shared experiences of people who belong to the same category, and, thus, it does make sense to refer to "women" and "men".

Social constructionism in feminist theory

Stevi Jackson (1999) argues that the "cultural turn" in feminist theory has caused the origins of social constructionism often (but certainly not always) to be overlooked; the markedly "social" has often been left aside. Jackson sees this revision of history as one result of shifting disciplinary hierarchies. As feminist theories from literary criticism, cultural studies and philosophy, particularly postmodern ones, have gained footholds, the material underpinnings of gender inequality has been undermined (Walby 1992, Jackson 1998).[13] In an attempt to recover feminist sociological research from oblivion, Jackson (1999) asserts that many of the insights ascribed to poststructuralists were long ago established in sociology. Referring to claims by poststructuralist feminists Weedon (1987), Jackson explains that feminist sociologists have long been aware "that there is no essential pre-social self, that language is not a transparent medium of communication, that meanings shift as they are contested and renegotiated, that knowledge is a social construct rather than a revelation of absolute truth" (Jackson 1999, p. 3).

Feminist sociologists revised earlier notions of gender "roles" in the 1980s, arguing for a relational concep-

tion of men and women, and emphasizing the hierarchical dimension in this relation (see, for example, Delphy 1984). Today, they acknowledge that postmodernists' refusal to conceptualize women as a category, in favor of allegedly greater sensitivity to diversity, often lead to a neglect of material conditions and structural inequalities (see Walby 1992, Jackson 1998). However, influenced by postmodernists, feminist sociologists have recently shown an increased interest in studies concerned with localized, situated social practices and processes (Jackson 1998). Unlike many postmodernist studies, these sociological studies stress the "*social* reality". To reiterate, social reality should not be equated solely with social structure; it also comprises patterns of interaction and institutions (see, for example, Smith 1987, West and Zimmerman 1987, Adkins 1995, Maynard 1995, Ridgeway 1997, Thurén and Sundman 1997).

Let me expand on two studies that deal with interaction and institutions. Cecilia Ridgeway (1997) has shown that when trying to make sense of self and of other, interactants draw on primary cultural rules to which sex categorization are central. In the absence of an initial categorization where self and other are specified as similar or different along some dimension, interaction cannot take place. Sex categorization evokes gender stereotypes, which include the construction and use of gender status beliefs as well as the biasing of the choice of comparison group (any comparison with others will include comparisons with one's own gender). Ridgeway thus focuses on cross-sex interaction, arguing that changes in gender status beliefs lag behind changes in the material inequalities on which the former rest. The interaction process mediates these changes by inviting the interactants to draw on the prevailing constructions ("cultural superschemas") of gender.

54

Another feminist researcher, who directs attention not to interaction but to institutions, is Dorothy Smith (1987). Central to her approach, later named "institutional ethnography", is an interrogation of taken-for-granted practices of knowledge production. She highlights the close relation between organizational theory and the people in power, i.e., those who organize and manage. Researchers are, in other words, an essential part of the relations of ruling.

According to Smith, ideological practices in social science lead to the suppression of the relations that characterize the researcher's position in society (his or her subjectivity) (Smith 1990). Regarding the field of sociology she writes:

Sociology creates a construct of society that is specifically discontinuous with the world known, lived, experienced and acted in. The practice of sociology in which we were trained as graduate students was one that insisted that the sociologist should never go without a concept; that to encounter the raw world was to encounter a world of irremediable disorder and confusion; to even begin to speak sociologcally of that world required a concept, or concepts, to order, select, assemble, a sociological version of the world on paper. (ibid., p. 2)

Instead, she suggests a way to take into account the social construction of reality and the social organization of experiences. Arguing that the conceptual abstract knowledge prevalent in social science results from women's provision of background work that enables men to act "as if they lived in their heads", Smith moves on to identify men's subsequent loss of contact with certain parts of reality in the current gendered division of labor as a fundamental problem. For men, the only way of knowing is through objectified methods and through the mediated knowledge of others; i.e., without being a knowing subject. Criticizing this "ideological" aspect of sociological knowledge, the inattention to the local and

particular of our existence ("embodied knowledge"), she calls for the acknowledgment of "experiential knowledge". In her emphasis on the location of the subject and on the process of knowledge-production, Smith presents ideas that resonate both with Bourdieu's focus on theory and practice (see p. 108) and with his version of reflexivity (see p. 189).

Along these lines, Smith (1987) elaborates a theory of domination and ruling. She claims that certain forms of knowledge, "local knowledge" (e.g., people's interactional knowledge in everyday situations of social life), are taken for granted. Knowledge that serves as the basis for any kind of ruling (e.g., in management, politics, and institutions) subordinates this local knowledge. In this recognition, she points at ideology as a reproductive mechanism regarding the power relation between men and women, in which men dominate women. These structural relations will be the topic of next section.

THE GENDER ORDER

Numerous feminist researchers have studied the gender order that permeates our society and its organization (for overviews of different theories of patriarchy, see Wahl 1992 and Gemzöe 2002). A classic article on the topic is Gayle Rubin's (1975) account of the "sex/gender system". Whereas other feminist researchers, for example, Oakley (1972) had distinguished between gender and biological sex, Rubin integrated the two in the concept of "sex/gender". Criticizing "essentialism", Rubin defined gender as "a socially imposed division of the sexes", "a product of the social relations of sexuality" (Rubin 1975, p. 179). At the center of Rubin's theory is a recognition that all societies have "a sex/gender system – a set

of arrangements by which the biological raw material of human sex and procreation is shaped by human, social intervention" (ibid., p. 165). Rubin argues that these arrangements place women in a subordinated position, in an economic system with a man and a woman as a core unit, women's bodies are forced to fit in. Furthermore, Rubin casts light on the cultural contingency of these sexual relations by, for example, pointing at different organizations of relationship and marriage. These points are further developed by Scott (1986) who emphasizes not only that gender is a "constitutive element of social relationships based on perceived differences between the sexes", but also that "gender is a primary way of signifying relationships of power" (p. 1067). The hierarchical dimension of gender relations (see for example Delphy 1984, Delphy and Leonard 1992) is also central to the theorizing of Swedish historian Yvonne Hirdman, to which I turn next.

In Sweden, the writings of Hirdman (1988, 1990) on the gender order have been very influential. Drawing on studies of contracts (Haavind 1984, Pateman 1988), she charts a theory that she calls "the gender system". The latter comprises the pattern of various gender contracts regarding constructions of femininity and masculinity. These are contracts concerning ideas, paradigms, and institutions, and also, contracts on an interactional level. Consisting of two parallel logics, the gender dichotomy and the gender hierarchy (or, the primacy of the male norm), the gender system is socially and culturally created, and, thus, constantly in a state of creation. Consequently, the gender system is manifested differently across time and space. Focusing on understanding the reproduction processes of the gender system rather than the primary cause of women's social subordination, Hirdman (1988) suggests that gender segregation is a

57

prerequisite to the supremacy of the male norm. This segregation hinges on a dichotomous conception of gender, ubiquitous in our social reality. It is a construction that reinforces differences between the genders, and, in particular, seems to exploit the biological differences. The gender contracts highlight the interdependence of men and women; the reproduction of the gender system takes place through men and women's respective compliance with various contracts.

Having identified constructions of gender as a fundamental social structure in our society, I would now like to linger a little on the topic of men and masculinities.

Men and masculinities

Earlier, in 1952, De Beauvoir had drawn attention to the male norm and the dichotomous construction of gender:

[...] if I wish to define myself, I must first of all say: 'I am a woman'; on this truth must be based all further discussion. A man never begins by presenting himself as an individual of a certain sex; it goes without saying that he is a man. The terms masculine and feminine are used symmetrically only as a matter of form, as on legal papers. In actuality the relation of the two sexes is not quite like that of two electrical poles, for man represents both the positive and the neutral, as is indicated by the common use of man to designate human beings in general; whereas woman represents only the negative, defined by limiting criteria, without reciprocity. (De Beauvoir 1989[1952], p. xxi)

Since then, a large number of feminist scholars have begun to elaborate a critique of the "gender neutral". Always critical in its analysis of gender, feminist research has repeatedly stressed that in the social sciences, most research rests on the assumption of the male norm. In other words, most research is about men. Beyond this persistent interest in men on the part of feminist

58

researchers, there has lately been a proliferation of research on "men" and "masculinities". This rather disparate research field encompasses both the work of feminist scholars and the work of researchers whose view of gender conflicts with a feminist perspective. Feminist research on men and masculinities often fall under the heading "critical studies on men" (see Collinson and Hearn 1994, 1996; Holgersson 2003). Concomitant to the epistemological debate on whether or not to conceptualize women as a category, there is an ongoing discussion about the use of such concepts as "masculinity" (see Connell 1987, 1995; Hearn 1987; Morgan 1992). In an effort to capture the diversity and the continuous alteration, some researchers refer instead to "masculinities".

Researchers doing "critical studies on men" have highlighted the interrelation of men, masculinities and management (see for example Collinson and Hearn 1996). I will return to studies on homosociality among men in chapter 7 when I expand on the field of gender and organization.

CHAPTER SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter, I have elaborated on gendered reality. As an enlargement of the topic of social constructionism introduced in the preceding chapter, it provides a basis for the subsequent analysis of the gendering of the organizational members' relation to taste. In emphasizing the social aspects of gender constructions as well as the gender order, I thus reiterate that social reality is not fixed in time and space. In particular, I introduced the theories of two feminist sociologists that I will draw upon, Ridgeway's work on interaction, and Smith's on institutions. Their theories represent two sides of the gender construction processes. Moreover, I clarified my

stance with regards to categories, as socially constructed, a discussion I will resume in chapter 6. Hirdman's (1988) account of the "gender system" will serve as a basis for my gender analysis.

In the next chapter, the shortest, I will present a theory on content and form, two facets of social reality.

11. For a more thorough exposé of the field of feminist research and its history of ideas, I would like to refer to Walby (1986), Flax (1990), Bryson (1992), and Wahl (1992).

12. Harding also identifies "feminist empiricists", but I will omit this epistemology from the discussion as it rejects social constructionism (see Harding 1986). Furthermore, "postmodernism" and "post-structuralism" are used interchangeably throughout this dissertation although the latter is indeed only a brand of postmodernism. Post-structuralism developed in response to structuralism (Hutcheon 1988, Jameson 1991).

13. Concomitant to this discussion is the debate between a sociologically informed approach to culture and a postmodernist approach (as in the tradition of cultural studies). In this debate, postmodernists often approach culture by limiting themselves to the symbolic and the representational while ignoring the social aspects of culture, for example, culture as a shared way of life, or the relation between culture and social class (see Schudson 1997).

Form and content

In what follows, I will present my model of the world for this dissertation. In other words, my *analytical model*. It is not only a representation of the world I am studying, but it also brings to light how I view the relationships within this model, i.e., my theoretical framework. These are the concepts and relations I will stress when I analyze my empirical data in Part II. In turn, this analytical model rests on the social constructionist, feminist position laid out in the preceding chapters. In addition, the following chapters should not be regarded as a plain literature review. Rather, I have selected a number of theories that I relate to, and combine in order to arrive at a conceptualization to study how organizational members in an organization in the field of cultural production relate to taste at work.

As I stated in my introductory chapter, cooperation is a fundamental feature of organizational life. As we will see, taste can be theorized as both a medium of power and one of cooperation. Setting the stage for a closer look at this problem in later chapters, this chapter will address the difference between *form* and *content*. This distinction is also crucial in order to fully understand Goffman's theories on the production of self and the nature of social life, which I present in the following chapter.

A predecessor to Berger and Luckmann, sociologist and interactionist Georg Simmel introduced the notion of sociability. Lest we forget, I have chosen to open the presentation of my theoretical model with Simmel in order to emphasize the predominance of a sociological perspective over a psychological one throughout this dissertation. Simmel focuses on sociation, patterns of interaction, rather than the common psychological approach of studying personality characteristics of "sociable individuals".

German sociologist Georg Simmel's notion of sociability

can be derived from his idea of sociation as the basic unit of society. Sociation describes the patterns of interaction that get established between individuals. According to Simmel, the *content*, i.e., the pragmatic outcome of interaction, may vary, but the *form*, i.e., the sociation in which individuals grow together into units that satisfy their interests, can be defined under certain conditions (Simmel 1950). In his view, there is interaction for the sake of interaction, sociability being the "play-form", or the autonomous form, of sociation:

[...] this process also is at work in the separation of what I have called content and form in societal existence. Here, 'society', properly speaking, is that being with one another, for one another, against one another which, through the vehicle of drives or purposes, forms and develops material or individual contents and interests. The forms in which this process results gain their own life. It is freed from all ties with contents. It exists for its own sake and for the sake of the fascination which, in its own liberation from these ties, it diffuses. It is precisely the phenomenon that we call sociability.[14] (ibid., p. 43)

In other words, sociability implies a disconnection between *form* and *content*; form has become autonomous. People talk for the sake of talking. Because sociability involves the maintenance of interaction for its own sake, it also prevents the participants from foregrounding their personalities or their social stratum too obviously. There are upper and lower "sociability thresholds":

At the moment when people direct their association toward objective content and purpose, as well as the moment when the absolutely personal and subjective matters of the individual enter freely into the phenomenon, sociability is no longer the central and controlling principle but at most a formalistic and outwardly instrumental principle. (Simmel 1949 [1911], p. 256)

As a result, great importance is attached to *tact*; the participant has to engage in the right balance of self-effacement and self-assertion (Simmel 1950). Tact serves as a self-regulation of the individual's relations with his or her fellow interactants when there are no other interests, e.g.,

differences based on social stratification or on psychology, to guide the interaction. Whenever a connection between two individuals, which started off on a sociable level, begins to revolve around personal values, it is bereft of the vital quality of sociability. It has become a relationship contingent on content. Talk, contact and exchange are then merely means to other ends, whereas for sociability, they are the whole meaning and content of interaction.

A variation on this theme is found in the work of Erving Goffman. Not only is his theory informed by Simmel's notion of form, but also, it takes notions such as tact and interaction rituals as points of departure. In chapter 5, which is devoted to the theories of Erving Goffman, I will delineate the link between Simmel's and Goffman's work.

Simmel maintains that the same interactional pattern (e.g., competition, trade, the creation of coalitions, the vacillation between opposition and cooperation) may either be driven by a purposive content or serve as plain sociability. However, in a conversation that is entirely sociability-based, the talk itself generates the content that functions as "the indispensable carrier" of further stimulation. The forms of interaction that are normally full of content and purposes, for example, arguments, compromising conclusions, the finding of common beliefs, have in sociability meaning in and of themselves. More precisely, their significance lies in the stimulation of the play of relations that they give rise to. As soon as content becomes relevant, interaction loses its sociable character. However, this does not imply that the content of sociable conversation must be insignificant. It is essential that the content of sociability is interesting and fascinating, and it could even be important. Nevertheless, the presence of these qualities does not reflect a conversational purpose, i.e., bring results that have relevance

outside of the conversation. Since the subject matter of the sociable conversation tends to change easily, Simmel labels its character "interchangeable and accidental".

Lindgren (1992) points out that occasionally sociability seems to overpower the impact of class and gender on interaction. Labeling the foundation for sociability "a communicative basis", Lindgren identifies the size of cultural categories (based on gender and class) as critical to eliciting it. For example, in her study of a clinic, Lindgren (1992) notes that sociability appears to take place during weekends when the number of representatives for each professional category (nurses' assistants, nurses, and doctors) is low. I will return to this study when I position myself in the field of gender and organization, in chapter 7.

CHAPTER SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This third chapter has focused on form and content in the organizational setting. I have presented Simmel's theory of sociability, which establishes the autonomy of form, interaction for the sake of interaction. With no insistence that sociability is more germane to organizations than other social settings, I want to stress the fact that there are episodes of sociability in organizations. In the construction process regarding taste, matters of power are dealt with in content-focused interaction. Cooperation issues, on the other hand, may be handled in both content-based interaction as well as in situations characterized by sociability.

Prior to focusing on the specific features that characterize organizations in the field of cultural production, I will turn to Erving Goffman's interactionist theories of self and the nature of social life.

14. Please note that this reference to "society" is very different from the notion of society mentioned in discussions about the relation between the individual and society (see for example chapter 2 and 6).

Production of self
and the nature of social life

The question of constructions and uses of taste in an organization pervades the remaining chapters in Part I. My purpose here being the purely theoretical endeavor to examine some possible mechanisms behind these constructions and practices in organizations, I will devote this particular chapter to looking at the micro-processes that may construct taste in organizations. I will expand on the interactional aspects of taste construction processes without going into a discussion on taste per se. This amounts to an elaboration of some of the theories of Erving Goffman, in particular his notion of self and his treatment of social life.

Embarking on this theoretical journey of inquiry into taste construction processes in organizations, it cannot be emphasized enough that this *theoretical* conceptualization is not to be confused with the *empirical* constructions of taste among the organizational members. The latter will be introduced in Part II alongside the theoretical "tool-kit" (see Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, or p. 108) presented in the following chapters.

In the pages that follow, as well as in the next chapter, I will concern myself primarily with gender-blind sociological theories.[15] Instead of continually adding to the presentation references and criticism from a feminist theoretical viewpoint, I will save this task for the analysis.

Before launching into to a presentation of these theories of Goffman's, I want to give some background as to why I have chosen to focus upon Goffman. The history of the social sciences provides a variety of theories on micro-level interaction (my other options were, for example, Mead 1934; Berger and Luckmann 1966; Blumer 1969; Cicourel 1974; Collins 1981; Archer 1988, 2000; Turner 1988; Mische and White 1998). First of

all, I want to underline that Goffman is not an unusual link between micro-level interaction and macrostructures (see for example, Giddens 1984, Sjöstrand 1985, Boudon 1987, Sewell 1992). The use of Goffman in organization theory may, at first sight, seem ubiquitous – a vast number of scholarly works refer to Goffman (see, for example, Williamson 1981, Scott 1995, Weick 1995) – but often, the inclusion of Goffman is limited to one or two sentences declaring that social life can be conceptualized as a drama. Occasionally, he is criticized for not taking into account larger structures in society. After a thorough account of the theories in question I will return to this criticism, and explain why much of it is not germane to my use of Goffman's work, should that not be clear from my presentation.

In the case of this particular study, Goffman's theories on the production of self and the nature of social life offer a way of bringing Bourdieu's theory of taste to the organizational arena; Goffman highlights *performances* and *audience segregation*, two notions that, based on my first round of interviews, seemed central to how taste can be conceptualized in an organization with mixed principles of legitimacy. As I will soon demonstrate, many of the related concepts came in handy as well. In addition, Goffman's focus on *form*, which will be discussed below, is consistent with the use of taste as an interaction medium (see p. 125). In opting for two theories that are conceptually congruent, I pave the way for a theoretical contribution that can be combined with and added to central theories in my research field (see also chapter 9). As I will demonstrate in this and the subsequent chapter, neither Goffman nor Bourdieu problematize taste in organizations on their own.

Clearly inspired by Georg Simmel's concepts form and content, Erving Goffman recognized that for the organization of social relations, appearance is far more important than is the content. He stresses repeatedly that he does not focus on the specific content of the participant's activity or this content's role in the larger social system. His concern is the *form*, i.e., the dramaturgical problems associated with presenting any activity in an interactional setting. He demonstrates that people control and maintain social relations by employing compound repertoires of interaction skills (see Goffman 1959, 1967). Recognizing that reality is constructed by very specific social mechanisms that can be pinned down, Goffman insists on not taking social reality as given. Goffman's work is vast and complex, and in this study I will only highlight a small, but arguably the most vital, segment of his production. Sorted under two headings, "Production of Self" and "Nature of Social Life", I will present Goffman's perspective on dramaturgy and rituals of social life. After that, I turn to his writings on gender and teams. The ideas presented here are collected from a number of books, predominantly *Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (1959), *Behavior in Public Places* (1963), *Interaction Ritual* (1967), *Frame Analysis* (1974), and *Gender Advertisements* (1979). Along the way, I will point out their relevance for this particular study, which will become even more apparent as we place Goffman next to Bourdieu's theory on taste. As Goffman has produced an adequate theory of the dramaturgy and rituals of social life, I have no intention to *add* to his particular theory. Rather, I presuppose Goffman's theory of social life.

Some introductory definitions

In Goffman's world, there are *interactions, situations, occasions, performers, audiences, co-participants, observers*, and, of course, much more. In order to chart out this world, it may be a good idea to start with a few definitions. Others will be introduced along the way.

Goffman defines his object of analysis in *Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*:

[...] interaction (that is, face-to-face interaction) may be roughly defined as the reciprocal influence of individuals upon one another's actions when in another's immediate physical presence. An interaction may be defined as all the interaction which occurs throughout any one occasion when a given set of individuals are in one another's continuous presence. (Goffman 1959, p. 15)

Trying to control the impressions of the situation that the others present before him or her obtain, each participant in the interaction makes use of some techniques. These techniques, tailored to sustain impressions, as well as the contingencies that accompany the use of them, are highlighted by Goffman. In every interaction, there are participants who switch between being performer and audience.

'Performance' may be defined as all the activity of a given participant on a given occasion which serves to influence in any way any of the other participants. Taking a particular participant and his performance as a basic point of reference, we may refer to those who contribute the other performances as the audience, observers, or co-participants. (Goffman 1959, p. 15)

His formal definition of social role[16] is "the enactment of rights and duties attached to a given status" (Goffman 1959, p. 15). Just like Berger and Luckmann, Goffman thus emphasizes position but he stresses the accompanying rights and duties to a greater extent.

The information game

In any interaction, the individual attempts to control the definition of the situation. He or she then tries to express him or herself so that the impression of the others present will be such that they will act "voluntarily in accordance with his own plans" (Goffman 1959, p. 3). According to Goffman, there are two streams of communication. From the perspective of the performer, there is on one hand "the expression that he gives", and on the other hand, "the expression that he gives off". Confined to verbal assertions and the like, the former is fairly manipulation-friendly. In the second stream of communication, however, the performer has seemingly little control. This stream comprises an array of actions whose common feature is that the audience expects that these actions were performed for different reasons than the information hence conveyed. Thus, the others can make use of the latter, presumably ungovernable, behavior as a validity check on what is expressed in the other, governable, stream of communication. In other words, being aware of two streams of communication, the witnesses have an advantage over the performer, who is only aware of one stream of communication. This asymmetry in the communication game is the basis for what Goffman calls *the information game*.

Observing an unobserved observer is one way for a witness to take advantage of the asymmetry. Then again, knowing that others will verify the "controllable" behavior by checking on the "uncontrollable", the individual may capitalize on that possibility. The individual may then widen the range of controlled behavior to include conduct that in general gives off information considered quite trustworthy; a "calculated unintentionality". Although one could expect the information game to unfold a

"potentially infinite cycle of concealment, discovery, false revelation and rediscovery" (ibid., p. 8), Goffman underscores the advantage of the witness over the actor. Claiming that it is always more difficult to manipulate one's behavior than to uncover the "calculated unintentionality", he reaffirms the aforementioned asymmetry.

Definition of situation / definitional claims

The interactants' attempts to control the definition of the situation will only go as far as to avoid an open confrontation. Generally, definitional claims are reasonably in sync, which is not the same as saying that there is a consensus. By concealing some of their supposedly idiosyncratic wants, participants strive to pass on a definition of the situation that they think others will accept. In addition, the interaction is facilitated by *a division of definitional labor*. By this, Goffman refers to the arrangement in which each participant is only committed to defining the situation in matters that are relatively more important to him or her. As soon as other participants consider matters that are more significant to them and of no immediate importance to our "original" participant, that participant keeps a low profile. In this interactional modus vivendi "the participants contribute to a single over-all definition of the situation which involves not so much a real agreement as to what exists but rather a real agreement as to whose claims concerning what issues will be temporarily honored" (Goffman 1959, p. 9). Referring to the agreement that explicit conflict regarding definitions of the situation should be avoided, Goffman characterizes any interaction by the "working consensus". Still, it is only the *form* of the working consensus that is common to all interactions. Its *content* may vary a great deal. Thus, there is a working consensus in defining a dispute

as a dispute, a tête-à-tête as a tête-à-tête, a doctor-patient meeting as a doctor-patient meeting, and so on, but what the participants say and do in order to reach this agreement may vary considerably.

The division of definitional labor testifies to the importance of knowing other people's relevance structures. Information regarding co-participants will function as a plan for the joint activity that lies ahead.

Defensive and projective practices

Also central to Goffman's writings on the definition of the situation is its moral character.

Society is organized on the principle that any individual who possesses certain social characteristics has a moral right to expect that others will value and treat him in an appropriate way. Connected with this principle is a second, namely that an individual who implicitly or explicitly signifies that he has certain social characteristics ought in fact to be what he claims he is. (ibid., p. 12f.)

Thus, by making certain definitional claims regarding the situation at hand, an individual also, implicitly or explicitly, claims to be a specific *type* of person. That can, according to Goffman, be seen as a moral demand on the others present before him or her; they are required to grant this person the treatment that is generally considered appropriate for people of his or her kind.

Once again drawing on Simmel's sociability concept and his emphasis on tact, Goffman casts light on the ways of avoiding and compensating for "definitional disruptions". In interactions, there is frequent use of "defensive practices" as well as "projective practices". The former refers to an interactant who aims to safeguard his or her own

projections, whereas the latter represents a co-participant's attempt to maintain the definition of the situation fostered by another participant. Thus, "projective practices" can also be described as "tact". These acts of tact appear in everyday social interaction, for example, saving the face[17] of a participant who has misread the situation, and can be seen as small transformative actions (or "agency", see Sewell (1992)). Whereas Simmel's notion of tact is more focused on self-regulation, Goffman's version of tact is to a greater extent directed at co-participants.[18]

After this initial introduction of some of Goffman's key concepts, we now turn to his view on the social construction of self.

PRODUCTION OF SELF

There are two ways in which the self can be seen as a social product. First, self is a product of the performed characters that individuals stage in social interaction. Second, the projected self needs to be validated in relation to the norms of the stratified society at large. In this section, I will expand on the production of self. This necessitates the introduction of some additional concepts, i.e., idealization, and self-as-performer *vs.* self-as-character. I will begin with some comments on Goffman's notion of performances.

Performances

Whenever an individual is continuously present before a specific group of observers (or just one), the activity before these people is a "performance" in the goffmanian sense if the activity influences them. Another concept central to Goffman's notion of performance is "front":

It will be convenient to label as 'front' that part of the individual's performance which regularly functions in a general and fixed fashion to define the situation for those who observe the performance. Front, then, is the expressive equipment of a standard kind intentionally or unwittingly employed by the individual during his performance. (Goffman 1959, p. 22)

"Front" consists of "setting" and "personal front". As the scenic element of expressive equipment, the setting provides the background, as well as the available props, for the interaction. For instance, in a talk between an employer and her employee, the employer's setting could be her desk. The parts of expressive equipment more closely associated with the performer him or herself, in the sense that they follow the performer anywhere, are a "personal front". Such equipment includes status signs, clothing, gender, age, ethnic characteristics, looks, spoken communication, expressions, gestures, etc. Furthermore, the personal front is composed of "appearance" and "manner"; the former informs us about the performer's social statuses whereas the latter indicates what interactional role the performer can be expected to play. (What is perceived as) an apologetic manner may thus foster the impression that the individual is waiting for someone to take the lead. We expect consistency not only between appearance and manner, but also between setting, appearance and manner (Goffman 1959). Fronts then may cause people to adapt their behavior to meet what they perceive as the requirements of the situation.

Moreover, Goffman points out that the information communicated through front has two important characteristics: abstractness and generality. Due to these characteristics, the observer is able categorize the situation and the performers by resorting to previous experience and stereotypes – *typifications* in Berger and Luckmann's vocabulary – when orienting themselves in the

situation. Along similar lines, Ridgeway (1997) notes that due to the evocation of gender stereotypes, interactions may preserve the gender order. Drawing on Durkheim, Goffman notes that the front can turn into a "collective representation", i.e., an institutionalization of the expectations that it yields. If an individual wants to assume a new role, it is thus often accompanied by a "given" front. So rather than create new fronts, interactants select among already established fronts. Problems can arise when none of the available fronts fits perfectly.

Idealization

There is, however, yet another way in which self is socially produced: idealization, by which Goffman refers to the tendency among performers to conceal or underplay aspects of his or her activity, motives or background information that are inconsistent with an idealized version of him or herself. Thus, the performance will represent and exemplify the socially sanctioned values of society disproportionately with regard to the individual's behavior as a whole. Goffman points to performances of the socially mobile as the most idealized ones: "Commonly we find that upward mobility involves the presentation of proper performances and that efforts to move upward and efforts to keep from moving downward are expressed in terms of sacrifices made for the maintenance of front" (Goffman 1959, p. 36). Anticipating Bourdieu's theory of economic capital, Goffman exemplifies his point with participants' employing of signs of wealth. When the censored conduct is somehow gratifying, the individual may treat him or herself to it clandestinely.

A performer often attempts to convey the impression of a perfect/ideal match between him or herself and the role. Sometimes performers wish to convey an impression that they never went through a learning phase, that they always had this self-confidence and skills.

Similarly, executives often project an air of competency and general grasp of the situation, blinding themselves and others to the fact that they hold their jobs partly because they look like executives, not because they can work like executives. (Goffman 1959, p. 47)

Furthermore, there is usually an idealization of the performer's relation to his or her audience. For example, the performer may try to bring about an impression that his or her performance is unique and personal. A prerequisite for, and an outcome of, this kind of idealization is *audience segregation*. This is a means by which the performer makes sure that "those before whom he plays whom he plays will not be the same individuals before whom he plays a different part in another setting" (ibid., p. 49). Audience segregation is central to my study, as the latter is confined to the audience of the organization. In other words, I am not concerned with how the organizational members perform outside of organizational life. I will not look into what impressions of themselves they foster when among friends or family.

Impression management

At first glance, Goffman may appear as a great believer in agency, or the individual's power of self-determination. It is true, according to Goffman, that the individual is quite successful in managing impressions. However, this is not due to immeasurable power on the part of the individual. Rather, it is the result of the others' projected agreement. The individual's impression management is

rarely challenged not because of a power asymmetry but because of the performer's modest liberties in stretching the limits of the interactional modus vivendi.

Self-as-performer and self-as-character

Goffman presents a dualistic conception of the self, which is not, however, at odds with his view that self is socially constructed. Whereas *self-as-character* is merely a social product, *self-as-performer* encompasses the human being as a psychobiological organism as well. The self-as-performer is the thinking, fantasizing, learning and desiring human being.

The human being's capacity to experience pride and shame (also elaborated on by Norbert Elias 1994[1939]) is the basic motivational core for the individual to engage in performances and take safety measures against embarrassment, and, subsequently, to attain selfhood. Thus, self-as-performer is not *the self* (as it is constructed in our society). It is the self that engages in the "all-too-human task of staging a performance" (Goffman 1959, p. 252).

The socialized self, or, to use Goffman's phrasing, self-as-character, is what we think of as the (inner) self. However, Goffman rejects equating the character one performs with one's self. According to him, that line of reasoning "is an implied part of what we are trying to present, but provides, just because of this, a bad analysis of the presentation" (ibid., p. 252). The reason is that the self-as-character is an entirely social product, i.e., the character performed, and not the inner motivational core that people often take as the inner self.

A correctly staged and performed scene leads the audience to impute a self to a performed character, but this imputation – this self – is a product of a scene that comes off, and is not a cause of it. The self, then, as a performed character, is not an organic thing that has a specific location, whose fundamental fate is to be born, to mature, and to die; it is a dramatic effect arising diffusely from a scene that is presented, and the characteristic issue, the crucial concern, is whether it will be credited or discredited. (ibid., p. 252f.)

Throughout his work, Goffman plays down the significance of the self-as-performer, or, in other words, the human being that decides what mask to wear. He only points to one important aspect of this self: that it makes people engage in the social world where they become social constructs. The capacity and inclination to be converted into social constructs as well as to be subject to moral rules is what Goffman regards as human nature:

Universal human nature is not a very human thing. By acquiring it, the person becomes a kind of construct, built up not from inner psychic propensities but from moral rules that are impressed upon him from without. These rules, when followed, determine the evaluation he will make of himself and of his fellow-participants in the encounter, the distribution of his feelings, and the kinds of practices he will employ to maintain a specified and obligatory kind of ritual equilibrium. The general capacity to be bound by moral rules may well belong to the individual, but the particular set of rules which transforms him into a human being derives from requirements established in the ritual organization of social encounters. (Goffman 1967, p. 45)

Goffman's dualistic notion of self is not to be confused with the oft-made distinction between the "real" or "true" self and the "contrived" or "false" self. Opposing that kind of dichotomy, he underscores that both the "real" and the "contrived" selves are social products, resulting from performances (Goffman 1959).

Difference between role and person

While granting a distinction between role and person, Goffman emphasizes that such a distinction is socially constructed. He stresses the individual's ability to distance him or herself from some of his or her activities, events and roles by regarding them as unimportant or accidental. This is in line with his discussion on "role distance", the expressed separateness between the individual and his or her accepted role on which he elaborates in *Encounters* (Goffman 1961). Repeatedly, however, Goffman underscores that what a person "really is" is neither possible to capture nor of any importance. "What is important is the sense he provides them through his dealings with them of what sort of person he is behind the role he is in" (Goffman 1974, p. 298). Enlarging on the notion of tact, Goffman extends his ideas regarding performances and the construction of self to include the nature of social life, which is discussed next.

NATURE OF SOCIAL LIFE

In his writings, Goffman often resort to metaphors of drama and ritual. By using metaphors that highlight both manipulative and moral aspects of social life, he also shows that manipulation and morality are not as separable as we tend to think. According to Goffman, morality is produced in performances and interaction rituals. Moreover, the seemingly manipulative ways individuals use to present themselves in the presence of others is how we attach ourselves to the moral order of society. By caring about maintaining our own face and other people's faces, we acknowledge and reproduce the ritual order. This section, on the nature of social life, will be divided into two parts, *social life as drama* and *social life as ritual*.

Goffman casts light on the fact that whenever an individual enters a social situation, he or she will want to discern the essentials of the situation. Since complete information of this kind is virtually never available; i.e., the reality of the individual's concern is unperceivable, the individual tends to use appearances (expressive gestures, status symbols, and other cues) to make inferences as to what the situation is really about. Thus, Goffman points to a paradox: "the more the individual is concerned with the reality that is not available to perception, the more must he concentrate his attention on appearances" (Goffman 1959, p. 249). The interactant's need to convey impressions implies the importance of dramaturgical principles. Rejecting the opposition of manipulation and morality, Goffman asserts that although individuals as social beings want to meet the moral standards of the society, they are as performers "concerned not with the moral issue of realizing these standards, but with the amoral issue of engineering a convincing impression that these standards are being realized" (ibid., p. 251).

Crucial to the outcome of a performance is the performer's *authorization* to perform in a particular way. Consequently, a "false" performance has nothing to do with the actual performance, but rather the co-participants' lack of acceptance of the performer. Accordingly, there are similarities between a "real" performance in ordinary life and the admittedly artificial performance in a staged action at a theater. The success of the latter requires the same real techniques which are used by interactants in any everyday life to sustain their definition of the situation.

Social life as a ritual

The respect an individual can expect from his or her fellow interactants depends on his or her social status. Within the ritual order, the individual's task is to show acceptance of his or her social position through the presentation of self. Social interaction is structured on mutual acceptance of each participant's *lines* [19], since self-respect and tactful considerateness characterize all interaction (Goffman 1967). By affirming *face* [20], rituals also acknowledge and reproduce the status order. According to Goffman, a person's face is always subject to approval by society. It is "only on loan to him from society" (ibid., p. 10), the individual does not freely choose a face.

Goffman also argues that strategic calculation is central to the maintenance of the ritual order because individuals realize that they would lose more than they would gain by challenging the social order:

Social life is an uncluttered, orderly thing because the person voluntarily stays away from the places and topics and times where he is not wanted and where he might be disparaged for going. He cooperates to save his face, finding that there is much to be gained from venturing nothing. (Goffman 1967, p. 43)

In *Behavior in Public Places* (1963), Goffman highlights regulations against "auto-involvements". These regulations, activated during any social interaction, provide assurance that no single interactant will become involved discretely in matters that concern only him or herself. There are also regulations against intense mutual-involvement among a subset of the participants. Any interests that only involve a few in the gathering are avoided. In that way,

[…] the individual perforce demonstrates that something of himself has been reserved for what remains, namely, the little system of regulated social life that is jointly and exclusively maintained by all those in the situation as a whole. (Goffman 1963, p. 194)

With regard to *content*, this obviously implies that participants should avoid topics that only engage a select few. Consequently, regulations against auto-involvement and mutual-involvement could have an impact on the sort of subjects dealt with in different situations in an organization.

THE MERELY SITUATED AND THE SITUATIONAL. In the immediate presence of others, our actions are socially situated. However, a lot of these actions could just as well be pursued in privacy. In making a distinction between the *merely situated* and the *situational*, Goffman wants to identify what is intrinsic to social life. He then differentiates between "what is incidentally located in social situations (and could without great change be located outside them)", and "what could only occur in face-to-face assemblies" (Goffman 1983, p. 3). The former is the merely situated and the latter is the situational.

Goffman rejects the common notion that the systems of conventions provided by the interaction order are upheld because participants only have to pay a small price and receive a considerable convenience in terms of facilitated coordination. He casts light on groups of people whose interactional existence is persistently very costly: "what is desirable order from the perspective of some can be sensed as exclusion and repression from the point of view of others" (ibid., p. 3). Goffman then proceeds to address the question of why these disadvantaged groups continue to cooperate. In his view, their collaboration is a result of automatically resorting to the ritual forms that come with

the interaction order (despite unequal distribution of rights and risks in the interaction order). The situational aspects of these interactions are "embodied indicators of status and character, thus appearing to render persons readable" (ibid., p. 3). In other words, social situations present participants with *evidence* of each other's characteristics (gender, class, ethnicity, health, personality, etc). Along similar lines, Ridgeway (1997) points to the centrality of sex categorization to interaction, noting that people are "nearly incapable of interacting with one another when they cannot guess the other's sex" (ibid., p. 219). Ordinarily, she adds, a failure to place someone along other dimensions of inequality, for example, class or race, does not encumber interaction.

According to Goffman, socially situated activities are characteristic of our human condition. That is to say, we spend our everyday lives in the immediate presence of others. In these encounters, and in other circumstances as well, there can be subjective weighting of the indicators (of status and character), which can result in the reproduction of social structure. Still, only the provision of evidence of the interactants' attributes is situational.

This distinction between the situational and the merely situated also permeates Goffman's writings on gender, which, again, center on the situational.

GOFFMAN'S TAKE ON GENDER

Goffman's two texts on the topic of gender, "The Arrangement between the Sexes" (1977) and *Gender Advertisements* (1979), also concern the relation between the interaction order and structures. Again, Goffman acknowledges structures, but chooses to focus

on the *form* of interaction. Goffman's take on gender is to focus on how the so-called *frames* [21] that organize social interaction endow gender with meaning. In line with his general social constructionist approach, he argues that the organization of interaction *gives rise to* differences between the sexes. It does not serve as a forum for the expression of natural differences between the sexes. Goffman concludes that the human nature of males and females is "the capacity to learn to provide and to read depictions of masculinity and femininity, and a willingness to adhere to a schedule for presenting these pictures" (Goffman 1979, p. 8). In other words, he adopts a position similar to that of feminist sociologists like Ridgeway (1997) (see p. 54).

The preceding sections on the merely situated and the situational, as well as on Goffman's take on gender, serve as a suitable transition to the next chapter, which will cover some of the theories of Pierre Bourdieu. Revolving around structures and the reproduction of social order, his theories are not concerned with the situational. To the extent that they pertain to interactions, they are content-oriented. However, before we turn to the French sociologist, I would like to dwell a little on the topic of teams. In brief, Goffman adopts a methodological position not unlike that of Berger and Luckmann and as we will soon see Bourdieu.

GOFFMANIAN TEAMS

The purpose of this section is to give a taste of the goffmanian perspective on teams by demonstrating how this view connects with the perspective on organizations used in this study.

Definition of teams

In this section I will describe how Goffman applies his interactionist and dramaturgical perspective on the study of teams (and, by extension, organizations). Rejecting the idea that performances are "merely an expressive extension of the character of the performer", i.e., an individualized view of performances, Goffman points to a number of distinctive features of performances that call for a study of team performances. First, Goffman stresses that performances often serve to express not the characteristics of the performer, but the properties of the task that is being performed. Similarly, Goffman further notes that a performance does not always reflect how the performer would like to appear. Rather, the performance may be put on to affect a scene on a larger scale. An individual's performance may then, for example, serve to foster the impression that the organization cares about its customers' satisfaction (although personally, he or she honestly does not care much about either the customers or their satisfaction). Moreover, Goffman highlights the intricate interdependence of participants in an interaction: "[...] we commonly find that the definition of the situation projected by a particular participant is an integral part of a projection that is fostered and sustained by the intimate co-operation of more than one participant" (Goffman 1959, p. 77).

In goffmanian terms, "performance team" or "team" denotes "any set of individuals who cooperate in staging a single routine" (ibid., p. 79). Locating teams between the individual performance and the interaction of all participants, Goffman discards the idea of an interactionist methodological individualism (where the cooperation between two performing individuals is the basic point of reference). The cooperation of several participants cannot

be treated as "a variation on a previous theme". Regardless of whether a team is made up of similar individual performances or of disparate performances that nevertheless materialize into a whole, the distinctiveness of the team calls for closer study of the mechanisms behind it. Below, I will introduce two essential characteristics of the team. Initially, I will turn to the special type of relationships that link members of a team to one another. Subsequently, I will discuss Goffman's take on the effect of teams on the definition of situation.

Dependency and familiarity

Distinctive of the team is the special relationship that team members have to one another. This relationship is characterized by two basic elements: reciprocal dependency and familiarity. When a team performance is underway, any team member is capable of giving the performance away or disrupting it. In other words, team members are tied to one another by a bond of reciprocal dependence. Goffman stresses that this mutual dependency derived from team membership serves as a source of cohesion for the organization at large. Cutting across both structural and social fissures, performance teams integrate the divisions of the organization and make people with different status dependent on each other.

Furthermore, Goffman goes on to discuss the special relationship that arises between team members who must cooperate to maintain a given definition of the situation in front of an audience. Because of the joint effort of putting on a team performance, team members will hardly manage to maintain the same impression for each other.

Accomplices in the maintenance of a particular appearance of things, they are forced to define one another as persons 'in the know', as persons before whom a particular front cannot be maintained. (Goffman 1959, p. 83)

Thus, team members are linked to one another by "familiarity" rights. These rights vary with the frequency of team performance and the "number of matters that fall within impressional protectiveness". Goffman emphasizes the formal nature of this type of familiarity. Once an individual is granted membership, he or she is automatically endowed with the privilege of familiarity. In other words, it is not necessary that this sort of familiarity develop slowly over time.

The maintenance of a given definition of the situation is contingent on the team member's *dramaturgical* cooperation. As a consequence, not all members of organizations are team members. This is also why some of the individuals who constitute the team may be very different, to the extent that they in other situations would be eager to keep social distance from one another. It is this enforced familiarity that characterizes the team members who jointly stage a performance.

Line

Any performance aims at maintaining a certain definition of the situation. While an individual performer, unencumbered by teammates, can make quick decisions about what his or her position in a particular matter is, teams cannot embody a rich definition of the situation. Rather, "reality may become reduced to a thin party line, for one may expect the line to be unequally congenial to the members of the team" (ibid., p. 85). Any open dis-

agreement among team members suggests problems with the reality sustained by the team. In order to avoid jeopardizing the espoused impression of reality, team members are often obliged not to take a public stand in the question at hand until a shared team position has been established. As soon as there is a team position in a matter, team membership requires compliance with it.

Not only is it necessary for a team member to know the team position, but also, the team position must be presented to the individual team member so that he or she knows how to play his or her part and feel like part of the team. If the team's stand is not available to a team member, she or he does not have a character to play. Such a member is unable to claim a self, uncertain about what stand to take.

Likewise, once a line has been taken, team members who do not maintain the given line, i.e., team members who make a mistake before the audience, cannot be punished and corrected until the audience is gone. In order to ensure the maintenance of a line, performers naturally prefer team members whom they trust will perform appropriately. Additionally, no individual can be part of both team and audience if the team is to maintain a certain projected definition of the situation successfully.

IN THE FOOTSTEPS OF GOFFMAN

Let me emphasize, for the sake of clarity, that there are many other theories that concern micro-level interaction and which I supposedly could have used instead (see p. 73). To reiterate, a decisive factor in selecting the theories of Goffman was that my first series of interviews pointed at organizational members claiming to take on

different approaches to taste in the organizational arena than elsewhere in social life (see chapter 12). Thus, Goffman's dramaturgical theories seemed most conducive to a greater understanding of taste and organization. These dramaturgical aspects are, for example, not central to symbolic interactionists like Blumer (1969), nor to interactionists like Berger and Luckmann (1966). Moreover, following the discussion on *form* and *content* in the previous chapter and the import of sociability in organizations (see for example Lindgren 1992), a continuous reference to these two aspects of interactions through the inclusion of Goffman's theories seemed appropriate.

Furthermore, since its completion, Goffman's work has been subject to criticism and evaluation, but it has also served as a source of inspiration for a vast number of researchers. In closing, I would like to present the main points of the criticism that has been directed towards the sections of Goffman's work presented here, and briefly discuss its pertinence from the perspective of this study. Also, I would like to point to some of his current followers.

The critique of Goffman primarily concerns an alleged disinterest in power and hierarchy, an imprecise position, and a deficient methodology. In terms of power and hierarchy, Goffman is sometimes criticized for not taking into account power asymmetries in interactions (see, for example, Garfinkel 1984 [1967], Gouldner 1970). Too much weight, the critics say, is given to personal will and intent. However, I dismiss this criticism by emphasizing Goffman's focus on the *situational*. His concern being the *form* of interaction, he clearly states that he does not address issues of social structure. Acknowledging that while the latter topic is more important to sociology, he describes the subject of his concern, the situational fea-

tures of social life, as only secondary (Goffman 1974). For a more indepth account of the difference between the *situational* and the *merely situated* I refer back to p. 89. I also reject the critique that Goffman is a firm supporter of the individual's self-determining power; I think this criticism derives from an unfortunate reading of Goffman's notion of impression management. He clearly states that because the performers rarely challenge the limits of the interaction order, the interactants most often accept the performances and, consequently, impression management then succeeds (see p. 83).

Related to the question of power is the criticism of Goffman regarding an inadequate account of his position and his intent (see for example Lofland 1980). While I concur with this critique, his theories nevertheless offer a useful tool for analysis. In the methodological chapter I reflect upon my relation to the research subjects and my position in general. While remaining on the topic of methodology, I also want to cast light on the fact that many scholars have criticized Goffman for employing unsystematic methods (see for example Glaser and Strauss 1967, Psathas 1980, Schegloff 1988). Although I think this critique is justified to some extent, I do not endorse the requirements of validity checks that some more positivistically oriented critics call for.

At this stage, I want to call brief attention to some of the present-day researchers who work in Goffman's tradition, some of whom I draw upon in my dissertation: see for example Hochschild's (1983) writings on the management of emotions, Ridgeway's (1997) account of the impact of interaction patterns on the gender order and Lindgren's (1992, 1999) use of the goffmanian dramaturgy.

I conclude by again calling brief attention to some of Goffman's concepts that are central to my approach to the study of taste in organizations. Inspired by Goffman's theories presented here, I also introduce the notion of *taste performances*, a concept I develop further in the following chapter. What I propose to explore is how the organizational members relate to taste in the *organizational arena*. In other words, I am interested in the organizational members' performances of taste in the organization. Focusing on "self-as-character" rather than "self-as-performer", I thus seek to explore the uses of taste in the organization. My approach hinges on *audience segregation* and the conceptualization of the organization as an arena for the production of self. Typically, the same audience (the other organizational members) will most likely not be exposed to other roles played by the same individual. However, one could of course speculate on the possibility of several different audiences in the organization. I am not at all interested in how the organizational members present themselves with regard to taste outside of organizational life. Accordingly, I have no intention to disclose any "closet fans".

For reasons that will emerge clearly in the body of the book that follows, I want to highlight the three portions of Goffman's work treated in the foregoing pages: *the production of self, the nature of social life,* and *teams*. The former comprises the notion of self as socially constructed. There is no essential self inside each individual. In its place, there are approved performances that convey a sense of an inner self. Moreover, self is a social product also because it relies on validation along the lines of the prevailing norms of society. Goffman's take on the nature of social life stresses its concurrently

manipulative and moral sides. Finally, I will apply his conceptualization of teams, and its emphasis on dependency and familiarity, to organizations. Together, these three segments of Goffman's work lay out the groundwork for the theoretical construction of taste in organizations. These particular theories will thus serve to highlight the interactional aspects in the organization, i.e., aspects of the construction *processes*.

Goffman's work, I suggest, also fits the theory of taste developed by Bourdieu. Both Goffman and Bourdieu seek to transcend the division between the individual and social organization. Having discussed sociability and interactional forms, I will now turn to Bourdieu's more structuralist but nevertheless *content*-focused theory of field and taste.

15. However, both Erving Goffman and Pierre Bourdieu have theorized gender (see Goffman 1979 and Bourdieu 2001), and I will provide brief accounts of these studies. Still, Goffman insists on only using the masculine pronoun in statements that I interpret as very general, and may, thus, unreflectingly reproduce the male norm.

16. Like Lindgren (1992) I want to distinguish between Goffman's notion of "role" and the notion of "gender roles". I reject the latter, as it rests on a complementary notion of gender and disregards power dimensions.

17. For an extended discussion on Goffman's notion of face, see footnote 20.

18. However, Goffman's writings on the regulations against auto-involvement (see p. 88) echoes Simmel's self-regulative aspect of tact.

19. "Line" is the "pattern of verbal and nonverbal acts by which [the individual] expresses his view of the situation and through this his evaluation of the participants, especially himself" (Goffman 1967, p. 5).

20. By "face", Goffman refers to the "positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact" (ibid., p. 5).

21. Frames are principles of organization that govern social events and our subjective involvement in them, principles that are closely tied and often constitutive of definitions of a situation. For example, an activity may be framed as a hobby or an occupation (Goffman 1974).

Bourdieu's field theory and his theory of taste

As much as this dissertation is an empirical study of the constructions and performances of taste in an organization in the field of cultural production, so too is it an endeavor to conceptualize taste in organizations based on relevant theories. I will devote the chapter at hand to Pierre Bourdieu's theorization of taste. As I shall soon have occasion to demonstrate, Bourdieu's work is replete with interdependencies between the various concepts. Thus, I believe it is not viable to conceptualize Bourdieu's strain of taste without discussing his broader theoretical framework. By the same token, I would refrain from using concepts such as "capital", and "field" without Bourdieu's overall framework. Although this elaboration will temporarily take us away from the analysis of the construction of taste in organizations, I believe my study benefits from a wider inclusion of Bourdieu's concepts and his field/practice theory. For one, his notion of field is highly relevant for my dissertation. It will assist me in problematizing the relation between the organization and the fields in which it operate.

INTRODUCTION TO PIERRE BOURDIEU

One of Bourdieu's recurring themes is the inseparableness of theory and practice. Accordingly, I would misspend my energies if I were to look for a theoretical treatise of his ideas. Instead, I have benefited from reading his writings on a variety of topics, ranging from the coping strategies among Algerian farmers during French colonization to the democratic art and pastime of photography. My primary sources for this chapter, however, are *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (1977), *Distinction* (1984), *The Logic of Practice* (1990), *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology* (1992), *The Field of Cultural Production* (1993), *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*

(1996) and *Masculine Domination* (2001). In chapter 11 and appendix 1, where I present my photographic study, I will draw on *Photography: A Middle-brow Art* (1990) as well. I am aware of the irony in endeavoring to produce an entirely theoretical exposition on Bourdieu, but this qualification aside[22], I will present some of the key ideas from the abovementioned books.

A central theme in Bourdieu's writings is the rejection of dichotomies, for example mind vs. body, theory vs. practice, structure vs. action, objective vs. subjective. Furthermore, Bourdieu seeks to understand people's everyday *practices* and, particularly, how they reflect power relations. In Bourdieu's view, actions are produced in processes of improvisation, where the actor draws upon the (practical) resources and constraints that are associated with his or her *habitus*. These aspects of Bourdieu's theory will be discussed below under the general heading of "practice theory". While somewhat overlapping with the previous theme of practice theory, I will devote a separate section to his elaboration on the relation between structure and action. The subsequent section considers the key relational concepts of *field*, *habitus* and *capital*. Eventually, I will arrive at Bourdieu's conceptualization of the field of cultural production and his theory of taste and distinction. After a brief section on Bourdieu's stance on the gender order, I close the chapter with a discussion of studies in the footsteps of Bourdieu.

PRACTICE THEORY

Game models

"What game(s) are the actors playing?", should, according to Bourdieu, be the guiding question in any attempt

to understand a social situation (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992).[23] Answering this question is also a way to distinguish different *fields* (or subworlds). The stakes of the game ordain the winners and losers. For example, in the game of business, players pursue material wealth whereas in the game of literature, players compete for reputation. Not only do the stakes of the games determine what counts as winning and losing, but they also establish the ways in which players will foster and sustain the autonomy of the field. In *Rules of Art* (1996), Bourdieu shows how the literary field took shape and continuously preserves its autonomy by (players) distinguishing literature from journalism and academic writings. In the game of science, a commitment to truth, and a special way of striving for truth (through empirical research) defines the *field* of science.

Besides struggling for the stakes of the game, players are required to improvise. Bourdieu stresses that a game cannot be understood solely by reference to the rules. Rather, an understanding of the game calls for "a sense of the game". This "feel" for the game is social; it encompasses instinctive responsiveness to the other players and their strategies. Analogously, a tennis player may develop a sense of her opponent's right hand serve and subsequent approach to the net. Without calculating, players are invariably aware of the field as a whole. The moves players make reflect their *habitus*, their capacity to improvise the next action. Because games are strategic, players are compelled to assess their opponents' strengths and weaknesses, as well as their own strengths and weaknesses, when deciding upon strategy (Bourdieu 1977, Bourdieu 1990a).

An organization, then, may encompass several different games concurrently. In some organizations the game (or

the games) of the agents may coincide with that or those of the organization whereas in others, agents may be playing several different games which sometimes diverge from the goals embraced by the organization.

The dialectic between theory and practice

Bourdieu regards his theory of practice as a product of the socially constructed "sense of the game" (Bourdieu 1990a). By insisting that social scientists must bear in mind the uncertainty under which people act, Bourdieu suggests that the focus of social science should be strategic actions rather than rule-following. Practical tasks rests heavily on habituation; in addition to rule-following it involves the continuous adaptation to the situation (described as improvisation above). Actors act with uncertainty regarding both the future and the overview of the game. The actor can only view the situation from his or her particular position; the "full picture" is always contingent on position. Social scientists often know the historical turn of events when they carry out their work. On one hand this allows them to account for inadvertent effects of agents' actions as well as for the probability of events turning out in a specific way. On the other hand, this position on the part of the researchers may imply inattention to the uncertainty that characterizes the situation of the actors.

Further, Bourdieu wants to "recover the practical side of theory as a knowledge-producing activity" (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, p. 30). Disapproving of "conspicuous theorizing", i.e., theoretical work conducted for its own sake, Bourdieu argues for a pragmatic use of theories. He advocates the use of concepts as "tool-kits" for solving problems. Theories should take into consider-

ation actors' resources and practical dispositions that enable people to adapt to the situation.

In these two senses, Bourdieu challenges the dichotomy between theory and practice. Asserting that all research is at once empirical and theoretical (it deals with observable phenomena, and it rests on assumptions regarding relations), Bourdieu supports the fusion of theoretical construction and practical research procedures. An ample social theory should comprise a theory of the fissure between theory and practice.

Hence, Bourdieu maintains that social research should concern itself with the dialectical relation between the close knowledge of practical activity and the more abstract knowledge of objective patterns. Otherwise the focus of the researcher risks shifting from actual social life to statements about it offered by informants. By embracing practice theory, Bourdieu seeks to capture the practical strategies people use as well as the relationship between these actions and their discursive explanations of their actions. Endorsing Bourdieu's practice theory when studying constructions of taste in organizations thus amounts to a call for greater reflexivity in exploring the differences between the discursive descriptions of the organizational members' practice of taste and this practice itself. In chapter 9, I will discuss to what extent this is possible in the study at hand.

STRUCTURE AND ACTION

This leads me to another dichotomy challenged by Bourdieu, the one between structure and action. The opposition between these terms often shapes theoretical thinking about the social world. Bourdieu uses the con-

cept of *habitus* as a link between social structures and mental structures, alerting people not to mistakenly consider the dichotomies as existing in reality instead of in our conceptual framework. Still, Bourdieu contests the structuralist legacy, the universality of human thought processes residing in the structure of the human brain (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992).

In *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (1977) Bourdieu develops his theoretical approach that challenges the structure / action dichotomy, a line of thought that resonates with that of Berger and Luckmann (1966). Both strive to integrate structure-based sociology, i.e., methodological collectivism, with methodological individualism. Bourdieu argues that from the Durkheimian tradition to consider social facts as things often follows a tendency among social scientists to overstress the role of structure or rule-following. Traditionally, the objective reality made up of these social facts was considered the heart of objective science. Seeking to identify the underlying conditions that enable the existing social facts, Bourdieu remarks that objectivism cannot account for the transformation of the basic structural stipulations into empirical reality. Instead, just like Berger and Luckmann, he maintains that such a reality is the result of people *acting* on these structural conditions and *understanding* reality through their practical subjective knowledge. This dialectic between objective reality and practical subjective reality thus resembles Berger and Luckmann's theory on the social construction of reality with the difference that Bourdieu's dialectic puts greater emphasis on practice. Furthermore, whereas Berger and Luckmann focus on primary and secondary socialization as key to subjective reality, Bourdieu highlights strategies and positions. In other words, Bourdieu's theory puts more emphasis on the internalization of power struc-

tures than of institutions. Furthermore, whereas Berger and Luckmann distinguish between objectivation and internalization, Bourdieu employs his concept of *habitus* (see p. 112) to encompass both phenomena. All in all, Bourdieu's theory directs more attention to the reproduction of power structures. By internalizing culturally specific categorizations or dichotomies, we reproduce social structure. Bourdieu reminds us that the dominated perpetually contribute to their own domination through their disposition (*habitus*), the embodied effect of domination, on which they act (Bourdieu 1984). These dispositions consequently correspond to the objective structures of social reality.

Thus the submission of workers, women, minorities, and graduate students is most often not a deliberate or conscious concession to the brute force of managers, men, whites and professors; it resides, rather, in the unconscious fit between their habitus and the field they operate in. It is lodged deep inside the socialized body. (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, p. 24)

Replete with interdependencies, Bourdieu's theory does not easily lend itself to a structured exposition. This character of his theoretical work now obviates a justification for a thorough treatment of his key concepts.

KEY CONCEPTS

In line with Norbert Elias (1991 [1939]), one of his most notable influences, Bourdieu highlights interdependencies when outlining his theory of field that link together his key concepts of *field*, *habitus* and *capital*. Therein lie the problems of extricating one of his concepts from his overall theoretical structure; I have to retain the context. Substituting the notion of "society" with that of "field" and "social space", Bourdieu stresses a differentiated

conception of society, the idea of a central unity to society is abandoned. A *field* is a relatively autonomous sphere with distinct rules and stakes for social activities (or "games") (see also p. 113). These regulative principles demark the field in which the game is played. Struggling to either change or defend the boundaries of the field, agents act upon their *habitus*. The latter refers to:

[…] the strategy-generating principle enabling agents to cope with unforeseen and ever-changing situations… a system of lasting and transposable dispositions which, integrating past experiences, functions at every moment as a matrix of perceptions, appreciations and actions and makes possible the achievement of infinitely diversified tasks. (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, p. 18, originally from Bourdieu 1977, p. 72, 95)

In other words, habitus is the set of dispositions upon which the individual acts. Neither entirely individual nor completely determinative of behavior, habitus is the juncture between institutions and bodies, between objective reality and subjective reality. As habitus encompasses an individual's understanding of reality, it has a constitutive power. Through habitus, each individual (as a biological being) relates to social space and his or her fields. Serving as an embodied sensibility for practical sense of the game, habitus enables improvisations (Bourdieu 1984, Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992).

Incorporated in habitus, and also available to the agents to struggle over in the field, capital is a field-specific "energy", a social relation, that determines the social rank and power of the agents within a field (Bourdieu 1984). To use the game analogy, one's embodied capital can be seen as a set of cards that vary in relative value according to game.

[...] a species of capital is what is efficacious in a given field, both as a weapon and as a stake of struggle, that which allows its possessors to wield a power, an influence, and thus to exist, in the field under consideration, instead of being considered a negligible quantity. (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, p. 98)

What is rewarded in one field may not be accorded importance or status in another field. However, translations between fields are possible through the conversion of capital, perhaps the most distinctive feature of Bourdieu's theory. Contrary to Marx, Bourdieu does not regard economic capital as the primary motivation of action or as a fundamental basis of a general system. In its place, he stresses the autonomy of different kinds of capital, essentially cultural capital (prestige), social capital (networks of connections) and economic capital (material assets).[24] He also describes more field-specific capital that does not translate easily across fields, for example scientific capital (Bourdieu and Waquant 1992).

If agents do not bring into play their various forms of capital, they will soon be lost. "A capital does not exist and function except in relation to a field" (ibid., p. 101), and, thus, it requires constant reproduction in one field or another.

A closer look at fields

A field comprises three dimensions with regards to capital: volume (i.e., amounts of economic, cultural and social capital); their specific composition; and direction and speed of change in the other two dimensions over time (Bourdieu 1984). Any agent's strategy will depend on these dimensions. Not only can individuals attempt to convert their capital, but they can also try to alter the current rules of the game. For example, agents may make an effort to change the exchange rates between different

forms of capital by questioning the value of the types of capital he or she has less of.

Bourdieu shows that fields not commonly associated with the pursuit of economic interest nevertheless function by principles of capital accumulation and reproduction (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992). Fields like art, religion, and science all operate primarily according to their own distinctive capital. This is crucial for the emergence of autonomous fields (Bourdieu 1996). Exemplifying with the literary field, Bourdieu illustrates how – despite a common construction of the artist and writer as disinterested – the success of the agents depends not only on aesthetic ideas and originality but also on their sense of the game. One of the key parameters in artistic fields is a devotion to art for art's sake. The artist seeks to produce work that improves his or her position in the artistic field, for example by paying homage to certain artists and, also, by distinguishing him or herself from them to some degree. The alleged disinterest in fact only indicates that the agent plays the game that defines his or her particular field, that the agent is not just a representative for other fields. In other words, the perceived disinterestedness derives from the interpreter being positioned in another field (with other interests). If an artist seeks to give art another function than the one endorsed by the artistic field, he or she is, according to Bourdieu, reminded of his or her dependency on other fields. "For each field fills the empty bottle of interest with a different wine" (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, p. 26). As much as many people in the *field of cultural production* seem disinterested from the perspective of people in the economic field, as much do many of the latter seem disinterested from the perspective of people in the field of cultural production. In short, the assumed disinterest refers to a *different* interest.

114

The field of cultural production

The literary field, the art field, the film field and the music field are all subfields within the field of cultural production. Structured along two poles, the autonomous pole based on cultural capital[25] (for example, taste, consecration and artistic celebrity), and the opposite pole based on economic capital, the field of cultural production is an "economic world reversed", according to Bourdieu (1993). This is so because the cultural pole has a positive connotation while the economic pole is marked negatively. All cultural practices are situated anywhere between these two poles (or principles of legitimacy). Moreover, he regards these two principles of legitimacy as autonomous and internal (cultural capital), and as heteronomous and external (economic capital). Thus, "high" art, such as "classical" music and "serious" literature are based on internal principles of hierarchization, whereas mass culture or popular culture is based on external principles of hierarchization. Furthermore, the field of cultural production encompasses not only the structure of the field in terms of the positions occupied by the producers, but also agents who legitimize the field, such as the public, critics, academics, etc. In addition, the field of cultural production is within the field of power (see p. 116).

Any thorough understanding of the construction of taste in an organization in the field of cultural production must come to grips with the fact that this field is also part of the field of cultural consumption. In other words, the agents of the field of cultural production are cultural consumers as well. I will soon turn to this theme under the section "cultural consumption as a means of distinction".

Relational concepts

As I stated at the outset, Bourdieu's concepts are relational. He uses open concepts as "a permanent reminder that concepts have no definition other than systemic ones, and are designed to be put to work empirically in systematic fashion" (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, p. 96). These concepts require a researcher to address questions regarding the construction of the universe of the study. As a result, habitus, capital and field cannot be defined separately. Thus, Bourdieu defines a field in the following terms:

[...] as a network, or a configuration, of objective relations between positions. These positions are objectively defined, in their existence and in the determinations they impose upon their occupants, agents or institutions, by their present and potential situation (situs) in the structure of the distribution of species of power (or capital) whose possession commands access to the specific profits that are at stake in the field, as well as by their objective relation to other positions (domination, subordination, homology, etc.). (ibid., p. 97)

Bourdieu further argues that the apparent idiosyncrasy among agents derives partly from the field itself; i.e., their position in the field (which also serves as a basis for their view of the world) as well as the construction of the field. However, these social agents' actions are not mechanical. Agents act from their respective position, and, by and large, they either try to preserve or change the present capital allotments (ibid.).

The field of power

Social spaces vary in degree of differentiation, i.e., the number of autonomous fields. Regardless of the number of fields, every field has a specific position with regards to the general "field of power" (ibid.). However, rela-

tions between fields change over time. This can be illustrated by the degree to which a position in a field corresponds to a high position in another field. In general, successful artists have difficulties in translating their professional prestige into a high position in other fields. People who hold high positions in business, politics, and law, on the other hand, tend to convert their position to other fields more easily. Indeed, some sorts of capital offer very unfavorable exchange rates if the possessor wants to switch to economic capital. Bourdieu points out that artistic fields, fields in which cultural capital is emphasized over economic capital, occupy a dominated position within the field of power (Bourdieu 1996). Belonging to the "dominated fraction of the dominant class" may have several different implications, one of the most frequent being the emphasis on distinction (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, p. 104). This topic will be discussed next.

CULTURAL CONSUMPTION AS A MEANS OF DISTINCTION

In his widely influential book *Distinction – A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste* (1984), Bourdieu charts a theory of the making and preservation of the social class structure through the monopolization of taste-making. It is first and foremost the theories on taste, distinction, and classification from this book, along with the abovementioned theories in the field of cultural production, that I will draw on in the study at hand. However, the ideas in *Distinction* rest heavily on the concepts, theories and approach to the social sciences I have described in this chapter. Although the book addresses a wide range of concerns, I will confine my exposition to the relation between taste and social order

in "the field of cultural consumption". As my dissertation concerns the organizational arena, I will not devote much attention to mobility and the educational system in society at large.

Part of Bourdieu's objective is to undermine the universal validity of Immanuel Kant's aesthetic theory. Arguing that the criteria of Kantian aesthetics, disinterestedness, purity and difficulty, in fact only reflect middle-class or high bourgeois values, Bourdieu discards the opposition between "the taste of sense" and "the taste of reflection", i.e., the distinction between mere sensuous gratification and reflective enjoyment (a separation which implies a division between the facile and the difficult, the crude and the fine, the common and the rare). Claiming that "no judgment of taste[26] is innocent", he shows how the dominant classes stigmatize the taste and life-style of the lower classes while at the same time rendering their own taste more distinguished and pure. Thus, taste constructs barriers between social groups.

Based primarily on two substantial surveys by Bourdieu and his collaborators, *Distinction* examines people's cultural consumption patterns regarding a wide range of cultural goods ranging from paintings and music (labeled "legitimate areas of culture" by Bourdieu) to clothing, furniture, social pastimes, and cooking. Calling for the desacralization of culture, Bourdieu underscores that "culture" has to be used in a broad, anthropological sense.

The studies in *Distinction* highlight two "facts"; first that there exists a strong connection between cultural consumption and educational capital[27], and second that given equal amounts of educational capital, social origin shapes cultural consumption (especially in relation to

everyday choices, such as cooking, clothing and decoration). Bourdieu refers to the fields under consideration as "fields of culture". However, I am afraid this notion may lead to misconceptions; for example, it may be interpreted as a reference to fields where cultural capital is valid (i.e., all fields), or it may be confused with the field of cultural production. A more suitable term may then be "fields of cultural consumption", as such a term captures the idea of applying distinctive practices to all areas of everyday life (see Bourdieu 1984, p. 5). After all, these practices are at the center of Bourdieu's analyses in *Distinction*, and they are the organizing principle of the fields that he is concerned with. Cultural capital serves as a resource in people's everyday cultural performance.

Taste is commonsensically understood as something subjective, idiosyncratic, something we either have or do not have, and its presence or absence can be interpreted as marking our place in the social space. Bourdieu suggests taste is a socially patterned phenomenon, and in order to uncover the social underpinnings of taste he proposes that we must "abolish the sacred frontier which makes legitimate culture a separate universe in order to discover the intelligible relations which unite apparently incommensurable 'choices', such as preferences in music and food, painting and sport, literature and hairstyle" (ibid., p. 6). A person's disposition for certain objects is created by his or her habitus and the field in which he or she lives. The habitus provides each person with classification schemes, which work in part unknown to the agent. Shared tastes unite people into social categories, while dissimilar tastes differentiate between these groups. "Taste classifies, and it classifies the classifier" (ibid., p. 6). In other words, because of their constitutive power, these dispositions form "the unconscious unity of a class". The taste disposition is a social orientation for

agents in social space, guiding them to positions as well as practices and goods that accompany such positions. Thus, taste is a significant element in the reproduction of the social order although the social nature of taste is somewhat disguised owing to our tendency to associate it with idiosyncratic qualities, such as distinction and good breeding. According to Bourdieu, social science should concern itself with the relationships between mental structures (or principles of classification) and social structures (ibid.). Summarized by Celia Lury (1996, p. 93):

Taste is thus shown here to be a process of differentiation, but it leads not only to the creation of distinctions between different categories of goods, but also to the creation of distinctions between social groups [...]. Taste not only provides a means of defining why some goods are better than others, but also a means of defining the people who use such definitions, and why they are better or worse than others.

Likewise, Bourdieu argues that the use of "popular culture" reproduces the dominant definition of culture as it is defined in relation to legitimate culture (Bourdieu 1984).

Bourdieu focuses on the field struggle that takes place in the field of cultural consumption by using the classes of the dominant and the dominated (exemplified with university professors as dominant and elementary school teachers as dominated in the cultural domain, and executives as dominant and low-level employees as dominated in the economic field). Hence, social class is relationally defined. According to Bourdieu, dominant groups use cultural capital, expressed through taste, to mark cultural distance and proximity, monopolize privileges, and exclude and recruit new occupants of high status positions.

Bourdieu thus underscores the endurance of the class system; both upward and downward mobility are rare

and constrained. The preferences of each class in the field of cultural consumption reflect an "adaptation to and consequently acceptance of the necessary, a resignation to the inevitable" (ibid., p. 372). People's choices correspond to their habitus.

Furthermore, the effect of habitus is manifested in different consumption patterns despite the same level of income. It is thus not only economic conditions that shape cultural practices. It is also a choice of the necessary. The latter implies two things: on one hand, the choice hinges on what is "technically necessary, the practical", i.e., what the person in question needs to do in order to "get by"; on the other hand, the preferences reflect the "economic and social necessity condemning 'simple', 'modest' people to 'simple', 'modest' tastes" (ibid., p. 379). Accordingly, choices are adjusted to the objective conditions imposed by the habitus, expectations are adapted to match objective chances. These "reasonable" choices are furthermore accompanied by the encouragement of group cohesion and class solidarity. "'Who does she think she is?'" and "'that's not for the likes of us'" (ibid., p. 380) caution the dominated person against distinguishing him or herself by attempting to associate with another group. The dominated hence refuse what they are refused.

By illustrating the correspondence between mental structures and social structures through, on one hand, the inscription of the social class system in people's minds, and, on the other hand, the constitutive power of the distinctive practices, Bourdieu thus shows how the social order is reproduced. The same correspondence between mental structures and social structures is highlighted in Bourdieu's account of the gender order, to which I turn now.

In *Masculine Domination*, Bourdieu theorizes about the gender order by discussing masculine domination as an instance of symbolic violence. Rooted in *doxa*, the "uncontested acceptance of the daily lifeworld" (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, p. 73), symbolic violence infuses the gender order with a notion of naturalness. According to Bourdieu, the structures of male domination are internalized in agents' habitus in two ways. First, both men and women internalize the male point of view, constructing the male as subject, and the female as object. Hinging on positions occupied in social space (see discussion on p. 111), the schemes of perception tend to oppose and hierarchize those features most frequent among the dominant and those most frequent among the dominated. Second, men and women acquire gender-specific "bodily hexes" (i.e., somatic expressions of the political), for example, controls, postures, modes of action, tastes, and certain forms of facial masks. Women adopt a "feminine" style and men a "masculine" style, thus inscribing the social construction of femininity and masculinity on the body (Bourdieu 2001). In other words, the gender dimension of habitus implies that the subjectivity of the social agents reflects the gender order. While women tend to gravitate toward dominated positions, men adopt dominant ones. As a result, gender differences, as well as their consequences, are perceived as natural. At the individual level, such differences seem to emanate from idiosyncratic choices by specific individuals, but at the systemic level, gendered practices are experienced as deriving from intrinsic, presocially determined differences between men and women. Masculine domination is thus naturalized through a profound biologization.

Drawing on his Algerian study, Bourdieu emphasizes the "extraordinary autonomy of sexual structures relative to economic structures, of modes of reproduction relative to modes of production" (Bourdieu 2001, p. 83). In an attempt to understand the perpetuation of the masculine domination, Bourdieu turns to the institutions that consistently contribute to its maintenance, most notably, the family, the church and the educational system. However, since my study is concerned with the organizational arena, I will not go into detail on how these institutions continuously reproduce the gender order.

IN THE FOOTSTEPS OF BOURDIEU

What follows next is a brief account of some studies from the fields of organization and sociology that criticize or contribute to those aspects of Bourdieu's work that I have just presented. The reason why I first gave a thorough description of (my interpretation of) his work is that I often find that a lot of criticism arises from a poor reading of his work. The sorts of reactions to Bourdieu's work that I will deal with here concern change, cultural consumption, aesthetic sociology and cultural repertoires / justification.

Change

Let me start with the issue of change. A stream of criticism calls attention to Bourdieu's alleged failure to explain change (see, for example, Sewell 1992, Alexander 2000, Lovell 2000). Arguing that Bourdieu does not account for changes that arise from within the operation of structure, Sewell (1992) has developed five axioms in order to demonstrate how transformations are

generated within the ordinary operations of structure. Alexander (2000) and Lovell (2000) claim that Bourdieu gives too little weight to the autonomy of the subject. Still, I would argue that Sewell, Alexander, Lovell and their fellow critics disregard the weight given to actors' capacity for improvisation through their habitus, although within certain boundaries which I think Bourdieu has proven to be justifiable; the class system tends to endure.

Cultural consumption

This section covers a range of different theories and studies concerned with cultural consumption[28] from a sociological perspective (most of which relate to the writings of Bourdieu). Under this heading I will introduce theories of taste, and, subsequently position my study in relation to these theories. I want to emphasize that this section implies a temporary move from the field of cultural production to the larger field of cultural *consumption* (see p. 119). All organizational members are part of this field, as this field comprises all corners of social life. Unlike my dissertation, studies of the field of cultural consumption encompass manifestations of taste outside of the organizational arena. At the risk of major oversimplification, I will divide theories of artistic consumption into two branches. Some theorists focus on cultural consumption as a medium of interaction. These are researchers with a more goffmanian, i.e., form-focused, slant to the study of cultural consumption. I will discuss these theories in some detail just below. The other branch, to which I subsequently turn, concentrates on symbolic boundaries. Much of this research follows in the footsteps of Bourdieu, and is thus more content-oriented.

CULTURAL CONSUMPTION AS A MEDIUM OF INTERACTION
Douglas and Isherwood (1979) maintain that goods, as communicators of social meanings, are necessary in order to make categories of culture visible and stable. Besides being concerned with content-related aspects of cultural consumption, for example, how cultural consumption can serve to foster exclusion and intrusion, they highlight how mundane everyday consumption facilitates and mediates social interaction. The ephemeral character of artistic experience makes it a portable and, thus, powerful medium around which interaction revolves (Douglas and Isherwood 1979, DiMaggio 1987). Conversations that revolve around relatively scarce cultural products such as opera, minimalist art, breakdancing, enable bonding with people who can reciprocate, experiencing "the joy of sharing names", while leaving others as outsiders (Douglas and Isherwood 1979). This is what Goffman (1963) refers to as "intense mutual involvement" (see p. 88). But cultural consumption is not always used for placing one another. Conversely, some cultural consumption, e.g., television, facilitates least-common-denominator talk, which is common within groups with time to spend on interaction for its own sake (Simmel 1950, DiMaggio 1987). Paul DiMaggio (1987) writes, "Consumption of art gives strangers something to talk about and facilitates the sociable intercourse necessary for acquaintanceships to ripen into friendships" (p. 443).

As the organizational context implies cooperation and attempts at collective sensemaking (Weick 1995), talk of taste, based on cultural objects, may be an important vehicle in interactions with people in the organization as well as outside of it. Although Bourdieu does not deal with this sort of more form-centered cultural consumption, my simmelian and goffmanian theories compensate for this.

Following Bourdieu, researchers have inquired into the notion of cultural capital, and sought to operationalize it in other contexts. I will give an account of a few studies that are relevant to my research area. Alongside the descriptions of each study, I will relate the study in question to my reading of Bourdieu. Additionally, I will suggest how I deal with the issues at the center of the studies below.

Lamont and Lareau (1988) propose one way to free the notion of cultural capital from the French context where it was developed. They study the day-to-day process and micro-level interactions where individuals make use of their cultural capital to reach desired social goals. Inspired by this recommendation, Lamont (1992) examines the creation of symbolic boundaries among upper-middle class men in France and the U.S. through in-depth interviews. According to Lamont, Bourdieu tends to see a strict hierarchical social order in an objective sense, whereas Lamont claims to recognize the status order's subjective quality. In Lamont's world, everyone belongs to his or her own "high-status" group. Thus, she opposes Bourdieu's concept of "the field of power", claiming that this construct assumes that groups are stable. Instead, Lamont advises researchers of culture to "compare how boundaries vary across contexts and across groups (not only classes), who boundaries potentially exclude where, and how they affect inequality" (Lamont 1992, p. 183).

In an attempt to recover Bourdieu's theory of taste, I would argue that the authors above operationalize cultural capital and field in a way that ignores the relational quality of all of Bourdieu's concepts. Bourdieu's notion of fields, including "the field of power", implies the con-

tinuous development of fields in relation to each other, as well as in relation to the concepts of capital and habitus. Furthermore, judging from Lamont's assertions that Bourdieu's theory of distinction rests on the assumption of an objective hierarchical order, recognized by all classes in society, I believe she has somewhat misread Bourdieu. My reading of Bourdieu implies a focus on the disinterested pursuit of taste rather than a deliberate manipulation that paves the way for exclusionary practices. To some extent, classification schemes operate unconsciously, so that choices are always in sync with the objective conditions established by the habitus. Thus, Bourdieu certainly takes into account the internalization of the objective conditions (the subjective characteristics of habitus).

I will, by some means, take up Lamont and Lareau's suggestion to study individuals' use of cultural capital in day-to-day processes and micro-level interactions. However, I will focus on how organizational members present themselves, and perform taste in everyday organizational situations.

SOCIAL NETWORKS AND THE USE OF CULTURE IN THE WORKPLACE. Criticizing Bourdieu's study of class and culture, Bonnie Erickson claims that Bourdieu neglects what she considers to be two important aspects of social structure, namely social networks and work relations (Erickson 1996). By incorporating a third kind of capital, social capital, "a capital of social connections, honorability, and respectability" (Bourdieu 1984, p. 122), Erickson argues that networks have more impact on culture than class does (Erickson 1996). According to Erickson, a person's culture is more varied the greater the network variety of classes. Following this line of argument, her study is confined to familiarity with cul-

ture, which she sees as the most portable and controllable form of culture (ibid.).

In her critique of *Distinction*, Erickson argues that there is a mismatch between theory and data, residing in a failure to study fields, and a focus on leisure lifestyles (Erickson 1996). I disagree with Erickson's reading of Bourdieu; I think that Bourdieu emphasizes that "the cultural field" (or, the term preferred by me, "the field of cultural consumption") involves all kinds of cultural consumption, not only "leisure life" (see p. 117). For example, it also includes talk about and consumption of cultural objects at work, in school, at home, etc. Thus, Bourdieu does not focus on "leisure life".

Although I also reject Erickson's interpretation of a "field" (i.e., as an industry in a specific local market), I want to highlight her recognition of the fact that companies must have both *domination* and *coordination*. With regard to domination, Erickson holds with Bourdieu to some extent, contending that the culture useful in domination is some kind of culture correlated with class. Then again, organizations have to be coordinated as well. Since coordination encompasses all ranks in the company, there is a premium on shared culture to smooth relationships across class boundaries. Consequently, according to Erickson, even culture that has little or no correlation with class is an essential part of class relationships. For her the most widely useful cultural resource is "cultural variety" accompanied by an understanding of the rules of relevance (cf. Berger and Luckmann 1966), and this, in turn, is closely linked to social network variety (DiMaggio 1987, Erickson 1996).

I find her focus on the organization very interesting and her notion of the "use of culture", which resembles my

endeavor to study performances of taste. Her study on the use of culture to smooth relationships across class boundaries in the organization also evokes the role of cultural objects as an interaction medium.

OBJECTIFIED TASTE VS. EMBODIED TASTE. I will now introduce some arguments made by Douglas Holt (1997), who argues that in postmodern cultures cultural objects no longer directly signal the cultural capital invested in consumption in the way Bourdieu's theory implies in *Distinction* (1984). According to Holt, Bourdieu's theory of taste is based on the assumption that different categories of cultural goods and activities call for differing levels of cultural capital for successful consumption. Cultural capital becomes *objectified* in consumption objects. However, historical changes have weakened cultural objects' role as representations of consumer practices and as consensus class markers (Holt 1997). These changes include technological advances, which have led to increased accessibility of goods, travel and media; extensive diffusion of innovative styles and designs, i.e., between haute and mass markets; the blurring of the distinction between high and low / mass culture (see, for example, Bell 1976, Huyssen 1986, Holt 1997). The breakdown of the hierarchy distinguishing "high" culture from mass "low" culture can be illustrated by the art world's espousal of features that previously were confined to mass culture, such as seriality and mass reproduction, and, conversely, popular culture's adoption of complex and sometimes obscure semantic structures that parallel modern art (Holt 1997, Collins 1992). Postmodern theorists argue that advanced capitalist societies are characterized by the massive overproduction of commodity-signs (see, for example, Harvey 1989; Jameson 1991; Stam, Burgoyne and Flitterman-Lewis 1992). This is in line with sociologists' contention

that there are substantial overlaps in preferences across social categories (see, for example, Bryson 1996, Peterson and Kern 1996).

Holt then underscores the point that *objects* do not serve as accurate representations of consumer practices, which is not to say that cultural capital differences in consumption no longer signal social membership (Holt 1997). Rather, Holt argues that an empirical investigation based on Bourdieu's theory of taste requires that the investigator first specify the theory with regard to the "socio-historical particularities of the population of interest" (ibid., p. 109). In the contemporary U.S., for example, Holt claims that an operationalization of Bourdieu's theory should emphasize "measures of tastes and consumption practices (*embodied cultural capital*) over preferences for categories of consumption objects (*objectified cultural capital*)" (Holt 1997, p. 109). In the study at hand, I will resort to Bourdieu's theory as Holt (ibid.) only recovers Bourdieu's theory so that its operationalization fits the present societal and cultural conditions. In other words, he does not challenge Bourdieu's theory of taste.

Although I think some of the studies presented under the heading of "cultural consumption" have serious methodological shortcomings (e.g., I do not share their commitment to quantitative methods in the study of taste, nor their occasional fondness for secondary data), I still believe they can provide certain useful insights. They can be linked to my dissertation by means of their emphasis on distinctive as well as interactive uses of cultural objects in social life and, in the case of Erickson (1996), in organizations. Admittedly, Erickson's (ibid.) study of the use of culture in the workplace may have major weaknesses in its treatment of social fields and its operationalization of cultural capital, yet I think the

account of the organizational context's influence on how culture is used is beneficial to the present study.

Aesthetic sociology

In addition to studies on cultural consumption (also called "sociological aesthetics"), taste is also treated in studies within "aesthetic sociology" (Gronow 1997). Aesthetic sociology is concerned with the role of taste in terms of aesthetic reflection, primarily in today's society (ibid.). By casting light on how fashion serves as a mediator between individualization and socialization, Gronow demonstrates the aestheticization of social life. However, as I have already mentioned, I was less interested in cultural consumption in general than in the use of taste at work, and, consequently, my focus on the organizational arena made the choice easy. The social determination of taste seemed much more in tune with my project.

Repertoires of justification

A strand of research labeled "the new French pragmatic sociology" that has attracted a great deal of interest during the last two decades concerns the "repertoires of justification" (for an overview of this research, see for example Bénatouïl 1999, Lamont and Thévenot 2000, Silber 2003). Often conceptualized as a response to the critical sociology tradition associated with Bourdieu, the interest of these pragmatic sociologists lies in how people justify their doings in various social settings (see, for example, Boltanski and Thévenot 1991, Lamont and Thévenot 2000). The critique of Bourdieu relates to his "over-emphasis" on the strategic quality of human action (Caillé 1988). For example, it is argued that

Bourdieu cannot explain the interest of amateurs to perform music (Gomart and Hennion 1999). Focusing on how actors generalize or legitimize their claims, while not construing openly expressed or hidden interests behind actors' general claims, they reject Bourdieu's field theory (Lamont and Thévenot 2000). Boltanski and Thévenot (1991) suggest an analysis of orders of justification that people draw upon in order to assess whether an action benefits the "common good". In other words, they are interested in finding out the most legitimate types of arguments that actors engaged in public discussions refer to when they want to appeal to common interest. Their "grammar of worth" comprises economic, political, technical, and moral criteria of evaluation. More specifically, according to Lamont and Thévenot (2000), they encompass a range of evaluations:

[...] 'market' performance, 'industrial' efficiency based on technical competence and long-term planning, 'civic' equality and solidarity, 'domestic' and traditional trustworthiness entrenched in local and personal ties, 'inspiration' expressed in creativity, emotion, or religious grace; and 'renown' based on public opinion and fame. (Lamont and Thévenot 2000, p. 5)

In comparative studies, repertoires of evaluations are compared across national borders. Despite my interest in different principles of legitimacy, I have chosen to include in my analytical model Bourdieu's field theory rather than the pragmatic sociologist's "repertoires of evaluation". I prefer Bourdieu because of his emphasis on power in his theories and models, something lacking in the pragmatic sociologists. Organization theorists generally agree to there being power differences in organizations, but often disagree about whom this power serves (see for example Crozier and Friedberg 1980, Perrow 1986, Acker 1990, Martin 1994, Scott 1998). I would also argue that my study originated partly from general interest in the field of cultural production and partly

from a wish to combine Bourdieu's theory with Goffman's theory and apply them to an organizational context. As Bourdieu, contrary to the pragmatic sociologists, problematizes the social underpinnings of taste, my focus on taste hinges on the inclusion of his theory of taste. Hence, my study is designed in such a way that if I had replaced Bourdieu's field theory with something else, for example theories on repertoires of justification, I would have written an entirely different book.

CHAPTER SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter has been one step in the development of a theory of the study of taste in organizations. I have sought to demonstrate how Pierre Bourdieu theorizes about taste and distinction by way of his concepts of field, capital and habitus. Bourdieu's theory of taste is fundamental to my study, which rests on the recognition of the social character of taste. My concern is however with taste in an *organization* in the field of cultural production. Vital to this study is the fact that the producers of culture are also consumers of culture. What remains, however, is to integrate Bourdieu's theory with the preceding ones.

While Bourdieu is concerned with the *content* of the game, e.g., strategies and stakes, Goffman focuses solely on the *form* of the interaction (i.e., the *situational*). However, form and content operate concomitantly. Habitus, which comprises the different types of capital, is continuously reproduced in the interaction order. In any encounter, interactants will affirm each other's faces. As these faces are "only on loan" from society, these affirming rituals serve to reproduce the social order (Goffman 1967). The claimed face of an interactant

emanates from the line he or she takes during the inter-
action. In turn, this line could be said to be adapted to
each participant's scope for improvisation, the latter
being contingent on the individual's habitus.

Thus, the maintenance of the social order hinges on both
an "unconscious fit between [the] habitus and [the]
field" (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, p. 24) in question
(Bourdieu's explanation) and the refraining from losing
one's face by not challenging the current ritual order
(Goffman's explanation). In the first case, the objective
structures of the field have been internalized and will be
reflected in the individual's dispositions (the *content* of
the games), e.g., by means of "the taste of necessity".
Goffman refers to this condition as the "merely situ-
ated". In the latter case, the social order is reproduced
through the specific rituals of interaction (i.e., the *form*).
In Goffman's terms, these are the "situational" aspects of
interactions. However, both Bourdieu and Goffman
point to a certain scope for improvisation. While
Bourdieu yet again is concerned with the content (strat-
egies for action, a "sense of the game"), Goffman
emphasizes transformative actions that are situational
(e.g., projective practices), but which may still influence
the content. Social order is of course also reproduced in
organizations. Still, some characteristics of the organ-
ization may have a mediating effect on this reproduction,
something I will return to in my analysis.

Bourdieu urges us to ask what game or what games
actors are playing, in order to distinguish various fields.
This may be an intricate task as the organization in the
field of cultural production consists of people who, as
individuals, may belong to different fields and who, as
organizational members, may define the organization as
well as organizational situations differently with regards

to fields. Drawing on Bourdieu, an organization in "the creative industries" is part of a number of different fields. In addition to being part of the economic field (due to its status as a company), it is part of the cultural consumption field (referred to as "the cultural field" by Bourdieu). Furthermore, it is obviously part of the field of cultural production, and, in turn, also, of one of its subfields, such as the literature field, the arts field, etc. The organization's position in the overall field of power is then determined by the subfield's position vis-à-vis the field of power, as well as by the organization's position with regards to the subfield and the economic field.

In the empirically oriented Part II, I will return to the discussion of whether there is a film field with a specific relation to the cultural production field and the economic field. Particular aspects of organizations in the film industry may call into question the existence of an autonomous film field. In place of a common set of rules of the game, organizations and their members may operate under different rules. In other words, they may play different games and thus define the field differently.

I have already touched on the differences between Goffman and Bourdieu in the use of metaphors. Where the former employs metaphors of drama, the latter makes use of metaphors of games. Somehow these metaphors also point to the differing foci: form and content, respectively. However, they both seek to go beyond the division between the individual and social organization. By combining their two approaches to the study of social organization, I may specify the concept of *taste performances* further. I regard content-based taste performances as strategies in an organization in the field of cultural production.

22. To my defense, this "theoreticist fallacy", to paraphrase Bourdieu, is an isolated case, confined to this chapter (and the preceding ones).

23. An alternative to Bourdieu's practice theory is Crozier and Friedberg's (1980) writings on strategic action. However, in line with my overall epistemological position, I prefer Bourdieu's theorization of power as well as structures to the methodological individualist approach represented by Crozier and Friedberg (1980) which ignores structures.

24. In addition to these forms of capital and their subcategories, Bourdieu uses "symbolic capital". It refers to: "the form that one or another of these [other forms of capital] takes when it is grasped through categories of perception that recognize its specific logic or, if you prefer, misrecognize the arbitrariness of its possession and accumulation" (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, p. 119). My understanding of the notion of symbolic capital is that it encompasses the tools (other forms of capital) used by individuals and institutions in a field in their struggle for domination. As I do not find the notion of symbolic capital essential to this study I will not dwell on this concept. Instead, I will use the operationalized forms of symbolic capital (for example economic and cultural capital). For an extended discussion, see Bourdieu 1977, p. 171–183; 1990a, p. 112–121.

25. Bourdieu (1993) uses the notion of "symbolic capital" (see footnote 24). However, since he specifies its operationalized form in the field of cultural production as cultural capital, and in the interest of clarity, I will keep to the concept of cultural capital.

26. Bourdieu refrains from defining "taste", but refers to the inseparableness "of the faculty of immediately and intuitively judging aesthetic values from taste in the sense of the capacity to discern the flavors of foods which implies a preference for some of them" (Bourdieu 1984, p. 99). However, a short definition appears on p. 56 in Distinction: "manifested preferences". Furthermore, he refers to taste as "an acquired disposition to 'differentiate' and 'appreciate' […], in other words, to establish and mark differences by a process of distinction, which is not (or not necessarily) a distinct knowledge, in Leibniz's sense, since it ensures recognition (in the ordinary sense) of the object without implying knowledge of the distinctive features which define it" (ibid., p. 466).

27. Measured by father's occupation. Educational capital is constructed as a subcategory to cultural capital, "assimilated cultural capital" (see Bourdieu 1986 on forms of capital).

28. "Artistic consumption" and "cultural consumption" are used interchangeably throughout this study to refer to consumption of cultural objects (see p. 171).

Gender and organization

.

This study of taste in an organization in the field of cultural production cuts across a number of disciplinary areas. As I stated at the outset, it is a dissertation in the field of organization studies. An inclusive field, organization theory encompasses different epistemological and, subsequently, methodological views. With no insistence on giving a thorough account of the field of organization theory (for general outlines of the field, see for example Clegg, Hardy and Nord 1996; and for Swedish contributions to the field, see for example Czarniawska 1998), I will present select theories in the field of gender and organization, which will all be incorporated in my theoretical framework. My decision to position myself in this field attests to the fact that my perspective on organizations entails recognizing the always-present significance of gender. In my study I want to explore the various manifestations of gender in taste performances in the organization. However, before turning to feminist organization theory, I would like to introduce two gender-blind theories. First, I present a theory on *organizing*, which will provide a framework for how organizational members make sense of organizational processes. The reason I include this theory is that I expect sensemaking processes to be particularly important in an organization operating in a field with mixed principles of legitimacy (see p. 115). Then, I briefly describe Asplund's (1991) figure of thought *Gemeinschaft / Gesellschaft* (based on Tönnies' *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* from 1887). Since it reflects many of the upcoming descriptions of the organization in Part II, I will resort to this figure to organize parts of my empirical material.

As we move along, I will explain how I expect to use the theories in question in my overall analytical model developed to study how organizational members in the field of cultural production relate to taste in their work and how theses relations are gendered.

Just like Bourdieu and the theorists in the field of gender and organization addressed below, Karl Weick is interested in the *content* of interaction and how we make sense of things. He is not occupied with forms of sociation as are Simmel and Goffman.

While individuals in the organization attend to their environments in a selective manner, they interact to make collective sense of what is going on (Weick 1995, 2001). Weick claims that this collective sensemaking brings about a range of routines and patterns of interaction, which constitute the process of organizing.

The basic raw materials on which organizations operate are informational inputs that are ambiguous, uncertain, equivocal. [...] The activities of organizing are directed toward the establishment of a workable level of certainty. An organization attempts to transform equivocal information into a degree of unequivocality with which it can work and to which it is accustomed. This means that absolute certainty is seldom required. It also means that there can be enormous differences among organizations and industries with respect to the level of clarity that they regard as sufficient for action.

Members of organizations spend considerable time negotiating among themselves an acceptable version of what is going on. The activity itself is preserved by the phrase consensual validation and the content of the activity is preserved by the phrase reducing equivocality. (Weick 1979, p. 6)

Thus, by reducing ambiguity to a certain extent, organizational members aim to create a somewhat shared understanding of what is happening. Yet, I want to stress the possibility of several parallel sensemaking processes in an organization.

However, organizing does not imply achieving a preordained goal. Weick argues that the idea of "goal consen-

sus" preceding action conceals the fact that consensus must be established around something "tangible", more specifically, actions. These actions may be current actions or actions already completed. Consequently, it is not surprising if goal statements are sometimes made in retrospect.

Sensemaking

Before we proceed, I would like to linger a little on the concept of sensemaking. Weick (1995) contrasts it with interpretation, and arrives at a number of distinguishing traits. While interpretation suggests translating one to one, i.e., one word is explained by another, sensemaking is about not only reading but also authoring. In other words, sensemaking encompasses both creation and discovery. Focusing on process, the notion of sensemaking "highlights the action, activity, and creating that lays down the traces that are interpreted and then reinterpreted" (ibid., p. 13). Linking the interpretation of previous developments with current outcomes, sensemaking efforts often focus on the writing of convincing (sensemaking) stories. In doing so, organizations take part in creating the realities that impose constraints on them.

As we saw in chapter 2, there are relevance structures to knowledge in everyday life. As much as these relevant structures generate contents in the service of sociability, so too do they provide organizational members with the frames of reference that they use in the sensemaking processes. For example, these relevance structures may determine which pole, the economic or the cultural, will be triggered in organizational processes. Furthermore, as Dorothy Smith describes in her writings on relations of ruling (see p. 55), it is likely that in sensemaking processes knowledge associated with ruling (for example manage-

ment) is ascribed more importance than so-called "local knowledge". In other words, the prerogative of interpretation on the part of dominating groups, for example men or the organizational members who represent the dominant pole, will affect the sensemaking processes.

Construction vs. enactment

Under this heading, Weick identifies a difference between his theories of sensemaking in organizations and other theories on social constructionism. So how does "enactment" differ from "construction"? By "enactment", Weick (1995) refers to the fact that organizational members often "produce part of the environment they face" (p. 30). He is careful to point out that this term cannot be equated with perceived environment. Contrasting his notion of "enactment" with the concept of "construction", Weick claims that the former to a larger extent incorporates the idea that people "actively *put* things out there that they then perceive and negotiate about perceiving". According to him, "construction" is more narrowly defined to negotiations of what is out there. Weick's distinction, however, is superfluous because he disregards the notion of externalization, an essential element of Berger and Luckmann's social construction concept. Through externalization, people produce both themselves and their environment (Berger and Luckmann 1966). Thus, I think Berger and Luckmann would agree with Weick's treating of the environment as (partly) an output of organizations. However, that may be a very different take from "the classical organization studies" that Weick positions himself against.

Johan Asplund's (1991) figure of thought *Gemein-schaft / Gesellschaft* is based on Tönnies' book *Gemein-schaft und Gesellschaft* from 1887. I will however not concern myself with the original theory by Tönnies, which sketches an evolution from ancient to modern society. In Asplund's figure of thought, *Gemeinschaft*, denoting a simple, traditional, kin-based community based on natural and unplanned relations between people, is contrasted with *Gesellschaft*, which is a money-based society of strangers where everything is intended and artificial. While the spirit of community distinguishing Gemeinschaft may occasionally lead to conflicts, Gesellschaft is based on conflicts. There are neither friends nor enemies in a Gesellschaft. Rather, there is only a market where people relate to each other as com-petitors. Highlighting the dialectical opposition between Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft in modern society, Asp-lund thus calls attention to how one could make use of the two concepts in understanding discourses and prac-tices in everyday life (Asplund 1991). Like Weick's the-ory on organizing, Asplund's Gemeinschaft / Gesellschaft figure of thought may be regarded as a tool for under-standing sensemaking in the organization.

I now turn to the gendering of organizations.

FEMINIST PERSPECTIVES ON ORGANIZATION THEORY

Concomitant to the gender construction processes in soci-ety at large, gender is continuously produced and repro-duced in the organizational arena (see for example Acker 1992, Mills 1992, Wahl 1992). Aiming for a more com-

prehensive organization studies, feminist theories on organizations address gender in organizations both theoretically and empirically. The field of gender and organization evolved from criticism of the gender blindness of mainstream organization studies (see for example Acker and Van Houten 1974, Hearn and Parkin 1983, Ferguson 1984). The bulk of organization research conducted tended to downplay the significance of gender in organizations; women were often overlooked or marginalized, while men were not acknowledged as gendered beings. With no ambition to provide an all-inclusive representation of the field of gender and organization, I shall proceed by giving an account of theories pertinent to my study. These are theories that concern gendering processes, gender structures and segregation processes, homosociality and local constructions of gender in organizations. In other words, these theories are all included in my analytical model, and I position myself in relation to these theories in the field of organization and gender.[29]

THE GENDERING OF ORGANIZATIONS

Acker (1988, 1992) argues that all social relations are gendered. Thus, even ostensibly gender-neutral processes contribute to the construction of gender. By "gendered processes", Acker (1990) refers to the fact that "advantage and disadvantage, exploitation and control, action and emotion, meaning and identity are patterned through and in terms of a distinction between male and female, masculine and feminine" (p. 146). Encompassing a very broad range of activities (people's actions, talk and ideas / beliefs), gendered processes are integral to all other social processes (involving, for example, class and race relations). They can be either gender-explicit, as when only men or women are preferred at certain organ-

izational positions, or gender-neutral, as when organizational processes are perceived and presented as neutral but have gendered effects. Acker points out four analytically distinct gendering processes. First, she highlights the fact that organizational practices result in the gendering of jobs, wages, and power, i.e., they produce gender divisions. Second, she points at the creation of symbols, representations, and forms of consciousness that serve to explain, justify and sometimes to resist gender divisions. Third, gendering processes are also found in interactions "between individuals, women and men, women and women, men and men, in the multiplicity of forms that enact dominance and subordination and create alliances and exclusions" (Acker 1992, p. 253). The fourth set of processes is the internalized reality of the individuals, the mental structure at work when they construct their understanding of the gendered organizational structure, as well as the quest for "gender-appropriate" performances.

Moreover, Acker (1992) stresses that gender, sexuality and bodies can be conceptualized either as *organizational resources* to be used by management, and/or individuals or groups, or as *problems for management* (i.e., resources that need to be controlled). Acker also demonstrates that the gendering processes are based on, and also reproduce, a gendered substructure of organization. Fundamental to these gendered substructures are "the spatial and temporal arrangements of work", "the rules prescribing workplace behavior", and "the relations linking workplaces to living places" (ibid., p. 255). Underlying these practices and relations is the assumption that work is separated from private life. According to Acker, organizations depend on this division; workers must be supplied through external reproduction arrangements. In other words, the gender substructure of

organization is related to family and reproduction. In addition, the gendered substructures permeate organizational theory. Although it may seem gender-neutral at first sight, traditional organizational theory assumes that managers and employees are male, that these are endowed with stereotypical male attributes: attitudes, powers and commitments (cf. Smith 1987).

In an organization in the field of cultural production not only will different parts of the organization, but also various organizational practices, such as the aforementioned *taste performances*, be gendered. Further, I will take into account the gendered substructures that Acker highlights. Structures will remain the theme of the next two sections.

A STRUCTURAL APPROACH TO GENDER AND ORGANIZATION

As I stated in the previous chapter, I have chosen to bring to light theories that highlight power. Having presented a theory of power struggles in terms of fields, I will now move on to address power structures in organizations. In her seminal book *Men and Women of the Corporation*, Kanter (1977) demonstrates how the distribution of power affects women and men in the organization. Arguing that gender is constructed in the organizational arena, she stresses the conditions of men and women rather than gender in and of itself. Thus, Kanter advances a structural perspective on gender and organization. She pins down three "structural determinants of behavior in organizations": the structure of opportunity, the structure of power, and the relative numbers (proportion and social composition). I will briefly describe these three organizational dimensions.

Referring to opportunity as expectations and future prospects, *opportunity structures* then involve mobility and growth. Opportunity structures are determined by, for example, career openings from a certain position and the individual's prospects in relation to others of approximately the same age and seniority. Kanter argues that the opportunity differentiation in organizations result in distinct strategies and behavior among people low in opportunity and those high in opportunity. The former tend to develop limited aspirations in the organization, refraining from placing great value on responsibility and participation. Instead, they look for satisfaction in activities outside of the organization. This set of behavior is often accompanied by a lower self-esteem and an inadequately low valuation of their competence. On the other hand, the people high in opportunity tend to keep their aspirations high. With a high self-esteem, they often value or even overestimate their own competence. Work plays a central role in their life, and from this follows a commitment to the organization and its goals, as well as a willingness to sacrifice for it.

The structure of power refers to "the capacity for the person to act efficaciously within the constraints of the wider organizational system" (ibid., p. 247). Determined by formal job features (e.g., routinization vs. discretion, visibility, import for the organization at large, approval among people in top positions) and informal affiliations (e.g., sponsors among high status people, support from peers), the structure of power gives rise to distinctive behaviors according to position. People low in organizational power often perform authoritatively, and in their effort to keep control they often supervise too closely and sometimes also hold back subordinates. People high in power tend to have cooperative subordinates, a fact which obviates the use of strong controls. By

delegating control to their subordinates, people high in power often pave the way for the latter to grow and find new responsibilities. Thus, people high in power are often more popular among their subordinates.

By the third structure, *the structure of relative numbers or proportions*, Kanter points at the social composition of organizational members in the same situation. "It is a simple quantitative matter of how many people there are of what relevant social types in various parts of the organization – e.g., the proportion of women, men, blacks, ethnic minorities" (ibid., p. 248). Difference is then a function of how many similar people make up the organization. Minorities face special situations due to three perceptual tendencies: *visibility, contrast,* and *assimilation.* Visibility refers to the fact that "the token" (the odd other that is often taken as a representative of their category, i.e., as a symbol) gets more attention in the organization. In other words, "as individuals of their type represent a smaller numerical proportion of the overall group, they each potentially capture a larger share of the awareness given to that group" (ibid., p. 210). The effects of contrast, are, according to Kanter, polarization and exaggeration of differences. The presence of a token implies that the majority becomes aware of their own culture and type. Usually, the dominant population is inclined to exaggerate the differences between itself and the token. The third perceptual tendency brought to light by Kanter, assimilation, entails the frequent use of stereotypes or other kinds of generalizations. It is the minority situation of the token that enables this kind of stereotyping, where the characteristics of the token are often misrepresented to fit the generalization. By conforming to the stereotype offered by the dominant group, the individual achieves "an instant identity", something that may sometimes appear easy

and convenient to the individual. Kanter concludes: "So tokens are, ironically, both highly visible as people who are different and yet not permitted the individuality of their own unique, non-stereotypical characteristics" (ibid., p. 211).

Since the publication of *Men and Women in the Corporation* in 1977, Kanter has been criticized for disregarding the wider picture; the fact that gender, power, and structures are interrelated (see for example Lindgren 1985, Pringle 1989, Acker 1990, Cockburn 1991, Wahl 1992). Kanter tends to distinguish between gender and power, considering power differences between the genders as solely contingent on the organizational structure (i.e., variations in terms of power, opportunities, and numbers). However, as Lindgren (1985) remarks, irrespective of the relative numbers in the organization, the gender order in society at large will affect the opportunities offered to both genders in the organization.

Yet, Kanter's structural approach to gender highlights the different conditions between men and women. By applying Kanter's thoughts to my study I may cast light on how men and women use and construct taste from different positions within the organization.

GENDER STRUCTURES IN ORGANIZATIONS

Wahl (1992) explores gender structures in organizations by addressing the underrepresentation of women in top positions in society at large and in organizations in particular. Wahl uses the concept of "gender structure" to examine organizations from a gender perspective. Manifested in the gender structure are three kinds of gender divisions:

1. The proportion of men and women in the organization (in general).

2. The degree of gender segregation in terms of occupations, tasks, and positions.

3. The hierarchical distribution of men and women in terms of influence and power.

Focusing on the last two factors, Wahl studies different consequences and manifestations of the gender structures. For example, she identifies two forms of structural discrimination in the organization: *direct* and *indirect discrimination*. The former refers to discrimination that can be linked to a certain individual. Direct discrimination often takes place in salary and promotion matters, and in work evaluations where the subject does not receive full credit for job performance. Furthermore, direct discrimination is, according to Wahl's study, more common in male dominated organizations. Moreover, women who aspire to higher positions experience direct discrimination to a greater extent than women who do not seek management positions. This could reflect a higher awareness among women who aspire to top positions or an organizational resistance to women who pursue careers.

Wahl's second notion, indirect discrimination, refers to different working conditions and general treatment. Included in this category are differences in terms of working hours, possibilities for career breaks and perceptions regarding age and career. Accordingly, indirect discrimination relates to the fact that "career", and the accompanying conditions and rules of the game, are constructed according to a male norm. The study describes discrimination as normal in organizational life. The gender structures in the organization are often taken for granted, and although the consequent discrimination is a structural phenomenon, it is often individualized.

According to Wahl, there are two main reasons why women who are subject to special treatment prefer not to label it discrimination. First, given the gender-neutral ideology of organizations, it is illegitimate to bring up the significance of gender. Second, women in male-dominated organizations adopt different strategies for dealing with the gender structures. Rather than emphasizing the negative aspects of gender, they find it vital to stress the positive aspects of gender in order to cope with male dominance.

In addition to the structural contingencies related to gender in the organization identified by Kanter, I will rely on Wahl's notion of gender structures in the organization. Incorporated in the structure of the organization, discrimination is supposedly an everyday experience for many of the women in my study as well. This will of course affect their daily practices in the organization, including their taste performances, and it may also influence the venture of bringing gender into the discussion in my interviews. In the next section I will elaborate primarily on one aspect of gender structures: gender segregation processes.

GENDER SEGREGATION PROCESSES IN ORGANIZATIONS

In numerous studies, sociologist Gerd Lindgren explores mechanisms of gender segregation in organizations (see for example Lindgren 1985, 1992, 1996, 1999). Employing a perspective that comprises both Bourdieu (his notions of *field, habitus* and *capital*) and Goffman (primarily his concepts of *frontstage* and *backstage*), Lindgren (1992) is particularly pertinent to the study at hand. In this study of a medical clinic, Lindgren identifies three

independent cultures in the organization: the collective culture (represented by the nurses' assistants), the corporative culture (represented by the nurses), and the cooptative culture (represented by the doctors). Through the use of Goffman's frontstage / backstage concepts, she highlights the kind of interaction that characterizes each of these occupational groups and their respective cultures. Existing side by side, these different cultures continuously produce and reproduce the organizational hierarchy, a process that has at its center two relations of power, class and gender, as well as a communicative element.

Lindgren describes the organization as simultaneously a manifestation of the class society and a basis for its reproduction. People's place in the organizational hierarchy is consistent with their habitus (see Bourdieu 1984). According to Lindgren, people of the same background are attracted to each other. Feeling a stronger connection to each other, people with similar habitus identify with one another, while distancing themselves from "the others" with whom they feel no affinity. The various occupational groups only differ in terms of how they reproduce the present social arrangements (strategies captured by Lindgren through the identification of the respective cultures). The gender order manifests itself in the organization as a number of different conceptions of femininity and masculinity. Like class, these gender contracts (see Hirdman 1988) intersect with the aforementioned occupational groups. Lindgren suggests that the feasibility of different types of gender contracts hinges on class (or habitus).

Communication is a prerequisite for all coordinated interaction in the various cultures in the organization, and the communicative element will occasionally take over and temporarily render the other two interactional

bases, class and gender, inoperative. Drawing on Simmel's notion of sociability, Lindgren identifies a communicative element that fosters a feeling of boundary-free commonality beyond the distinguishing traits of class and gender. The communicative element operates mainly at low representation of each cultural category. A single person does not reproduce a culture. Thus, a doctor, a nurse, and a nurse's assistant can find common topics that transcend the hierarchical organizational cultures.

Although my study does not involve a professional organization, I will make use of Lindgren's take on the study of gender segregation processes in organizations. And, as already indicated, I will pay attention to the notion of sociability or the "communicative element" in the organizational context.

Homosociality

A great number of researchers highlight notions of "homosociality", the tendency among men to seek, enjoy, and/or prefer the company of their own gender (Lipman-Blumen 1976). In this section I will present a few of these studies (for more reading on this topic, see Collinson and Hearn 1996; Kimmel 1996; Lindgren 1996, 1999; Holgersson 2003). The fact that men occupy top positions in organizations, and in society at large, gives, according to Lipman-Blumen (1976), rise to homosocial behavior on the part of men. Men identify with other men and orient themselves towards other men. Accordingly, most of their needs will be met through other men. Devoid of the same kind of resources and power as men, women are inclined to orient themselves towards men. Thus, women's behavior can be described as heterosocial.

Kanter (1977), too, identifies men's preference of men over women as the reason why men dominate top positions in organizations. The construction of managerial work can be characterized by *uncertainty*, *communication*, and *total devotion*. Kanter argues that the greater the uncertainty in a position, and the reliance on personal discretion that follows, the more likely is the development of homogenous groups. In other word, men in high positions promote men who are socially, culturally, and economically similar to them. Naming the phenomenon "homosocial reproduction", she particularly highlights how managers tend to reproduce themselves through selection and socialization. The need to reduce uncertainty is also reflected in communication; male executives prefer to communicate with people they understand, and, according to Kanter, they are more familiar with men's way of expressing themselves. Further, conformity in top positions is fostered by the demand for total devotion to the organization. Trust is manifested in loyalty. People with competing loyalties, for example, with families, are considered questionable. Together, these three aspects of managerial work, uncertainty, communication and total devotion, contribute to the reproduction of managers as men.

In her studies of homosociality, Lindgren (1996, 1999) looks into how homosocial games are centered around a "phantom", i.e., an ideal image, against which men calibrate or wish to calibrate themselves. Although manifested differently across groups of men, the phantom image (the norm) can be linked to a long tradition of male dominance in society. The homosocial game is thus a form of affirmation ritual. The phantom can, according to Lindgren (ibid.), be compared with hegemonic masculinity, i.e., the dominant cultural norm of how a man should look and behave (Carrigan, Connell and Lee

1985; Connell 1995). Men engaged in homosocial games constantly compete with each other, while simultaneously being not only confirmed but also strengthened by one another. According to Lindgren, these men do not strive to exert power over women, but rather, they are only concerned with how they rank in relation to each other. Another way of describing homosociality is to regard it as relational labor between men (see Lipman-Blumen 1976; Kanter 1977; Roper 1994, 1996; Lindgren 1996, 1999; Holgersson 2003). A study on the recruitment of managing directors points to the homosocial co-option that distinguishes the process (Holgersson 2003).

LOCAL CONSTRUCTIONS OF GENDER

Now I would like to dwell a little on two studies that focus on the relation between local and global constructions of gender. First, I turn to an inquiry into the gendering processes in an advertising agency, a study that, although not stated explicitly as such, focuses on the relation between gender and field. An advertising agency can be conceptualized as belonging to "the creative field" (Ericsson 2001). Second, I move on to a study that captures the dynamics of gender in organizations under constant change. Its inclusion hinges on the fact that, at the time of writing, the organization at the center of my study has recently undergone a merger (see chapter 10). Thus, in order to understand how taste performances are gendered in this organization, it is necessary to draw upon a study that considers gendering processes in organizations subject to change. Furthermore, it may also be fertile to use that particular study when dealing with an organization with mixed principles of legitimacy, as diverse constructions of gender may apply to different parts of the organization.

A case study:
gendering processes in an advertising agency

In exploring the internal relations of an advertising agency, as well as the working environment, customer relations, perceptions and discourses in the advertising industry in general, Alvesson and Köping (1993) highlight the gender relations in this particular sector of the economy. Their case study of an advertising agency addresses the gender division of labor, sexuality, and gender identity. In the study, the advertising business is described as exceptionally male dominated and extreme in its gender division. Women occupy low-status and remote administrative and nurturing positions, whereas men are leaders (i.e., they are in charge of the organization as well as key customer accounts) and creators (of ads and campaigns). The gender relations are, according to the authors, central to the organizational culture. In comparison with other sectors of the economy, the advertising industry encompasses organizations with more distinct gender structures. In other words, manifested in these organizations is an almost exaggerated version of the gendering processes that take place in organizations in general. However, using the metaphor of marriage to understand the relation between the advertising agency and the client, Alvesson and Köping identify the advertising agency as a "feminine" organization. They argue that *typically* (i.e., stereotypically) feminine qualities such as "weak, passive, emotional, seductive, and tempting" could be ascribed the advertising agency in its relation to the client. Qualities traditionally gendered male, e.g., analytical thinking and problem solving are, on the other hand, played down. Thus, although the work, as maintained by the authors, is constructed in feminine terms, the organization is still markedly male dominated.

Due to advertising people's weak professional authority, their ideas are often questioned and criticized by clients. Good judgment and "a feel for" what works in terms of advertising are critical, but it is difficult for the individual advertising representative to claim that he or she has the best judgment or feeling. Alvesson and Köping assert that despite the "feminine" qualities of the organization, the very distinct gender structures are the result of the ambiguity of the business processes. By subordinating young, attractive women, men's identities are strengthened and confirmed.

I would avoid describing the advertising agency as "feminine" (even metaphorically). Despite the hedging on the part of the authors, I believe this metaphor enforces an essentialist notion of gender. I think the statement derives from the authors' considering the organization from a position within the economic field. If masculinity and femininity differ slightly between fields and organizations (see for example Lindgren 1992, Lantz 2006a), it makes no sense to describe organizations themselves in these terms. In the prevalent gender order, men's judgment and sentiments are generally considered more important and better. Thus, it is hardly surprising that the construction of creative people is usually gendered male. In the next section I will give an account of a study that claims that masculinity is constantly transformed to comprise what is considered important in the organization.

The dynamics of gender in changing work organizations

Lena Abrahamsson (2002) offers an analysis of how gender influences and is influenced by the implementation of modern organizational concepts and models (such as

TQM, HRM, *Knowledge Management*, *The Learning Organization*, and *The Boundaryless Organization*). Modern organizational models are usually ambiguous. Despite being marketed as a pathway to success and growth (for the individual as well as for the organization) and being said to offer a more cooperative take on organizational life and thus seemingly in harmony with more gender equality, these models usually entail gendered concepts that confirm the prevailing gender order in the organization. Identifying a number of different restoration processes, Abrahamsson illustrates how these organizational models set in motion forces that restore the gender order in the face of a content that challenges the very same order. For example, self-organization, flexibility, and informal organizations may serve as "restoratives" (see also Sundin 1998, Ackroyed and Thompson 1999, Abrahamsson 2000). These organizational qualities may encourage disobedience, which can bring the gender order back into play if that disobedience comes from influential people. Moreover, as symbols for renewal and progress, modern organizational concepts often serve to authorize and legitimize management. Because of loosely coupled departments and projects, these concepts never gain a foothold. The organization "profits" from the concepts, while avoiding the "cost" of organizational change. Abrahamsson (2000) points to the lack of consistent and enduring management control as one of the reasons for the frequent restoration processes in organizations. Men constantly benefit from the implementation of new organizational models because of their position in the gender order and the opportunity structures of the organization (see Kanter 1977). Furthermore, parallel to and included in the discourses on modern organizational models are sociobiological discourses that emphasize the "natural" and "precious" differences between the genders. The emphasis on biology implies that the individual is

regarded as unchangeable and predetermined, i.e., a notion of the individual that is at odds with the notion of the "learning individual", often espoused by modern organizational models.

Abrahamsson illustrates the gendering of modern organizational concepts by referring to the notion of "social competence". Traditionally associated with women and femininity, "social competence" has been considered an inherent characteristic rather than a socially constructed skill. Recently, however, "social competence" has increasingly been gendered as male, and then considered a socially constructed skill. Arguing that the apparently stable constructions of gender are in fact also dynamic, Abrahamsson closes her article by concluding that constructions of masculinity will continuously be modified to encompass what is considered important in modern organizations. In a similar way, Ridgeway (1997) demonstrates how interactional processes preserve gender inequalities in the face of significant organizational changes, continually gendering new work processes and structures.

I will draw on Abrahamsson's study in my effort to understand the gender constructions in the organization at the center of my study. Located in the field of cultural production with two competing principles of legitimacy, and at the intersection of other fields and subfields, the organization may encompass several constructions of gender concurrently and over time.

CHAPTER SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The preceding presentation of a theory on organizing and the Gemeinschaft / Gesellschaft figure of thought, as well as of a selection of theories from the field of gen-

der and organization was brought in to situate my study in the organization and to specify the latter as gendered. Weick's (1995) notion of organizing will be central to understanding how organizational members make sense of processes in an organization with two principles of legitimacy, or, in other words, at the intersection of several different fields. Asplund's (1991) figure of thought Gemeinschaft/Gesellschaft will serve as a tool for sorting descriptions of the organization in Part II. Further, Acker's (1988, 1992) theory on the gendering of organizations provides a means for understanding how taste performances are *gendered*. The two sections on structures, Kanter's (1977) structural approach to gender and organization, and Wahl's (1992) conceptualization of gender structures in organizations offer me a framework for understanding how gender structures affect organizational members' daily practices, and more specifically, their taste performances. Moreover, I will make use of Lindgren's (1992) writings on gender segregation processes. Her study is particularly relevant since she draws on both Goffman and Bourdieu. Furthermore, inspired by Simmel, she develops the concept of "communicative element", which I intend to use as well. The homosocial tendency among men may affect how taste is used in the organization. In highlighting judgments and sentiments, the study of gendering processes in an advertising agency seems pertinent to my study on taste performances at work. I brought the chapter to a close with a brief introduction to a study that concerns itself with changing gender constructions. I assume that these dynamics of gender construction may be germane to the study at hand, should it turn out that the two principles of legitimacy that characterize the field of cultural production comprise different but parallel constructions of gender.

Being cognizant of the constant gendering of processes and positions in organizations I will take a closer look at who performs taste, how it is performed and what meanings these performances acquire in the organization. I could have approached the topic of organizations in the field of cultural production by calling attention to the fact that men dominate these organizations just as they dominate organizations in the economic field (see p. 17). Since economic profit is supposedly not the sole objective of the film industry and other "creative industries" (see for example Björkegren 1994, Moran 1996, Caves 2000) – i.e., the cultural production field is "the economic world reversed" (see Bourdieu 1993) – film companies operate under different conditions than organizations in other sectors of the economy. Consequently, it would also have been worthwhile to study how the gender order is reproduced in this *particular* field and how these processes differ from the corresponding processes in organizations operating (exclusively) in the economic field. I might have arrived at the same focus on the relation between constructions of taste and constructions of gender since the importance of taste, as an operationalization of cultural capital, is a characteristic feature of the cultural pole (cf. Bourdieu 1993). However, I chose to begin by addressing the issue of taste in organizations, and, then, relating it to gender. By doing so, I hoped to capture some of the specific conditions that stipulate organizations in the creative industries. Accordingly, there may be many other processes that also reproduce the gender order in the film industry, which are not related to taste, and, hence, lie beyond the scope of this dissertation.

The theories presented so far are all included in my *analytical model*. To sum up, in addition to the epistemological stand I outlined in chapters 2 and 3, the analytical

model consists of Simmel's distinction between *content* and *form* (chapter 4), Goffman's theories on the production of self, the nature of social life, and teams, with a particular emphasis on *performances* and *audience segregation* (chapter 5), Bourdieu's field theory and theory of taste, with the accent on the field of cultural production (chapter 6), and, finally, theories in the field of gender and organization which draw attention to the gender order in the organization. Also included is Weick's theory of organizing and Asplund's *Gemeinschaft / Gesellschaft* figure of thought (chapter 7).

However, the dissertation remains within the confines of organization studies; I will make my main contribution to organization theory. Just as I make no claim to contributing to the discourse of classical feminist thinkers and sociologists such as Harding, Delphy, Bourdieu and Goffman, I will claim no contribution to the field of gender and organization. Rather, these fields will serve mainly as points of departure for problematizing how organizational members in an organization in the field of cultural production relate to taste in their work. This endeavor includes attending to what meanings they ascribe to taste and to their various uses of taste.

Prior to proceeding to Part II, I will however lay out some of the studies concerned with arts management and cultural production, an endeavor that in most cases unfortunately implies resorting to the genderblindness emblematic of earlier organization studies.

29. For more comprehensive accounts of the field, see for example Wahl (1992), Calás and Smircich (1996), Halford and Leonard (2000), Wahl et al. (2001).

CHAPTER 8

Studies in arts management
and cultural production

In the pages that follow, I want to provide a brief overview of the field of *arts management* and the studies that fall under the general heading of *cultural production*. These research fields are occupied with the same empirical field as I am, but they address other research questions, apply different theoretical frameworks, and often rest on other epistemic positions. Thus, although I am not interested in these studies' analytical approaches to the field of cultural production, I do entertain an interest in their *constructions* of the field. Part of the doxa (see p. 189) of the field, these constructions most likely exist in the organization I study as well.[30]

The field of arts management is at least partially concerned with organizations. Accordingly, I placed the section on cultural production to the end of the chapter, lest it blur my focus on organizations. I hope to overcome disciplinary intransigence and draw together the studies that best attend to the research area at hand. Consequently, I will also address conceptualizations of culture and taste that are at odds with those presented in my analytical model in the previous chapters.

Furthermore, although ostensibly gender-neutral, many of the theories in my analytical model, as well as those soon to be presented under the headings of "arts management" and "research on cultural production" are entwined in gendered substructures. In other words, these theories rest on the assumption that managers and employees are male (Smith 1987, Acker 1988), assumptions I will problematize in my analysis.

However, I open this chapter with a binary observation: culture is central to this study both as a theoretical concept and as an empirical construction. Of course these are hard to separate. So far, I have theorized around cul-

ture in terms of Bourdieu's *capital* concepts. This will
remain *the* theory of culture in my theoretical frame-
work. However, my study centers upon an organization
in a particular *field*, i.e., the field of cultural production,
or a subfield of it, where the cultural principle of legit-
imacy may support certain *constructions* of culture.
Thus, I will begin with an empirically oriented discussion
on constructions of culture.

CULTURE-SPECIFIC NOTIONS OF CULTURE

In discussing empirical constructions of culture, I will
abandon my ambition to avoid reifying culture. At the
center of this study is an organization in the field of cul-
tural production. Just as there may be local construc-
tions of gender, so too there may be field-specific con-
structions of culture. The latter may be important for
what taste performances various organizational mem-
bers carry out. For example, their definition of culture
may determine what is significant in terms of taste (see
footnote 37).

Raymond Williams (1983 [1976]) has traced the histor-
ical development of the word *culture*, a word he
describes as "one of the two or three most complicated
words in the English language". He identifies three prac-
tices (constructions):

(i) the independent and abstract noun which describes a general
process of intellectual, spiritual and aesthetic development, from [the
18th century]; (ii) the independent noun, whether used generally or
specifically, which indicates a particular way of life, whether of a
people, a period, a group, or humanity in general [...]; (iii) the inde-
pendent and abstract noun which describes the works and practices
of intellectual and especially artistic activity. This seems often now
the most widespread use: culture is music, literature, painting and
sculpture, theater and film. (Williams 1983 [1976], p. 90)

These constructions of culture may co-exist in the organization. Then again, situated in the field of cultural production, I find it likely that the third sense is the predominant construction of culture among the organizational members (see Bourdieu 1993). Yet, there may be conflicting ideas as to what intellectual and artistic activities fall under this notion of culture.[31] Moreover, in management discourse as well as in popular parlance, there is a widespread use of the concept "organizational culture", a construction that pertains to Williams' second sense. I believe it is important to find the scope of these constructions of culture as well as their possible intersections in order to understand organizational members' ensuing constructions and performances of taste.

Similarly, the meaning of "cultural object" varies in theory and in practice. In my study, it generally refers to "cultural products" (see Bourdieu 1993), i.e., products made in the field of cultural production. In addition to this empirical construction of "cultural object", I will make use of a theoretical notion of "cultural object" in my photographic study in chapter 11 (see p. 308).

Next, I will provide an account of some relevant theories and studies in the field of arts management.

ARTS MANAGEMENT

Arts management centers around questions such as: "What is the relevance of art and aesthetics in the practice and study of organizations and their management? How can we better understand the management of creativity and innovation in complex knowledge flows between cultural production and consumption?" (Chong 2002, p. vii). A subdiscipline to organization and man-

agement studies, arts management is a rather empirically oriented field. Characterized by an interdisciplinary take on its subject, the management of arts organizations, it comprises managerial/economic and aesthetic objectives. A substantial part of the field is devoted to studies on cultural policies, cultural entrepreneurship, collaborations between private patrons/sponsors and public institutions, artistic leadership, the marketing of cultural organizations, and cost effectiveness (ibid.). Chong identifies three commitments that characterize arts organizations: a commitment 1) to excellence and artistic integrity (in terms of performance or display), 2) to accessibility and audience development, and 3) to cost effectiveness and transparency. In short, whereas the first commitment leans towards the cultural pole, to use Bourdieu's term, the latter two are based more on the economic pole. Fitzgibbon and Kelly (1997) remark on the sense of unease that questions of management in the arts give rise to among cultural workers and artists. Echoing Bourdieu's conceptualization of the field of cultural production as structured along the two poles, Fitzgibbon and Kelly claim not only that art is contructed as anarchic and inspirational and, thus, not manageable, but also that there is a great distaste among "arts people" for an organization based on economics or commerce. Still, many studies in arts management seem to lean towards the economic pole, adopting a "managerial perspective".[32]

Organizational control

Insisting on only giving a small selection of examples of studies in the area of organization-centered arts management, I will start out with a study that belongs to a research stream on "organizational control": O'Connell's (1997) model for strategic planning. A managerial

model that underlines the necessity of having measurable objectives in order to succeed in strategic planning, it does however highlight one of the peculiarities of organizations in the field of cultural production, the competing principles of legitimacy. Similarly, Brettell Grip and Portnoff (2004) bring to light how the external and internal governance of a philharmonic orchestra can be conceptualized as an exchange process between economic and cultural capital, in which the management of the organization plays a key role. Difficulties in "measuring goals" in arts organizations are discussed in several studies (see Bonet, Cubeles and Rosello 1997; Forbes 1998). Castañer (1997) approaches the assumed need for control by encouraging management to actively use the organizational culture for this purpose.

Applying Mintzberg's (1979) conceptual framework to the study of arts organizations, "parallel administrative hierarchies" are often brought to light by researchers in arts management (see Castañer 1997, Chong 2002). There are in organizations two power centers that correspond to the two poles of Bourdieu's construction of the cultural production field: the "operating core" and the "support staff". The former encompasses expertise, endowed with great amounts of cultural capital. The power of the expertise rests on their knowledge of the "professional operations" in the arts organization. Conversely, the administrators, whom Mintzberg calls "support staff", are equally rich in economic capital. According to Chong (2002), the power of the administrators has increased substantially in recent years. He suggests that this flow of power from the "professionals" to the "administrators" points at the import of the roles of the people on the organizational boundaries.

Another stream of research within arts management concerns the marketing of cultural organizations (see for example Colbert et al. 1994, Kolb 2000). This work often takes as its point of departure cultural consumption by postmodern consumers who are said to traverse boundaries between popular and high culture (a theme I developed on p. 124 and onwards) (Kolb 2000). In order to avoid a decline in attendance / audience / consumers, "professionally managed marketing departments" have gained a foothold in cultural organizations (Kotler and Scheff 1997). Cooperation between artistic and marketing departments is thus highlighted. However, several arts marketing researchers emphasize that, rather than creating a product based on customer needs, marketing in the arts sector entails finding an appropriate target group subsequent to the making of the artistic product (see Mokwa 1980, Diggles 1986, Colbert et al. 1994). Some researchers refrain from treating both popular culture and arts under the same heading. Colbert et al. (1994), for example, distinguish between "organizations in the arts sector" and "cultural enterprises", where the former *typically* represents a product-oriented view coupled with a prototype production (i.e., unique productions) and the latter *typically* stands for a market-oriented view in addition to a prototype reproduction (i.e., mass production). Similarly, Björkegren (1996) identifies two different business strategies when it comes to managing the perceived uncertainty in arts production, a cultural business strategy that "means art on the artist's terms" (p. 44), and a commercial business strategy that "means art on the market's terms" (p. 44). Adopting a long-term take on investments, the cultural business strategy copes with uncertainty by developing a large number of artists, some of whom may become commer-

cially successful. Unlike the cultural business strategy, the commercial business strategy involves a focus on a limited number of cultural products subject to vast marketing campaigns and to the anticipation of rapid returns.

Organization studies

On the basis of their empirical concerns, a number of studies within organization studies could easily be included in the arts management tradition (see for example Björkegren 1996; Stenström 2000; Wetterström 2001, 2006; Köping 2003; Guillet de Monthoux, Gustafsson and Sjöstrand 2006; Lantz 2006a). Still, these studies differ from the *typical* arts management studies in that they abandon the managerial perspective, and problematize the organization as a whole. With theoretical roots in philosophy rather than sociology, Pierre Guillet de Monthoux (1993, 2004) studies management and organization from an aesthetic perspective. Stressing the distinctiveness of the cultural firm, he suggests that it may serve as a model for other kinds of businesses. Some studies in organization theory have taken on the subject of the intersection of the cultural and the economic poles in various fields. Stenström (2000) notes, for example, that just as there is a development in the business world towards an increase in the use of words earlier associated with "the notion of arts", and towards likening business leadership to artistry, there is a tendency in the artistic sphere to assume a business language. In line with Stenström's writings on the proliferation of artistic language in the business world, Ericsson (2001) calls attention to an upsurge in the demand for creativity in the same field.

To summarize, many of the studies conducted in the tradition of arts management deal with the two logics that for

175

Bourdieu (1993) characterize the field of cultural production. However, because many of these studies are conducted from a managerial perpective, with a positioning towards the economic pole, I have not included them in my analytical model. I believe I can produce more indepth analysis with the theoretical framework presented in chapters 4 – 7. Still, I want to highligt the fact that the "managerial models" in themselves call attention to the increasing weight being placed on the economic pole of organizations in the field of cultural production.

RESEARCH ON CULTURAL PRODUCTION

In the remaining part of the chapter, I will temporarily leave the subject of organizations, returning only at the end of each section briefly to extend the discussion to the study in question. Although there is plenty of research concerning cultural production that obviously bears an empirical relationship with my project, I do not intend to do a comprehensive literature review since much of this research has entirely different objects of analysis (not to mention epistemological positions), such as the cultural labor market (e.g., Frey and Pommerehne 1989, Elstad 1997), training and careers (e.g., Jackson et al. 1994), cultural workers' health (e.g., Raeburn 1999), cultural policy (e.g., Aslaksen 1998, Bennett 1998, Mangset 1999), cultural economics (e.g., Khakee and Towse 1992, Peacock and Rizzo 1994, Caves 2000), arts as markets (e.g., Peterson and Berger 1975, DiMaggio 1977), and culture and globalization (e.g., Hannerz 1996, Roudometof and Epitropoulos 1998). For an overview of research concerning cultural production in general, see Leonor Camauër's *Cultural Work and Cultural Production* (2002). In place of a literature review, I would like to highlight a study of production of

culture as a collective activity and a recent and influential *description* of "the creative industries", both which relate to aspects of my study.

Production of culture as a collective activity

Some sociologists have noted that an understanding of artistic work must come to grips with the production side as well as the consumption side, and the interaction between them (Gottdiener 1985, DiMaggio 1987). Accordingly, researchers primarily interested in the production of artistic goods have shown the collective character of art work; their historical accounts of cultural industries rebut the idea of artworks as passively reflecting either social change or public tastes (Hirsch 1972, Becker 1982). The collective activity takes place in what could be seen as a cooperative network. Becker (1982) recognizes that aesthetic judgments are characteristic of these collective activities. Thus, a shared sense of the worth of what they collectively produce emerges from the interaction of the participants involved. Producers of art works are also consumers of art; they make aesthetic judgments frequently. Hence, taste has a prominent role within the art world. Hume (1854 [1757]) once remarked, in a discussion of the standard of taste, that although what made art great was a matter of opinions, some opinions were better than others. Some people could make finer and more justifiable discriminations due to the fact that they had more experience of the works and genres in question. Becker resumes Hume's line of reasoning and asks himself what these people know. He concludes:

[...] the list includes such things as: the history of attempts to make similar works in that medium or genre; characteristic features of different

177

styles and periods in the history of the art; the merits of different positions on key issues in the history, development, and practice of the art; an acquaintance with various versions of the same work; and the ability to respond emotionally and cognitively to the manipulation of standard elements in the vocabulary of the medium. (Becker 1982, p. 48)

Thus, I assume that Becker is arguing for some kind of "objective" taste hierarchy within the art world. Although I reject such a position, I think Becker makes an important point when he remarks that producers of cultural goods are also consumers of cultural goods. Hence, taste is central to organizations in the field of cultural production. Additionally, Becker describes how taste or judgments are legitimized by the cultural pole in an organization in the field of cultural production.

The creative industries according to Caves

Also, I would like to cast light on a section of economist Richard E. Caves' (2000) study on the contracts between arts and commerce that, according to him, characterize "the creative industries" (see footnote 1). He identifies seven properties that differentiate them from other sectors of the economy. I list them here as they represent persistent *constructions* of the field of cultural production. This is not to say that they are "true". Still, people in the field of cultural production often act upon these constructions, and, thus, reproduce them.

1. Demand is uncertain / "nobody knows"
Caves points out that because the buyer's satisfaction is a "subjective reaction", the producer's superior knowledge of the production process does not entail a corresponding advantage in predicting customers' response.

2. *Creative workers care about their product*
Distinguishing between creative and humdrum "inputs" (see footnote 2), Caves argues that creative inputs are characterized by the creator's concern for the artistic achievement, for example, originality and technical proficiency. Humdrum inputs reflect a "just-in-it-for-the-money" attitude. Neither employer nor task, within the workers' span of competence, is of much interest to them.

3. *Some creative products require diverse skills*
Many creative products call for various skills and areas of expertise, and, thus, diverse personal tastes are brought into the production process, and with them potential conflicts of priorities and tastes.

4. *Differentiated products*
According to Caves, there is an infinite variety of differentiation possibilities. The artist can choose from a "universe of possibilities", and there is also a great assortment of creative products available to customers.

5. *Vertically differentiated skills*
There are talent differences in the creative inputs, i.e., the artists, in terms of skill, originality and / or proficiency.

6. *Time is of the essence*
Vital to the production of creative goods and services is the temporal coordination of the various activities.

7. *Durable products and durable rents*
Most creative products are durable, and Caves illustrates this property by referring to royalties collected by the creators or the performers.

I am not an economist, nor do I endorse an economist's idea of knowledge (hence, I will not concern myself with Caves' further elaborations on the contracts). However, as a *construction* of the distinguishing aspects of the field of cultural production, I find Caves' *description* useful. Most pertinently, the second and third properties, "creative workers care about their product" and "some creative products require diverse skills", epitomize some of the theoretical underpinnings of this study. The former corresponds to the aesthetic commitment (some) people in organizations in the field of cultural production show with regard to (some of) their products. The latter points to the fact that organizations in the field of cultural production bring together people of varying backgrounds, role perceptions, and aspirations, a diversity that may lead to various kinds of conflicts regarding, for example, main priorities and tastes.

In an effort to further stress the constructedness of these properties, I want to discuss one of them from a social constructionist perspective. If, for a moment, I may return to the first property, *demand is uncertain* / *"nobody knows"*, I would like to call attention to my earlier point regarding replacing Searle's "epistemic objectivity" with intersubjectivity (see p. 33). My interpretation of Caves' assertion is that whereas in many other industries (though definitely not all) the set of evaluation criteria is widely shared (i.e., there is strong intersubjectivity), there seems to be less shared knowledge of the assessment principles employed by cultural consumers. Consequently, customer reactions to products in other industries appear to be more "objective" as they seem more predictable. The apparent lack of predictability in customers' response to cultural products may, in turn, have to do with the symbolic rather than functional quality of cultural products (cf. Hebdige 1988), as well

as with Caves' fourth property (or construction), *the great differentiation of cultural products*. The ostensible objectivity in consumers' reactions to the introduction of a new refrigerator or a new soft drink may stem from a lesser degree of product development (less variety) and from diversity confined to certain areas (color, sweeteners, packaging, size, etc).

The reason that I bring in Caves' construction of the cultural production field here is that I believe these constructions to be quite pervasive in the field. At any rate, they are recurrent in my case study.

CHAPTER SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Having devoted the bulk of Part I to elaborating an analytical model for the study of taste performances in an organization in the field of cultural production, I related my study to the field of arts management. Here, I noted the growing importance of the economic pole. I also introduced a cultural production perspective where I emphasized the collective character of cultural production, and I laid out a construction of the field of cultural production as it has been summarized by Caves (2000). Despite being excluded from the analytical model, the studies presented in this chapter have empirical relevance for my dissertation.

Before moving on to the empirically oriented Part II, I will devote the last chapter of Part I to methodological considerations.

30. I want to add that this distinction between analysis and constructions is not intended to reinforce the theory – practice dichotomy. In my analysis (in Part II) I am most careful to use the analytical model as a "tool-kit" (see p. 108), which entails paying special attention to the specific conditions that characterize the situation of agents. However, in this chapter I want to lay bare some prevalent constructions of the field of cultural production, which agents act upon and continually reproduce.

31. Furthermore, any understanding of the constructions of culture must come to grips with the variations between languages. Whereas the anthropological usage of "culture" (ii) is widespread in the German and Scandinavian languages, as well as in English, it is less frequent in Italian and French (Williams 1983 [1976]). However, there are other differences in the institutional use of "culture". For example, in Sweden, newspapers often have a supplement titled "Kultur" ("Culture"), but in the U.K. and the U.S. it is most frequently labeled "The Arts". One way of interpreting this difference is to equate the word "Kultur" with "The Arts"; i.e., take it as an indication that the connotation of "kultur" in Sweden relates to Williams' third sense. On the other hand, this difference may reflect distinct approaches to the subject of culture, where the Swedish newspapers represent a wider take on culture (i.e., encompassing more than the third construction).

32. When I describe studies as having a "managerial perspective", or being built up around "managerial models" and the like, I am referring to studies where I interpret the authors as being concerned first and foremost with improving the management from an economic standpoint. Often resorting to rationalist models, these studies frequently comprise "implications for management".

CHAPTER 9

Methodological considerations

The point of this chapter is to clarify the methodology involved in the study. Methodology comprises the choices made regarding cases to study, methods of data gathering and forms of data analysis (Silverman 2001). I begin the chapter with a delineation of the theoretical roots of my methodology (i.e., in social constructionism), which, in turn, triggers a discussion of my positionality. Then, I present my study in terms of its development over time, and of its three separate substudies: an interview study, a brief questionnaire, and a collaborative photographic study. I wrap up this chapter by reflecting on the presentation, reconstruction and interpretation of my material.

AN INTERPRETATIVE STUDY

Consistent with the writings of Berger and Luckmann (1966), Blumer (1969), and Schutz (1999 [1970]), I embrace neither "objectivity" and "value-free knowledge" nor the safeguarding of a "distance" to the setting, as goals for this part of the study, something that is reflected in my lingering on my position and my relation to the research subjects in this chapter (see also, for example, Helenius 1990, Alvesson and Sköldberg 2000, Widerberg 2002). Further, I also dismiss the whole enterprise of formulating laws in the social sciences. As Giddens (1984) writes:

There are no universal laws in the social sciences, and there will not be any – not, first and foremost, because methods of empirical testing and validation are somehow inadequate but because […] the causal conditions involved in generalizations about human social conduct are inherently unstable in respect of the very knowledge (or beliefs) that actors have about the circumstances of their own action. (ibid, p. xxxii)

What distinguishes social science from natural science is the double hermeneutic quality, which refers to social

187

scientists' use of explananda which are (in some respects) actors' interpretations of themselves, their actions, the physical world, etc. (Gilje and Grimen 1992). In other words, social scientists resort to interpretations of interpretations. However, following Giddens (1976), I contend that social scientists must go beyond the interpretations made by the social actors themselves.

According to Norén (1995), there are two ways of using the interpretative approach. The researcher can choose to focus on the actor as a subject and attempt to uncover and describe the actor's experiences and preconceptions. Alternatively, the researcher may concentrate on the relation between him or herself (i.e., the actor) and the research object. In my study, I will make every effort possible to include and reflect on both uses. Since I have dealt extensively with the actor as a subject in the preceding chapters, I will direct more attention to the consequences of my own position in the following section.

SOME REFLECTIONS ON MY POSITION

The inseparability of theory and practice that I articulated in chapter 6 implies being alert to my position as a researcher. In an attempt to reflect on the consequences of my position on this dissertation, I will proceed by sketching my view of reflexivity, based on the conception of knowledge that I have presented in my analytical model in Part I, and then relate it to the studies and analyses that I have undertaken.

Positionality

Following Bourdieu (1977) and Harding (1986), I

acknowledge the positionality of everyone in the social world, in the present, as well as in the past (a trajectory) and in the future (where they strive to go). This implies that one cannot go outside of one's own relations, there is no possibility to be neutral or "objective". Akin to Berger and Luckmann's "pre-theoretical knowledge" is Bourdieu's *doxa*, the taken-for-granted knowledge of reality. Doxa varies according to culture and field. So, although we take it as "reality", it is socially constructed. Because of doxa, all understanding will be incomplete, "misrecognition" is an inescapable aspect of human life (Bourdieu 1977).

In place of the confessional, introspective reflexivity that Geertz (1988) calls the "diary-disease", I want to emphasize the distinct social conditions of the researcher and the research object (see Harding 1986, Bourdieu 1990a). These conditions imply that they have different distances to the universe that is being examined and, thus, different distances to the practice of the subjects under investigation (Bourdieu 1990a). Bourdieu identifies three biases that may impede research in the social sciences and jeopardize the epistemological quality of its analyses. I will organize this discussion on positionality around these three biases.

BIAS NO. 1: SOCIAL STRATIFICATION. First, Bourdieu draws attention to what he considers the "most obvious bias", the researcher's social trajectory and position based on broad coordinates such as gender, class, ethnicity, etc. Espousing a perspective on "reality" in which people occupy dominated or dominating positions, I also address the various implications of these positions for the individual, the organization and, to some extent, society or the field at large.

Despite being obvious to Bourdieu, the impact of gender on my research deserves more lingering attention. Because of my position as a woman in the gender order, as deviant to the male norm (see Hirdman 1988), I am probably more apt to develop an interest in feminist theories and more likely to include a gender analysis in my research. Gendering processes are also evident in the fieldwork that I have conducted. I will develop this point below. As a feminist scholar, I hope that my research will give rise to reflection on our practices with regard to gender and, in turn, pave the way for their change. In this sense, my research is emancipatory.

Echoing Wahl et al. (2001) I want to emphasize that just because I have chosen to focus on gender in parts of this dissertation, it does not follow that the significance of gender rises above everything else. The reason that I have highlighted gender is that a vast body of research has demonstrated its centrality to understanding organizations (see chapter 7).

While drawing on Bourdieu's notion of *habitus*, my analytical model implies a focus on taste *performances* (i.e., regardless of *habitus*). Although some organizational members may have more authorization for certain performances because of their habitus, I would hold that, in general, the habitus of organizational members as well as my own should not be of utmost importance. For the record, however, I would describe my own habitus as middle-class where my cultural capital has been acquired primarily through education (my parents do not have university-level education). Possibly, my habitus, coupled with my affiliation with Stockholm School of Economics (SSE), made it easy for me to relate to the wide range of people (in terms of education and lack thereof) represented at Sandrew Metronome.

In the process of gearing up for my interviews, one of the senior managers, who served as my contact person, advised me to emphasize that I had taken a film intensive workshop at New York University, and that I had made a couple of short films. In that way, he suggested, jokingly, they would understand that I was not a "nobody". In retrospect, his advice hinted at the Gemeinschaft quality of the film field that this senior manager, on the basis of my empirical study, represented.[13] In other words, for at least some organizational members, my practical experience of filmmaking was more important to legitimize my project and my presence in the organization than was my business education and my Ph.D. student status. That, at any rate, was how I perceived this manager presented to me. This is not surprising, considering the fact that the field of cultural production is conceptualized as the economic world reversed (Bourdieu 1993). My association with SSE, traditionally the most prestigious business school in Sweden, may thus be regarded as a drawback by some organizational members as it supposedly signals a *disinterest* in the cultural production field.

On a separate note, I should add that my subjects and I share the same ethnicity. While I am aware that by refraining from problematizing ethnicity I will reproduce the dominant norm, I restrict my study to the research questions and the accompanying theoretical framework that I have presented in Part I. If I had problematized ethnicity I would have posed different research question, drawn on other theories and designed an entirely different study.

As the impact of my position on the interviews, and, at a subsequent stage, my interpretations, merit further discussion, I will return to these issues below.

BIAS NO. 2: THE ACADEMIC FIELD. The second bias identified by Bourdieu has to do with the researcher's position within the academic field: i.e., "in the objective space of possible intellectual positions offered to him or her at a given moment, and, beyond, in the field of power" (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, p. 39). In other words, this, according to Bourdieu often overlooked, bias results from researchers being part of a field that defines all agents partly in relational terms (for example, how far / close they are from their competitors). In addition to my position in the academic field as a Ph.D. student, as a researcher in "business administration" in general, and in organization theory in particular, I would like to discuss the gendered field of science.

Being a doctoral student, I am obviously more confined to conventions of dissertation writing than academics in higher positions. Besides, writing in the field of organization studies, which, in Sweden, is a subfield to the larger field of business administration, a field with varied theoretical orientations, implies that I have taken Ph.D. courses with fellow students with diverse research interests (in terms of epistemology, theory, and preferred methods). As a consequence, I have been urged to argue for my social constructionist position to a greater extent than I assume would have been the case had I been surrounded by organizational scholars exclusively. However, at my department, *Center for Management and Organization*, there are researchers with whom I feel both a theoretical and an empirical kinship. This connection is also manifested in a number of shared favorite theorists, such as Berger and Luckmann and Bourdieu. Furthermore, I was introduced to feminist organization theory through the research group FosFor, headed by Anna Wahl, and without its presence at my department I would most likely not have become acquainted with

this theoretical tradition, as it is not represented in other corners of SSE. In fact, I would not have started as a Ph.D. student had it not been for the course *Organization and Gender* since the latter introduced me to the idea of pursuing a Ph.D.

Furthermore, in the gendered field of science, male authors and their often "gender-neutral" (see Smith 1987; Acker 1988, 1992; Wahl 1992; and p. 147 in chapter 7) texts are usually constructed as more central to the field than are those written by women. By including such authors as Pierre Bourdieu and Erving Goffman, I run the risk of reinforcing these constructions. However, by combining these theories, which I still find critical to the study of taste in organizations, with feminist theories, I wish to add to the former the significance of gender.

I realize that I am influenced by the social setting constituted by my department and, likewise, that I continuously shape this environment through the texts I write and the discussions I engage in. Naturally, local departmental seminars also affect my position in the academic field and the direction of my research.

BIAS NO. 3: THE THEORETICAL GAZE. The third kind of bias that Bourdieu accounts for is the inclination among social researchers to construct the social world under examination as a "spectacle, as a set of significations to be interpreted rather than as concrete problems to be solved practically" (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, p. 39).

As soon as we observe (theorein) the social world, we introduce in our perception of it a bias due to the fact that, to study it, to describe it, to talk about it, we must retire from it more or less completely. This theoreticist or intellectualist bias consists in forgetting to inscribe into the theory we build of the social world the fact that it is the product of a theoretical gaze, a 'contemplative eye'. (ibid., p. 69)

193

The heart of his reflexivity, this third type of bias is, according to Bourdieu, both more deeply rooted and more misleading than the other two (Bourdieu 1990a). Incorporated in concepts, methods and practical research operations, this bias necessitates a continuing sociological analysis of the situation of the researcher in the academic field and, also, of the practice of sociology. In other words, the "collective scientific unconscious" should be scrutinized (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992). Similarly, Smith (1990) argues that the practices of science conceal the relations that constitute the researcher's position (see p. 55). In arguing for a more engaged social science, Harding (1986) calls for a closer problematization of the relation between the researcher and the subject. Claiming that many social researchers end up writing about their relation to the object rather than the object, Bourdieu argues for an "anti-narcissistic" reflexivity (thus he directly criticizes for example Clifford and Marcus 1986). Bourdieu promotes a reflexivity that seeks to "objectivize the objectivizing point of view of the sociologist" (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, p. 69). I would like to briefly discuss the possible existence of a strong theoretical bias on my part.

As I already suggested, I do not conceive of myself as entirely different from my research subjects. After all, we have approximately the same social background, I too have an educational background in film and business. On top of that, I have worked in a media company for a short period of time. As a result, I can relate to my subjects and their jobs quite well, regardless of their specific trajectories. Still, there are differences between my interviewees and myself which hinge on our dissimilar positions vis-à-vis the processes subjected to my study. My interviewees do not know anything about my theoretical framework (see discussion on p. 204 below); none of

them ever mention any of the authors I use in my analytical model in Part I. Nor do they, in their day-to-day work, need to address the theoretical issues that my dissertation revolves around. Conversely, I am not obliged to face their problems and daily tasks practically. As Bourdieu and Wacquant (ibid.) point out, only an extensive ethnographic study could bridge the gap sufficiently. However, as such a study was beyond the scope of my dissertation I mainly rely on an interview study. I have tried to handle this bias by having a sensitive ear to how my subjects account for their experiences. Accordingly, over time I have tried to coalesce the theoretical construction of my project with the development of my practical research (i.e., primarily, my interviews). This has resulted in a project wholly distinct from the one I had initially proposed. In the following section, I recount this process.

MY STUDIES

I will proceed by describing how the study emerged and what direction it took. I then move on to a section on each substudy that is included in my dissertation. Primarily a study centered on developing theories and concepts, I will however also touch upon the study's explorative features.

How my study emerged

I will start out by giving a brief account of the long and convoluted process leading up to the study as it is presented in this book. In the course of the research process I have added new methods and omitted others. Thus, the final version of this study is a corollary to the parallel development of my literature review and my ongoing

interviews; both sides of the study have pushed me to proceed in new directions.

The one thing that has remained constant throughout my research process is an interest in organizations in the field of cultural production. Before I started at the Department for Management and Organization at SSE in 2000, I had applied for, and received, a year-long grant from the Anders Sandrew Foundation. My project proposal concerned the role of the producer on the film team, and was, thus, centered on a film production. Due to unforeseen difficulties in obtaining access to a suitable film production, as well as a progressively better knowledge of the research field (through my literature review and Ph.D. courses), I eventually discarded this initial focus on producers. In its place, I began to highlight taste and organization.

Although I abandoned the focus on film production, I still wanted to study an organization in the field of cultural production. Having established a connection with Sandrew Metronome through the Anders Sandrew Foundation (which owns parts of this company, see also p. 235), I asked for and received permission to include the organization Sandrew Metronome as a case study. Thus, my selection of a case study can be described as "theoretical sampling": I choose to study an organization where it is theoretically meaningful to study what I am studying and to develop a theory (Mason 1996). My study and my theoretical contributions will be generalizable to organizations operating in the field of cultural production.

Except for an informal meeting in 2001 and a brief email correspondence with the chairman of the foundation regarding the ownership structure in 2004, I have not

had any contact with representatives of the Anders Sandrew Foundation during the research process. As the grant did not entail any particular obligations regarding the content of my work, I have not felt dependent on the Foundation.

DIRECTION OF MY STUDY. The explorative character of this study is evident not only in the research methods but also in the research process itself. My initial project involved examining whether taste could be conceptualized as an "organizer", in addition to its role as a class marker in the cultural consumption field. My original interview guide was designed for this purpose. That guide was continuously modified to match whatever direction my research process took. Having conducted about three-fourths of my interviews, I distributed a questionnaire that was designed to enable "a cluster analysis on taste". Or so I thought.

Prior to the construction of the questionnaire I had interviewed critics in five cultural consumption fields: music, literature, television, film, and restaurants. I had asked them to categorize their respective field and to give three examples of each identified genre. Following DiMaggio's (1987) work on cultural classification, I also met with people who represented the commercial side of the categorization, for example, a music store sales person and a publisher. Urged to try out the survey design, I selected three test organizations, Glocalnet, Abel & Baker, and Adacra (three IT/communications companies) and had the respondents fill out and comment on the questionnaire. This led me to add a number of open-ended questions.

For some time, my interview study had triggered a greater interest in the organizational members' *use* of taste. My interview study amply testified that organizational mem-

bers in Sandrew Metronome had to relate to taste in their work. I was more and more apt to abandon the research question centered on taste as an "organizer". Concomitantly, I became increasingly aware of the problems of conducting an accurate cluster analysis in an organization of the size of Sandrew Metronome. In order to maintain a certain level of "cultural sensitivity", I ended up with a high number of variables.[34] To match that number of variables in a cluster analysis, I would need an organization approximately twelve times the size of Sandrew Metronome (in terms of employees). Not only would it be difficult to find and obtain access to an organization of that size in the field of cultural production (due to their rareness), but I would also jeopardize the possibility of conceptualizing the organization as an audience (cf. Goffman 1959). I had collected the survey [35] when I finally decided to omit the cluster analysis from my study. Still, as I had included some questions that provided me with useful background data on the organization, I draw on it in chapter 11.

In the course of writing my dissertation proposal, I took a class in qualitative methods, and I did some preliminary research into the use of visual methods in the social sciences. For various reasons outlined in detail in the section devoted to this particular substudy and in appendix 1, I found collaborative visual methods very appealing. At the final stage of my interview series, I thus asked selected organizational members to take part in a collaborative photographic study.

Initially, I also planned to do participant observations. However, after a few observed meetings, I decided to stick to interviews (along with the photographic study and the brief questionnaire). For my money, the most valuable participant observation would be of an ethno-

graphic character, where I follow the organizational members for an extended period of time. But without any chance to single out situations where organizational members' relation to taste would be particularly pertinent, I would have to follow individual organizational members for excessive time periods. Unfortunately, that was beyond the scope of my study. Still, without doubt, my presence in the organization during these early participant observations as well as pre and post interviews has increased my understanding of the organization.

Many of the theories included in my study may be said to be part of my *doxa*. I first became familiar with feminist organizational theory in 1996, and since then I have always paid close attention to the significance of gender in organizations and in society at large. Moreover, the sociology classes I took at Harvard had a strong impact on me, and I kept theories from these courses in mind throughout the research process. Similarly, I was influenced by the most recent courses in organization studies that I had taken in the Ph.D. program at SSE. My study, as presented here, then, evolved from the interplay of theory and practice. In other words, my *doxa* shaped my perception of the organization and its members, and, in turn, this understanding was affected, and further enriched, by what my interviewees conveyed to me. This interactive process not only made me delve deeper into some of the abovementioned theories, but also, it encouraged me to look for other theories that I subsequently added to my analytical model. Identifying theoretical gaps when it came to understanding the role of taste in organizations was part of my research process, and it made me formulate more precise research questions. My way of presenting the study reflects the interplay of theory and practice (and, obviously, my positionality) at this particular point in time. Thus, this book should not be

seen as an account of the research process. To convey the study at this instant in the most comprehensible way, I have followed a conventional dissertation structure where I lay out a theoretical framework, apply it to an empirical study, and, concomitantly, analyze the material.

Finally, let me say a few words about the selection of theories. I position myself as a feminist constructionist, and I develop the concept of *taste performances* by combining some theories of Bourdieu and Goffman. In opting for theories that are theoretically congruent, I thus pave the way for enabling a theoretical contribution that can be combined and added to central theories in my research field.

The topic of taste in organizations in the field of cultural production deserves a comment. The dichotomous construction of economic and cultural capital in this field implies that what is valued by the cultural pole is constructed as a sign of disinterest in the objectives endorsed by the economic pole, and vice versa. In a similar way, highlighting taste in organizations may be constructed as a disinterest in "what organizations are really about" from the point of view of the economic pole (on which most mainstream organization theory presumably rest).

The study design

Whatever the sociological weaknesses of a study that relies heavily on interviews rather than ethnography (see discussion on p. 195), I still feel that the collection of methods that I use in order to map the complexities of organizational members' relation to taste at work in the field of cultural production can serve as a basis for theoretical conceptualization and further discussion. To

speak with Silverman (2001) my aim has been to "say a lot about a little (problem)" rather than to "say a little about a lot". This overall ambition has also permeated my study design.

Interviews, a photographic study and a brief questionnaire, with the accent placed on the first of these, served as methodological tools for providing the basis for analysis. Next, I will present these three substudies separately. While the interview study is ubiquitous to my study as a whole, the photographic study is only brought in very briefly in chapter 10 and then again at a later stage in chapter 11, and the questionnaire is concisely employed in chapter 11 as well.

The interview study

The interview study had a great impact on how I conceptualized and developed the notion of *taste performances*. Still, when I set out to design my interview study, I had already acquired a considerable amount of theoretical knowledge of organizations as well as of taste and cultural consumption. Thus, I was deliberately not impartial or "theoretically naïve" when conducting the interviews (see Kvale 1997). As I mentioned earlier, I also felt somewhat familiar with the setting (see p. 194). The interview study provided me with knowledge about Sandrew Metronome specifically, and this *type* of organization in general. I used interviews to find out how the organizational members presented their understanding of the organization and of taste, and how they relate to taste in their work. In an iterative process, I then juxtaposed my interpretations of my interviewees' understanding with the theories mentioned earlier. Thus, I want to stress that even if my study was explorative in

the sense that I continuously looked for empirical information and discovered new aspects of my research area, my interview study in the end served to develop concepts by combining theories and practice.

When deciding upon the number of interviewees, I took a close look at the organization chart and also made some initial interviews with a senior manager at the Stockholm office who told me more about the company structure and history (see also p. 191). I believed that I needed to interview at least two or three people in each Nordic company in order to attain a balanced range of interviews in terms of professions, positions and gender. In addition, I wanted to do more interviews in the head office since it accommodated the most diverse work force. The collection of information regarding the company structure and business operations prior to the interview study provided me with a necessary entry point into the interviews. In total, I conducted 35 interviews with 30 organizational members during the fall of 2001 and the spring of 2002. I confined myself to organizational members who worked at the respective offices, i.e., I did not include any part-time employees at the cinemas, believing they would not be subject to the same day-to-day organizational sensemaking processes, and, most likely, they would not have to relate to taste in their work as often as other organizational members.

To sum it up: in Sweden, I interviewed 18 organizational members from the three companies represented at the headquarters (five of these interviewees I later included in my photographic study, and thus conducted additional interviews with them, see p. 209); in Norway, I interviewed three organizational members who represented the Norwegian company; in Denmark, I interviewed four organizational members who represented the two Danish

companies; in Finland, I interviewed six organizational members, who represented the two Finnish companies. Included in this interview study are interviews with all the CEOs but one (in the latter case I interviewed the vice-president). I have also made use of snowball sampling, which implies that one subject suggests another subject who in turns provides me with a new name, and so on (see for example Denscombe 1998, Vogt 1999, Warren 2002). All but one interview took place in the interviewee's office or in an adjacent conference room. One interviewee wanted to meet at a café. I found him slightly critical towards management, and interpreted his choice of interview location in light of this criticism. All interviews have been recorded and later transcribed. Further, I took notes during and after the interviews, highlighting what seemed specifically interesting to my study (themes that would later trigger new questions), and what characterized the interview process itself. The interviews generally lasted for about 60 or 90 minutes. Most of these interviews were made in Swedish, some in Swedish / Danish and in Swedish / Norwegian, and yet some in English (two interviews in Denmark, and three in Finland). The English-spoken interviews were, not surprisingly, shorter. I interpret these interviewees' tendency to speak more economically as an effect of the difficulties of going into great detail in a foreign language. Nevertheless, I am convinced that I obtained important information from these interviews as well. I do not believe that the main content would have been very different had I spoken Danish or Finnish. Still, they may have given me more elaborate (but possibly superfluous) examples if they had spoken their mother tongue.

Prior to each interview, I introduced myself and my research area. For example, I told my interviewees that I am a Ph.D. student at SSE, and, also, that I have a great

interest in film (adding that I have previously taken film classes and made a couple of short films). In order not to impose my theoretical framework on them (cf. Silverman 2001), I refrained from conceptualizing *taste performances*. Instead, I told them that I am interested in organizations in the field of cultural production, and that I planned to take a closer look at organizational culture and taste. The reason I brought up "organizational culture" was that I soon learned that this word often triggered detailed descriptions of the various departments and companies within the group, something that seemed critical to understanding the organization's location in the overall field. Not one interview passed without a word on the sharp division between film and video in the organization. I began the interview by asking the interviewee to describe his or her background and present position in the organization.

My interviews were semi-structured, i.e., my interview guide contained an overview of themes to cover, as well as suggestions of questions. In line with Kvale (1997), I sought to consider each question thematically and dynamically; in other words, I recognized the need to include questions relevant to my research area, while, at the same time, I acknowledged the need to ensure a good interaction between interviewer and interviewee. A typical interview guide can be found in appendix 2. The guide was however continuously revised so there were slight differences over time. I came to spend more time discussing the merger, and the cultural differences between the various companies in the group, than I had initially expected.

I tended to move from overall descriptive questions to more specific questions. For example, questions about the organization and the organizational culture would be

followed by questions regarding the significance of taste. According to Holstein and Gubrium (1997), the analytical objective of interviews is to "point at how what is being said relates to the experiences and lives being studied" (ibid., p. 127). Hence, in order to avoid general descriptions, I have asked interviewees to exemplify their answers with specific situations. Not only did I strive to pose follow-up questions where applicable, but also, I sometimes asked projective questions (Kylén and Vestlund 1978). In other words, I asked my interviewees about the attitudes and beliefs of "others" (their co-workers more precisely). These answers may reflect the attitudes and beliefs of others, but they may also hint at the interviewees' own opinions on the matter at hand.

SOME REFLECTIONS ON MY INTERVIEWS. Generally, it seemed like my interviewees enjoyed being interviewed, as the interview situation seemed to offer them an opportunity to reflect on otherwise unarticulated or neglected aspects of their work. For example, two interviewees expressed gratitude for having "philosophized" with them for a while (I believe this was primarily a reference to the discussion on meaningfulness, see p. 300). A phenomenological approach to interviews entails being open to learning from the interviewee, to understanding his or her world (Kvale 1997). I tried to foster a sense of trust between my respondent and myself. We jointly negotiated an intersubjective agreement regarding the organization, my project, and the interview itself (cf. Berger and Luckmann 1966, Silverman 2001). Yet, the interview situation did not consist of two individuals on equal footing. As an interviewer, I somehow had a dominant position; to some extent, I defined the situation and the topics or themes of conversation, I decided in what direction to proceed by posing follow-up questions or by moving along my interview guide. Still, my position vis-à-vis my interviewees

varied somewhat from one interview to another primarily depending on the organizational members' position in the organization, their habitus, gender and age.

How my research project and I were received seemed to differ according to the interviewee's location in the organization, i.e., along the *Gesellschaft / Gemeinschaft* dimension (see chapter 10). In the Gesellschaft section of the organization, organizational members took a great interest in my affiliation with SSE, but from time to time they also demonstrated some skepticism towards the topic of taste. I interpret the latter as a result of the endorsement of "the professional approach to taste" (see chapter 12). Epitomizing the Gesellschaft (Tönnies 1979 [1887], Asplund 1991), a business school background is naturally perceived as more desirable in this part of the organization than, for example, an art school background. In the Gemeinschaft section of the organization, there was more distrust of my qualifications, a business school background, for understanding the organization. As I mentioned on p. 191, I was encouraged, by a senior manager from "the old Sandrews", i.e., the Gemeinschaft section of the organization, to emphasize that I had taken film classes and made a couple of short films. The fact that more weight was given to my practical experience of film-making than to my theoretically oriented cinema studies, not to mention my Ph.D. studies in the field of organization theory, can be interpreted as a manifestation of the film Gemeinschaft where experience from within the film industry is of prime importance (see p. 243). Although I could stress different aspects of my educational background in the two sections of the company, I felt that I had an easier time legitimizing myself and my project in the Gesellschaft part of the organization. Still, interviewees in the Gemeinschaft part of the organization were often comfortable relating to the topic of taste.

Although I felt that the power relation between my interviewees and myself hinged more on the Gemeinschaft / Gesellschaft dimension, the interviewees' habitus naturally influenced how they related to being involved in a research project; interviewees endowed with more cultural and economic capital were generally more engrossed in the project itself and did not seem to feel subordinate to me. Conversely, the organizational members with only small amounts of cultural and economic capital showed less interest vis-à-vis my research project (this did not, however, affect their willingness and eagerness to answer my questions), and, from time to time, they behaved a little apologetically, from what I perceived as a subordinated position. Organizational members from the latter group did however sometimes stress their long experience in the industry, possibly to compensate for any lack of capital, i.e., their Gemeinschaft qualities. One woman in a high position in the Gesellschaft part of the organization, and with a business school education, asked me to recommend some basic cinema studies literature. I interpret this incidence as an opportunity for this woman, rich in economic capital, to acquire some cultural capital or film-specific knowledge that may come in handy when dealing with other parts of the organization without exposing other organizational members to the acquisition / learning process.

At times, I felt that I was treated like a young girl (often with explicit reference to "the girl") by people older than I. Also, my dissertation project was often referred to as "an essay", and thus somewhat diminished. One reason for this naming of my project may be the rather ubiquitous unfamiliarity with academic work (and the academic world) in most parts of the organization. Statements like these may also have been made by interview-

ees in order to position themselves and their practical knowledge as superior to me and my theoretical knowledge. Another factor that often interfered with my ambition to establish interview situations where the interviewee and I were on an equal footing was gender. This was particularly apparent when I interviewed executives, who were predominantly men and earned considerably more than I do. These men rarely stressed the power relations between the genders in the organization and seemed somewhat surprised at my questions relating to the significance of gender. However, none of my interviewees were provoked by these questions (cf. Höök 2001b, Holgersson 2003, Lantz 2006b). Accustomed to having the interpretive prerogative these men sometimes seemed to regard the interview as an opportunity to market their organization and their management, stating in typical corporate jargon, for example, "we promote leaders not managers". Women in high positions in the organization seemed more interested in questions relating to gender. One way of interpreting this is that these women have experienced the power dimensions of gender in their career to a greater extent than women in lower positions (see also chapter 10, p. 253).

A brief questionnaire

The survey was initially designed to capture "taste structures" in the organization (see p. 197 for details). It was handed out to 66 organizational members at Sandrew Metronome in Stockholm after the interview study but before the photographic study. Therefore, many organizational members were familiar with my project, something I hoped would contribute to a good response rate. While I abandoned the idea of identifying taste structures in the organization, and thus, disregarded most of

the questionnaire data, I do however draw upon it in order to demonstrate the relative cultural capital-intensity of the production department in Stockholm (see p. 291). I also use initial informative questions to describe the organizational members (see example of questionnaire in appendix 3). In line with my goffmanian perspective, my respondents identified themselves when filling out the questionnaire. I wanted them to provide answers that were in line with their presentation of self at work. Six respondents did however remain anonymous despite my request.

A collaborative photographic study

Drawing on suggestions that in the postmodern era objects are increasingly valued on the basis of their aesthetic and symbolic properties (Hebdige 1988, Zetterlund 2001), the photographic study is exclusively concerned with cultural objects [36] in close physical proximity to the organizational members. My intention was to capture socially significant [37] organization-specific cultural objects, and to do so I distributed disposable cameras to a small number of organizational members, and asked them to photograph things they like and dislike in the organization, as well as things that symbolize the organization. I then brought the developed pictures to the organizational setting and had the subjects tell me about the reasoning behind their photos. Using a reflexive approach to visual methods, I was interested in the interpretations of the pictures that were produced in the negotiations between my subjects and myself. One of my objectives with the collaborative method was to give the subjects a chance of asserting their subjectivity in relation to me. In showing me their pictures, my subjects automatically turned into elaborate storytellers. I wished

to find out if my subjects had chosen their objects based on aesthetic criteria, i.e., if they used "aesthetic" words[38] when describing them or if these objects in any way signified cultural capital. Similarly, I wanted to see if the photographs signaled economic capital in any way. Further, I wondered whether the photographs indicated features of organizational life that stem from the construction of the modern organization rather than from the fields? What artifacts were captured as symbols of the organization? I also wished to examine the practice of photography itself; how were the photographs taken? Did the style of the photographs indicate capital composition?

I could have proceeded by doing a reading of the organization environment based on interviews, participant observations and the like and, thus, have come up with a number of artefacts that seemed to have social significance in the organization. These could then have formed the basis of a new round of interviews or a questionnaire where I could have asked for the organizational members' specific relation to each of the objects. However, keeping in mind that all cultural aspects (i.e., everything that is created or thought by humans) may not be in use all the time (Hall and Nietz, 1993), such a "reading" of the organization environment would perhaps have resulted in an emphasis on artefacts without social significance. Instead, I wanted to examine how the cultural objects were produced and used in this specific social context (see Schudson 1997).

In interviews I made every effort possible not only to become familiar with the settings but also to move into the mind of the settings' participants (see Helle 1991, Lofland and Lofland 1995). Yet, I felt that this negotiated intersubjectivity with the "subjects" of my research was somehow not entirely satisfactory. The interview

form forces the researcher to guide the unfolding of the interview to a very large extent. Seeking a method that was conducive to bringing out the subject and capable of producing new kinds of information, I turned to photography and video. No longer in its salad days, but still treated gingerly by mainstream disciplines (see for example Prosser 1998, Harper 1998, Pink 2001), visual ethnography presented me with reflexive approaches to the visual. I subsequently decided to distribute disposable cameras to some of my subjects. Along with the cameras came the following assignment:

Photograph
three things you like in the organization
three things you dislike in the organization
three things that symbolize the organization

The purpose of the first two assignments was to find out more about the relation between organization and fields (see p. 308). The third assignment was designed to provide material for further analysis of the organizational culture (see p. 261). In addition, I would have a new type of data, i.e., visuals, which could possibly yield new ideas for further discussion in interviews.

Five people from the commercially oriented distribution department in Stockholm participated in the photographic study, three women and two men. I had previously conducted deep, semi-structured interviews with them. The rationale for focusing on the distribution department was a wish to capture the division between film and video. Furthermore, as distribution constitutes the largest companies within the group, and since distribution consists of people from "the old Sandrews" as well as from Warner Bros. and elsewhere (see chapter 10), I believed that distribution would present the great-

est variety of organizational members while still narrowing the study to one department. I wanted the participants to share a common physical envionment so that it would be easier to compare photographs. Thus, the photographic study did not include any organizational members from distribution departments outside of Stockholm. The reason for the small scale of the study is its explorative character, I did not know beforehand what it would offer.

In appendix 1, I clarify the underlying assumptions and theories that inform my method. The first section of the appendix presents theories on photographic practice. The remainder of the appendix gives more details regarding reflexive approaches to visual methods.

PRESENTING AND RECONSTRUCTING
THE MATERIAL

This section covers the presentation and reconstruction of my material, starting with a discussion on the overall structure of the dissertation. Under this heading I also describe the transcription and categorization of the interviews, highlighting how I arrived at the final analysis and chapter structure. Further, I point out some problems and side-effects of the translation process. I conclude the section with some comments on the limitations of my study.

My ambition in this section is to make the process of presenting and reconstructing the material more transparent, thus offering the reader a possibility to evaluate the credibility of my interpretations. As I stated on p. 199, the presentation of my material is not entirely true to the research process (I have prioritized readability over a strict adherence to the research process). Part I of

my dissertation describes a number of theories that make up my analytical model, i.e., an overall framework for my position on reality and the relations among various concepts (cf. Silverman 2001). In line with my epistemological position (see chapter 2), I do not aspire to a presentation of an untainted empirical study in Part II. Instead, my empirical material is filtered through not only my *doxa* but also my analytical model as outlined in Part I. The analysis is gradually built up by the successive layering of theories from the analytical model, culminating in the chapters on the organizational members' relation to taste at work.

Categorizing my interview material was an entirely iterative process and constituted the beginning of the analytical process (see discussion under the next heading). Already at the transcription phase I tried to identify recurrent themes in my interviews. These themes were sometimes further explored and highlighted by additional literature studies. However, the categorization called for approximately five more readings of all interviews, after which I outlined the major themes which I determined to use as a chapter structure: i) the organization in brief, ii) an organization with competing principles of legitimacy, iii) taste at work, iv) taste management. I identified what sections of the interviews would fall under which chapter heading. Then, for each chapter, I subsequently categorized the material further into subheadings. In this process I also omitted material that I felt did not contribute to addressing my research questions.

The one constraint I have set myself is that individuals should be given anonymity. Hence, my account of the organizational members' statements and general ideas of the organization is not structured according to persons, which would be more likely to reveal the identities of the

organizational members. Rather, the chapters to come are organized around a number of themes. Likewise, the presentation of the photographs is not organized around the five photographers. Instead, I structure the presentation of this substudy thematically, according to the photographic assignments. In citations and in descriptions where I want to stress the gender of the interviewee or of the person referred to by the interviewee, I make use of the four ABBA names: Bjorn or Benny to signify a man, and the names Agnetha and Anni-Frid to denote a woman. The downside of this presentation style is of course that the reader cannot see patterns in the answers of one respondent. Still, I do not consider this shortcoming particularly important as I have chosen to highlight overall social patterns among the organizational members rather than, for example, a specific process where the mutual relations of a few key characters are of considerable importance.

Further, because of my concern for anonymity of organizational members I avoid detailed job descriptions of my interviewees and employ the following broad affiliations: "production", "film or video distribution", and "exhibition". In this categorization, an occupational provenance in acquisitions is sorted under "production". I have indicated senior manager status since I believe that this kind of positionality is important in the organization, and, likewise, crucial for my interpretations. In cases where a senior manager, despite an overall business responsibility, is more operationally involved in one particular department, I specify this department. In a few places, I refer explicitly to "the group CEO"; the latter then talks about his job in relation to the CEOs of the subsidiaries. Moreover, I use the name "Polar cinema" for references to a specific movie theater.

The reason for revealing the identity of the organization

at large is what I consider to be the uniqueness of Sandrew Metronome as a cultural producing company; a great many aspects of Sandrew Metronome that are relevant to this study are not paralleled in any other organization, let alone in one *single* organization, in the field of cultural production. For example, the large amounts of capital required for film production are unequalled, as is the range of various compositions of cultural and economic capital throughout the organization. Epitomizing the division between cultural and economic capital is the construction of film and video as two very different and separate products. Furthermore, essentially competing with each other, the divisions of an integrated film company (such as exhibition, distribution, and production) are difficult to match in an imaginary, anonymous organization in the cultural production field.

The transcriptions of interviews may be regarded as interpretations or constructions of the interviews themselves; a transformation that involves the translation from spoken language to written language. Since I have no intention to do a sociolinguistic analysis of my material, I have tried to transform the spoken language to coherent written language. In the transcription process, I have also noted pauses, and emotional expressions such as laughter, sighs, and, occasionally, gestures. I have transcribed all interviews myself, thus ensuring consistency in the transcription process. All interviews were transcribed according to the language used by the interviewer: Swedish or English. This implies that those interviews where I interviewed in Swedish while the interviewee responded in his or her mother tongue (i.e., Norwegian or Danish) were translated to Swedish. Since I had the chance to ask the interviewees to clarify what they meant during the interview, there were few instances where I did not understand what the interviewee

said on the tape. Passages from the transcriptions that came to serve as citations were later translated to English. On the topic of citations, I also want to add that in the places where I cite my questions, they are translated into English and italicized.

I am aware that the presentation of my interviews and citations in English has a number of drawbacks. First of all, language is embedded in the social and cultural reality of my interviewees. Thus, it is impossible to communicate the exact or even corresponding meaning of their wording in English. The reader will thus miss certain information in the interviewee's way of expressing him or herself, information that in one's mother tongue is interpreted unconsciously through *doxa* (cf. Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992). In other words, I am referring to specific wordings that locate the interviewee culturally and socially. For example, one of my interviewees says "fin i kanten", an expression that I, only with great difficulties, would describe as signifying someone with large amounts of cultural and economic capital, or someone who acts as if he or she is rich in cultural and economic capital. The expression is usually employed slightly negatively, as if the person referred to is too superior for certain things. Further, I believe it is more subtle than "snobbish". The problems in finding a corresponding English expression for "fin i kanten" points to the partial loss of information that comes with the translation into English. Still, I consider these losses sufficiently small not to affect the interpretations and analysis at large. However, the reader may have found the descriptions and, especially the citations, more animated had the presentation been in the same language as the interviews. Instead, the translation may be regarded as part of the process of ensuring the interviewees' anonymity; the specificity of their language has to some extent been removed.

In presenting my material, I have sought to demonstrate typical answers and lines of reasoning. The citations are used to exemplify the material on which I base my analysis. The citations have been approved by the interview persons (see more details on p. 221).

I have already discussed some of my study's methodological limitations (see p. 198), but I would also like to comment on some other limitations that evolved during the research process. In light of the research questions I had defined and the information that came out of the interviews, I decided to omit a discussion of the effect of national culture on how organizational members in an organization in the field of cultural production relate to taste in their work. Part of the reason for this exclusion was my wish to limit the scope of the study. Another part of the reason was that the constructions of the nationalities of Sandrew Metronome seemed to vary depending on the sender's nationality and, also, they seemed to concern either the decision-making process (e.g., "Swedes always seek consensus", "Finns are good at taking orders") or the respective national market (e.g., "Norwegians like feel-good movies"). The only organizational members who could expand on this topic were executives. In addition, I have omitted material that concerns the future prospects for the organization and the industry at large. These questions did not generate any interesting discussions in line with my research objective.

Not only is my study restricted by my research questions, but also by my analytical model. The theories included determine what aspects of "the world", i.e., organizational life, I highlight. For example, my goffmanian perspective of regarding the organization as an arena for performances implies that I am not concerned with how organizational members relate to and construct taste

outside of the organization. This perspective has implications for what I can say about class. As social position, class, is fundamental to all of Bourdieu's relational concepts (such as habitus, field and capital), and, thus, also permeates his notion of the cultural and economic pole in the field of cultural production, I will not single out class as a *separate* object of analysis. Still, since class is continually reproduced in the organizational arena, it will be included in my analysis when it relates to taste performances, along with the reservation that my discussion of class is restricted to its manifestations in performances within the organizational boundaries. By placing taste and an organization in the field of cultural production in the foreground and only discussing gender, and to some extent, class, from that particular vantage, I make no claims to study the reproduction of gender and class *in general* (see also p. 163). Gender and class may thus also be constructed in a great many other processes in the organization, for example, in leadership and recruitment (cf. Wahl 1992, Holgersson 2003). But these issues are beyond the scope of my dissertation.

INTERPRETING THE MATERIAL

To reiterate, my research process has been characterized by an interplay between the theoretical framework and the empirical material, where I have interpreted and re-interpreted these two parts of my research in light of one another (cf. Charles S. Peirce's (1998 [1905]) notion of *abduction*). The complication of the issue is grand; I cannot possibly give a precise account of how I have arrived at the lines of reasoning as presented in this book. The inseparability of the empirical study and my interpretation may make the evaluation of the text more difficult. In an effort to make my interpretations credible, I will

however describe the analytical process schematically.

As I stated in the previous section, the analytical process began with the categorization of my interview material. The three broad themes that came to constitute Part II (the organization in brief, an organization with competing principles of legitimacy, and taste at work) were quite easily identified, partly due to my interview guide (questions on organizational culture led me in the direction of two competing principles of legitimacy, and questions on taste gave rise to the chapter on taste at work). However, the "real" analytical work was done under the respective chapter headings. Bourdieu's theory on taste, and his field theory constituted a key element in my initial theoretical framework. Still, it could not account for all aspects of the organizational culture that had surfaced in my interviews. One example is the distinction between film and video, which, I gathered, could be understood by reference to Asplund's (1991) account of the Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft figure of thought. The concept of Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft captured the differences in preferred trajectories and the construction of work, differences that were also apparent in the organizational members' relation to taste in their work. At the same time, it was easier to understand the interviewees' different definitions of the industry (or the field) in light of Bourdieu's concept of field. Moreover, Bourdieu's notion of the field of cultural production, and the two poles of legitimacy, provided a helpful tool in understanding the organization and the various departments with their differing capital compositions.

The most intensive interplay between theory and interview material occurred when I entered the topic of how organizational members relate to taste in their work. At the outset of my project, I was not only focused on

revealing "taste structures"; I had also thought of taste strictly as either a medium of power (à la Bourdieu 1984) or as a medium of interaction (à la Simmel 1949 [1911] or Douglas and Isherwood 1979). However, gradually, it became clear to me that organizational members, as well as the organization at large, relate to taste in more ways than that. Although I had a Goffmanian perspective from the very beginning, I discovered new aspects of taste performances that were linked to the notions of Gesellschaft / Gemeinschaft and the accompanying constructions of the market (i.e., *the professional approach to taste*, *balancing taste and market potential*, and *taste as a resource for market knowledge or influence*, see chapter 12). The theoretical naming and understanding of these concepts have developed over time after numerous readings and rereadings of my material. Whenever my empirical material turned up something that my theoretical framework could not explain, I added theories that would contribute to a better understanding of my material. The notion of *taste management* is developed on the basis of taste performances, linking the latter to Bourdieu's notion of strategies in a specific field, to Goffman's presentation of self and the team and to the gendering of all performances. My reliance on discursive accounts of taste performances may of course pose a problem; the practice may differ slightly from what the organizational members tell me. Still, as a social constructionist, I know that the discourse will affect, and be affected, by practice. Further, I find the interviewees' descriptions of their relation to taste in their work very credible from their respective positions in the organization.

To conclude, the effort to present my interpretations as credible involved pointing to the interplay of theory and empirical material, highlighting the parallel development

of my analytical framework, describing the collection of emprical material and discussing my positionality (and, hence, my responsibility for the text).

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Putting my study into words, I face the problem of revealing the identities of my interviewees. Since I highlight aspects of power, I do not want the subjects who have been critical of those in dominating positions to get into trouble. This may be considered a problem of confidentiality (see Kvale 1997). According to the ethical guidelines for research in arts and social sciences provided by a Swedish Research Council (HSFR 1996), researchers are required to protect individuals so that the rights of the latter are not violated. I have made every effort to minimize any harm to participants. Hence, I have tried to anonymize my material as much as possible. Since I disclose the identity of the organization, I have been especially meticulous in obtaining the consent of my interviewees to use the citations as they appear in this book. In translating the original Swedish citations to English, I might have done some violence to the meaning of my interviewees' words. Thus, all cited interviewees have been able to comment on their citations. Some have changed or omitted a few words. One person declined any quotation. However, as I was still allowed to use the content of the interview, I could rewrite this person's quotations to indirect speech. A few people wanted me to stress that my study is about the organization during the years 2001 and 2002, emphasizing the substantial changes that the organization has undergone up to the time of publication.

The interviewees did not however read my interpretations prior to the publication of this book. I hold that

as a researcher I make other kinds of interpretations than my research subjects due to my thorough theoretical knowledge. Thus, I also take full responsibility for my interpretations. Yet, prior to publishing this dissertation I gave the bulk of chapter 10 to the now retired group CEO, so that he would have a chance to point out factual errors in the description of the company history and structure.

CHAPTER SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter offered an account of the methodological considerations that informed my methods. Accordingly, I discussed my positionality. Further, after a description of the development of the study, I addressed each particular method and reflected on my primary method, interviews. Finally, I took up the presentation and interpretation of my material. However, the likely referential use of this chapter obviates a detailed chapter summary; I imagine that the reader will focus on what is important for his or her specific reading of the text. Instead, let us move on to Part II. But first, a few words on the use of the analytical model.

In an effort to avoid "conspicuous theorizing", the analytical model (see summary on p. 163), which presents my *assumptions* about relations in the "world" I study will be used pragmatically; my intention is to let the theoretical framework coalesce around the practices (and, inevitably, the discourses) of the organizational members. My theoretical model will be used as a tool-kit (see p. 108). Accordingly, in order to challenge the dichotomy between theory and practice and to remain consistent with my epistemological position, I will organize Part II concurrently around my empirical material and the the-

oretical discussions introduced in Part I. In other words, I will make interpretations of the material along the way.

While the first chapter in Part II (chapter 10) gives a brief overview of the organization, the two chapters that follow deal with the different principles of legitimacy, and taste performances at work. Thus, the analytical model is primarily used in the latter portion of Part II.

It is time to introduce my organization.

33. He had a long background in "the old Sandrews", a theme I enlarge on in chapters 10 and 11.

34. This "cultural sensitivity" consisted in the inclusion of around ten genres of each subfield of cultural consumption, each genre in turn exemplified with three specific authors, musicians, television shows, films, and restaurants.

35. The survey was handed out to 66 organizational members at the Sandrew Metronome office in Stockholm, and, with 53 respondents, I had a respondent rate of 80,3%.

36. Up until now, I have employed an empirically oriented definition of "cultural objects", products created in the "creative industries" or in the field of cultural production, i.e., in William's third sense (see p. 75). However, in the photographic study I draw on Griswold's (1987) definition of cultural objects as "shared significance embodied in form, i.e., [...] an expression of social meaning that is tangible or can be put into words" (ibid., p. 4). Griswold argues that it is analytical use that distinguishes cultural objects. In other words, any human artifact, idea or behavior may be considered a cultural object depending on how an analyst attends to it. This more theoretically inclined usage of "cultural object" will only appear in my photographic study and the accompanying discussion of social significance (see p. 308).

37. Regardless of whether "culture" is used empirically in Williams' third sense or if it is used in a wider, more theoretical sense à la Griswold (see footnote 36), this cultural dimension may not be in use all the time (Hall and Neitz 1993). Moreover, different users may ascribe different significance to the culture that is being used. For example, many people may look upon mobile phones as a utilitarian device, whereas others, for example electronic engineers, take on cell phone construction as a special kind of cultural knowledge, and yet others, such as teenagers and managers, find great pleasure in associating themselves with particular brands, designs and functions, i.e., they use the cell phones as status symbols. Social significance is of course also crucial to the study of more purely symbolic culture, such as art works. The understanding of how people attach significance to specific culture is a prerequisite in the attempt to delineate the sociological relevance of culture (Hall and Neitz 1993).

38. By "aesthetic words" I refer to judgments that highlight expressive or symbolic qualities of the objects (cf. Hebdige 1988). However, I continue to use open concepts, and hence, I do not want to define "aesthetic" in advance (cf. Bourdieu 1984).

PART II

The organization in brief

Assembling an introductory chapter about an organization is invariably thankless, almost anyone can object to what is put in or left out, as there is no particular question to address. However, I will do my best to provide you with some useful background information on Sandrew Metronome, the organization around which this dissertation revolves. "Useful" as in the type of information that could be necessary in order to fully understand the following chapters in Part II. My epistemological position (see chapter 2) precludes me from treating the organizational world as something to be uncovered. Rather, I will construct the organization through my interpretations of the interviews with organizational members and my numerous visits to the various offices in Scandinavia. Furthermore, my epistemological stance compels me to abandon the idea of presenting a theory-free account of the organization. Both my pretheoretical knowledge, i.e., my "doxa" and my theoretical framework affect my presentation. Thus, I will sometimes draw on the concepts I presented in my analytical framework when describing the organization and organizing my description.

I would also like to add a few words about my use of citations. In the interest of readability, I have deliberately tried to minimize the number of citations (of interviewees) in this introductory chapter. I simply prefer texts without citations. However, in the chapters to come, when addressing my research questions, I feel a greater need to use citations as transparent "proofs" – i.e., constructions – of the material on which I base my analysis, and, accordingly I will use them more frequently.

The chapter presents different organizational members' accounts of the organization. First, however, I give a brief historical overview of Sandrews, as well as of

Metronome, the two companies that constituted the core of the merger that created the Sandrew Metronome group. Then I proceed to chart the company structure. However, I will not linger on the structure for very long as my research questions do not require any deep knowledge of it. Whereas this account as well as the preceeding one is based on secondary material (i.e., books and presentations), I subsequently turn to presenting material from my interviews. Central to an integrated film company seems to be the construction of film and video as two separate entities / products. Thus, I start out by relating some of the organizational members' statements on the topic of film and video to the historical development of film and video from an industry perspective. Lingering on the division between film and video I apply the Gemeinschaft / Gesellschaft figure of thought in order to understand the constructions of the two departments. I also describe how the two products and the accompanying marketing practices are constructed. I then move on to focus on the gendering of the organization. This is followed by a description of the post-merger organizational culture in terms of economic and cultural capital, as well as of the hierarchy and coordination between different companies and divisions within the group. Finally, I expand a little on the organization's presence in four different Nordic countries, as this is linked to the organizational culture at large. Although I do acknowledge and enlarge on the differences in capital composition among the organizational members, I will postpone my field analyses to chapter 11.

Before we proceed, I would like once again to emphasize that the objective of this dissertation is to explore and develop concepts and theories regarding how organizational members in an organization in the field of cultural production relate to taste in their work. Had I been

interested in studying taste performances in general, I would have covered not only the work environment but also the actual consumption and everyday life talk about cultural objects. However, the restriction to "how they relate to taste *in their work*" requires that I focus on how organizational members deal with taste in the daily business operations that they engage in. Hence, the following descriptions of the organization will serve to better address and understand my research questions in the chapters to come.

THE HISTORY OF SANDREWS AND METRONOME

Sandrew Metronome AB is a Nordic corporation. It has, at the time of my study (2001), 400 permanent employees and 1000 temporary employees.[39] The group comprises ten subsidiaries that focus on *exhibition*[40] (Denmark, Finland and Sweden), *production*[41] (Denmark and Sweden), *distribution*[42] of film, video and DVD as well as film sales to broadcasters (Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden), and *acquisition* of rights. Also included in the distribution are the films, videos and DVDs of Warner Bros. (through a collaboration with AOL-Time Warner).

A grocer who invested his revenue in real estate, Anders Sandrew, the founder of Sandrews, became aware of the attraction of a movie theater when he was about to sublet the premises. Facing the great number of potential tenants, Sandrew (who had named himself after a bottle of port from his grocery store) decided to keep the movie theater and thus opened the Metropol Theater in 1926. He soon expanded his movie theater business, and in 1937 he owned 16 theaters in Stockholm. That same year Sandrew abandoned his grocery business in order to

focus exclusively on film. Not only was he the owner of movie theaters, but he was also a major distributor of film through various partnerships with American and European film companies. By then, Sandrews had become a vertically integrated film company, encompassing production, distribution, and exhibition. By the 40s Sandrews had a nationwide movie theater chain and had also embarked on a venture to start a theater business. At the time of Anders Sandrew's death in 1957, Sandrews' film production reached about ten films a year (Freund, Haslum and Lindgren 1988; Björkegren 1994). The theater business, which then comprised three Stockholm theaters, *Oscars, Vasan*, and *Intiman*, was run by Sandrews until the 90s. According to Björkegren (1994), Anders Sandrew ran his business vigilantly. Growth was financed through cash flow from his business operations. In other words, Sandrew remained economically independent.

Over the years, Sandrews has, despite a continuous commitment to promoting a great portion of art house film, changed its strategy slightly. According to Björkegren (1994), the company initially had a "commercial business strategy with a slant towards cultural idealism" (ibid., p. 141). In the 60s and the decades that followed, Sandrews stressed its art house productions even more. This direction was encouraged by the fact that the Swedish Film Institute's policy at the time supported films that were artistically interesting. However, facing a steadily declining audience for art house films in the 80s, Sandrews became more commercially oriented. It confined its productions to only a couple films a year, and, also, only engaged itself as co-producer. In addition, Sandrews opened several multiplex movie theaters. In the 90s, Sandrews resumed its role as a producer and made a few successful mainstream films (ibid.).

Concurrently in Denmark, the record company Metronome had been started by Danish composer Bent Fabricius Bjerre and the Swede Mats Bjerke (who later abandoned the company) in 1950. The Metronome studio became renowned for its technical facilities. Later, in 1979, Metronome was expanded to include film production under the name Metronome Productions. The following year, Metronome entered the movie theater business by acquiring *Dagmar Teatret*, as well as *Scala* (which has since closed down). Furthermore, in the 1980s, Metronome joined Warner Bros. and entered into film distribution with the company Warner & Metronome. In 1997, Bjerre sold Metronome group to Tele-Danmark and the Norwegian media group Schibsted.[43]

In 1998 Sandrews merged with the film side of Metronome and formed Sandrew Metronome AB, its ownership evenly divided between Norwegian media group Schibsted and Sandrew AB, the latter in turn owned by the Anders Sandrew Foundation (see more on p. 261). Whereas Schibsted as a corporation aims to maximize the total return to stockholders, the Anders Sandrew Foundation is a foundation whose prime objective is to hand out grants and various kinds of support (a detailed description of the objective of the foundation statutes can be found in appendix 4). The by-laws do not include any requirements as to areas of operation. Although the board of Anders Sandrew Foundation and the board of Sandrew Metronome differ, there are three people with overlapping board memberships (there are, however, no corresponding overlaps between the board of Schibsted and the board of Sandrew Metronome).

The merger was accompanied by the establishment of new companies in some countries. In the next section, I will describe the company structure as described in select presentation material[44] at the time of my study.

With its corporate headquarters located in Stockholm, Sandrew Metronome AB, has regional offices in Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden. *Sandrew Metronome International* acquires film rights for the Nordic region and produces Swedish films. The other companies in the Sandrew Metronome Group are national.[45] Six companies are in the distribution business. The Finnish and Swedish distribution companies distribute both film *and* video. In Norway and Denmark, distinct companies distribute film and video, and thus there are two distribution companies in each of these countries. Through an agreement with Warner Bros., Sandrew Metronome distributes all Warner Bros. titles in both film and video, in these four Nordic countries. Sandrew Metronome also has exhibition companies in Denmark, Finland and Sweden. In Norway, cinemas are owned by local municipal councils. Sandrew Metronome's presence in the three countries take different forms. In Denmark, Sandrew Metronome owns two theaters in the greater Copenhagen area. In Finland, Sandrew Metronome has its name on three movie theaters, in Helsinki and Turku. In Sweden there is a movie theater chain consisting of 21 movie theaters.

To the right is an organizational chart (and approximate number of employees in brackets[46]):

Sandrew Metronome AB

Nordic Media Link	SANDREW METRONOME International (5)
SANDREW METRONOME Bio Denmark AS (1)	SANDREW METRONOME Denmark AS SANDREW METRONOME Video Denmark AS (45)
SANDREW METRONOME Finland Oy / AB (9)	SANDREW METRONOME Dist. Finland Oy / AB (17)
	SANDREW METRONOME Norge AS SANDREW NETRONOME Video Norge AS (30)
SANDREW METRONOME Sweden AB (14)	SANDREW METRONOME Dist. Sverige AB (36)

What follows next is an account of the construction of the two products at the center of the organization, film and video. Thus, I will gradually leave the secondary sources and rely to a greater extent on the interviews that I conducted during my field studies.

FILM VS. VIDEO

Though Sandrew Metronome as an integrated film company comprises both film and video distribution, some structural problems remain, according to my interviewees. In each country there is either a single company for film and video or two separate companies. Still, regardless of company structure, throughout the entire Sandrew Metronome group there is an obvious division between people dealing with film and people dealing

237

with video. In addition to film distribution, the "film side" also comprises exhibition and production. Devoted to the separation of film and video, this section will give a brief account of how this distinct categorization is manifested in the organization. It seems that the respective products are essential to how the organizational members make sense of the organization and its fields; i.e., the difference between film and video is also a difference in cultural and economic capital, of Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft. Of course, the construction process of film and video also involves parallel constructions of the employees associated with the respective products. The whole matter of fields will be further elaborated on in chapter 11.

I will proceed by describing, in order, the historical roots of this division in the film industry, the organizational members' account of the characteristics of the Nordic film industry, in terms of the film Gemeinschaft and the video Gesellschaft, the experience of great risk-taking in the film acquisition, production and distribution phases, the marketing practices in film and video, and, finally, I will discuss various ways the organization has tried to overcome the separation between film and video. Before I continue I want to stress once more (as this is my first empirical chapter) that the following is my interpretation (or constructions) of the organizational members' experiences and stories from the organizational life at Sandrew Metronome. I will try my best to avoid any careless use of "account", "experience", "meaning" or one of their cognates that would imply a direct and perfect communication from the subjects to the reader. The fundamental idea of Part II is that I construct or interpret the organizational members' account of the organization and their respective roles. Then, I leave it to the reader to construct or interpret these constructions.

Historical review of film vs. video

The division between film[47] and video can be traced back to the early years of the VCR. In his book *Veni, Vidi, Video*, Wasser (2001) describes the development of home video into a mass medium backing the Hollywood blockbuster. I argue that this history is also an account of the construction process of video into a medium signifying low levels of cultural capital. In order to give some background to the recurring talk of film and video throughout my study, I will now briefly summarize some important elements of this construction process in Western society at large.

Even though the video revolution has affected television as well, Wasser argues that video has had a greater impact on film. Television expanded greatly during the years following the introduction of the VCR in 1974, something that made the re-broadcasting of programs easier. In that way, television also offered viewers some flexibility (time shifting being the competitive advantage of video). The impact of video on film concerns several areas. Let me start with the film industry. Since the risks, as well as the rewards, associated with direct payment of filmed entertainment (i.e., a movie ticket, a rental or purchase of a videotape, etc) are much higher than those linked to subscription payment (cable tv) and advertising financing (commercial tv), the media outlets relying on direct payment take various measures to cope with the risks. For example, exhibitors may give seemingly weak titles very little time or no time at all in the theaters, and video wholesalers may deny the same titles shelf space. Wasser claims that this has led distributors to feel that they have no time or space to build an audience in media outlets based on direct payment. Because exhibitors and retailers do not want to face the risk of marketing un-

known films, home video has become a blockbuster-driven market. Also important to the marketing of products of direct payment is convenience (as in wide releases, a high number of starting times for film showings, and numerous copies of the blockbusters offered by the video rental stores).

Furthermore, Wasser identifies "profit slippage" as a central feature of the media industries after the video revolution. This refers to the change of film profit margins where profit that was formerly earned through movie theater exhibition has now been dispersed to ancillary markets, thus raising the barriers of entry to the theatrical exhibition market and to distribution in general (see also Chong 2002, Bettig and Hall 2003). American titles have capitalized on the post-video market since international video distributors preferred to market blockbuster films.

Initiated by the independent distributors, the video revolution was, not surprisingly, soon taken over by the major Hollywood studios. According to Wasser, this happened because video wholesalers preferred titles subject to big theatrical releases rather than a wider selection of titles. Since the technology of home video resonated with the blockbuster oriented production strategy of the so-called New Hollywood[48], Wasser shows that the history of the VCR taught the film industry to anticipate new ways of distributing its content. Earlier, Hollywood had often neglected many ancillary rights to films, which had instead ended up with individual producers. The rise of home video boosted the value of film distribution, causing a wave of mergers and acquisitions in the media industry. For the big media corporations in the 1990s, the top three being Disney, Time Warner and Viacom, it was vital to own an outlet in every medium.

What Wasser labels the "outflanking strategy" is the need for the big media corporations to exploit every right to their products / films / shows.

In addition to strengthening the position of film distribution, video also influenced film form. Wasser highlights two genres that expanded dramatically with the introduction of video: hard-core tapes and children's shows. Very much in contrast with mainstream movies, pornographic films are almost exclusively sold on videotape. Similarly, according to Wasser's statistics, children's titles have gained a strong market share in video. I would argue that the preference for American blockbusters over "national film", coupled with the growth of porn and children's titles on video, suggests a construction process where video is continuously associated with low levels of cultural capital.

Moreover, scholars maintain that home video has affected film style. Dixon (2001) highlights changes in composition resulting from the new media outlets for films; in blockbusters, characters are preferably placed in the middle of the frame rather than to the left or right. This contrasts greatly with some of the classic films rich in cultural capital, for example the French and British New Wave films. Similarly, Wasser (2001) argues that an abundance of "technical events", for example cuts, zooms, voice-overs and superimpositions compensates for the simplified shots adapted to the smaller screen. Further, he calls attention to the loss of medium specificity that has followed upon the need to make films that serve not only the theatrical exhibition but also the video experience:

In today's economy of proliferating media, producers are encouraging the audience to consciously eliminate that part of the message that is

medium specific and to retain only that part of the movie that can be translated from medium to medium. Few members of the viewing public will remember or value that part of a film that does not survive its translations. (ibid., p. 198)

In earlier medium transfers, content borrowed from one medium to another had to be adapted, but the 90s saw more mechanical translation processes between medias. The emphasis on reformatting, rather than adaptation, generated films where an element (e.g., a character, a story, a place) was persistently marketed in a wide range of media and places. Stressing the construction of video as an economic capital-intensive product, Wasser writes: "home video technology shares a responsibility for ushering in an era when market values have totally subsumed cultural values" (ibid., p. 199).

This account of the video revolution will serve as a background to the construction of film as, relatively speaking, a cultural capital-intensive product and the construction of video as a product rich in economic capital. The history of the VCR also points to the continuous loss of cultural capital in mainstream Hollywood blockbusters as the craft of filmmaking is gradually abandoned in favor of the reconfiguration of film across various medias and markets.

All of my interviewees touch upon the topic of the division between film and video, and some also point out its presence on all levels in the international film industry. However, as this is a study of an organization, I will now turn to the situation at Sandrew Metronome. How are film and video, and their respective departments, constructed in this arena?

The film Gemeinschaft and the video Gesellschaft

In the course of the field study, I have repeatedly come across descriptions that correspond with Asplund's (1991) figure of thought *Gemeinschaft / Gesellschaft*. Most of my interviewees comment on the familiarity that characterizes the film industry in their respective country. Taken collectively, these statements form a rather coherent picture where, I would argue, film is constructed as a Gemeinschaft and video as a Gesellschaft. Unlike film, video is constructed as a product very much in line with other products produced by companies in the economic field at large. The economic field in general, "the market", being conceptualized as a Gesellschaft (Tönnies 1979 [1887], Asplund 1991), the construction of video as a Gesellschaft follows naturally.

It is first and foremost in the juxtaposition with video that the Gemeinschaft features of the film divisions manifest themselves. If the video department emphasizes education and experiences from other businesses, the film department stresses experience from within the film business. The latter also emphasizes the network of friends and acquaintances in the film industry. According to organizational members of Sandrew Metronome, the film department consists of people who have worked there for many, many years (this becomes particularly apparent when compared with the video department and with other industries). Numerous interviewees from the film department point out that they truly enjoy their workplace. Often, they testify to feelings of loyalty and pride towards the company. Several organizational members point to the fact that "once you've entered the film world you rarely leave it". Such statements may explain why some film departments are occupied by older people, relatively speaking. Likewise, there is an emphasis on the

particularity and uniqueness of jobs and positions. Further, there are numerous industry organizations for the organizational members to engage in. Management, too, acknowledges the importance of events and get-togethers arranged by these groupings. Several of my interviewees on the film side take pride in knowing their competitors. Along similar lines, a woman who works in the marketing department describes the film industry as friendly. Having told me that some of her best friends and colleagues work for competing firms, she goes on to explain that there is hardly any risk of industry espionage in the film industry:

Especially if you're distributing foreign film. You can't affect the product anyway. It comes as it is. Sometimes we have a success, and our competitors call to congratulate us, and sometimes our competitors have a success, and we call them. There are few pieces of information that are kept secret from your competitors. We share a lot. I think that's unique. If you're a toothpaste producer, you want to keep the [toothpaste] formula away from your competitor. Then, perhaps you can't socialize with your competitors. *(woman, film distribution)*

The film people I interviewed tend to stress personal relations with their co-workers both within the organization and outside of the organization. This holds for organizational members who have been involved in business development and those who presently work in production, who often stress the advantages of having good contacts in the industry. A woman points to the necessity of having a shared understanding and vision about the project. "It's a bit vague and hard to define, but you know, chemistry. It's like all relations, like for example relations between friends and lovers: the work relation is based on a feeling that we're going to work together, we'll do a good job together. A feeling."

The Gemeinschaft of the film industry is obviously most apparent to the people who have work experience from

other sectors of the economy. They testify to having felt like true outsiders when they entered the film business. Sometimes they also object to the common description of the film industry as singular and unique, saying that what really sets this industry apart is its small size. The same "outsider" people often comment on the conflicts in the film departments. Manifested as emotional arguments, these conflicts take on a very personal character, according to some newcomers. One man with a business background says that he thinks that because people let their work be a central feature of their identities, it is hard to criticize work without criticizing the person as a whole. He explains further:

[...] because there are still quite a few people from film and theater – areas where it is natural, if you want to be successful, to act based on your feelings – many people may [act on their feelings] in their job as well. [...] Arguments often become very personal. The result is deeper conflicts. It's not ok with me. But some people have learnt to accept it, they still don't dislike each other. It's like door slamming in a family; you love each other despite the slamming. It's scary to me.

Whereas the Gemeinschaft quality is seldom considered a problem in the film departments (rather, the importance of personal friendships and relations seems to be taken for granted), people from the video departments often remark that the film department needs much more "business thinking". Conversely, some employees from the film departments express dissatisfaction with the treatment of film and video titles as "merely any consumer product".

The construction of uncertainty
and of infinite differentiation

Having discussed the general constructions of, respectively, the film and video *departments*, I find it essential to

245

revisit the two cultural *products* film and video, and explore how they are constructed locally in this organization. In order to do so, I think it may be useful to first cast some light on the business processes of this integrated film company. The location of the organizational members in the business processes unquestionably has an impact on how they construct these products, and by extension, their organization / departments. In chapter 11, I will go into more detail about how the product and the accompanying department affect the field definition by the organizational members. My interviewees, especially those in more strategic positions, often talk about the pros of being part of an integrated film company. One of the most critical advantages that they refer to is the existence, within the company, of the full range of "windows". In other words, Sandrew Metronome accommodates a number of different media outlets, such as movie screens, VHS, DVD, "free" television, cable television, pay-tv, and video-on-demand. So if the product, referred to by the organizational members as "the title", does not work as expected in the first window, i.e., on the movie screen, there are still ways to capitalize on it. Preponderantly, interviewees call attention the greater risks involved in acquiring titles for cinema (the first window) than in taking over titles already marketed as films for video distribution. Even the titles that are only distributed on video involve less risk-taking, according to my interviewees. Let me dwell a little on the circumstances leading up to these constructions of film and video.

The construction of the creative industries expressed in Caves' (2000) property *Demand is uncertain / "nobody knows"* permeates the entire organization, but it is substantially more pervasive in the film sector of the organization, i.e., in the production, exhibition, and film distribution departments. Commonplace among the film

people are statements about feelings, intuition and experience being the only reliable guide in the film business beyond statistics on a particular film's box office results in other countries. Local differences must also be considered. A few employees stress that "big films" like Harry Potter are easier to predict, but add that most of the group's revenues come from smaller films. Moreover, because acquisitions are usually made long before the film is finished, decisions are often made on the basis of a synopsis and the names of the actors and the director.

You never know beforehand if a film will work or not. You can trust it, but you are never sure. I mean, if you were sure you would be sitting at the Bahamas or somewhere like that, enjoying the money you earned because you only made successes. *(man, senior manager production)*

The most fun part – but at the same time, the most difficult part – is that you never know how your product is going to be received. You can imagine something, because there is a fuss around your product and it has been released in the U.S., unless it's a local product. Often, it has also been released in some other European country. So you have an idea of what you can expect. *(man, senior manager film distribution)*

There are guessing games all the time. Often you've seen a synopsis, heard some rumors, you know what actors are going to be in it. You often get to see it pretty late. So it's hard to imagine the end result based on these suggestions. Besides the names you have to trust your feelings. *(woman, exhibition)*

We don't maintain a market share. We constantly create a market share. A company that has 20% market share this year can have 0% market share next year. […] It's up and down all the time. *(man, film distribution)*

I call it guessing, but having gone over figures every week it has become intuition. It's hard to separate what is a 'feel' for and what is experience. *(woman, exhibition)*

I think the most difficult part of my job is... well, I don't think it's particularly hard,... but I think the most difficult part is that there are no absolute truths. You have to have pretty good self-confidence in order to read scripts and say, 'let's go for this' or 'this is such crap.' *(woman, production)*

247

What you have in this profession is experience – I have worked with film for twenty years – plus gut feeling. That's what you have, and there are no exceptions. It's the same if you go to the CEO in Burbank. [...] Your experience is then somehow your competence. *(man, film distribution)*

Similarly, Alvesson and Köping (1993) show that the advertising business is characterized by a lack of criteria for evaluating advertising (the breaking of existing rules being one of the central principles). The arbitrariness inherent in the business often implies a problem in achieving support for ideas as well as for the end result.

In light of this general uncertainty that organizational members experience, a couple of managers confess to putting a lot of effort in finding the right people to collaborate with, on a long-term basis, with regards to production. However, they still recognize that everyone can make dreadful films every now and then.

A few interviewees move into ruminations about the link between the great uncertainty and the "tremendous amounts of money" that they invest in projects that "you can't see and you don't know what they will be". They regard the "big money" as a distinguishing feature of the film industry, in comparison with other industries.

In addition to the demand-is-uncertain property, yet another construction of the creative industries captured by Caves (2000) infuses the organization, its openendedness, its "universe of possibilities", its *differentiated products*. In one manager's words:

There are not two films that are alike. The way you should treat them, the way you produce them, and all that, it's different from film to film. Of course there are some main rules, but... it's different situations, different chances, which means that every film is a life in itself. You really, as I said before, have a new baby for every film. *(man, senior manager production)*

248

It is almost exclusively the film people (or organizational members with film experience) who bring up the topic of uncertainty. However, the video people join the film side in highlighting infinite possibilities in terms of products. For example, the great product variation is often referred to as something positive in their daily work. Among the video people, there is an acknowledgment of the problems inherent in trying to market an "old product"; "old" since it was in the movie theaters "ages ago" (or else, it was a direct movie release). As one of my interviewees asks, rhetorically, "why would any journalist write about something old or something that wasn't even in the theaters?" Films are usually given a lot of "free marketing" through reviews.

Marketing practices and profit distribution

The rendering of the products as replete with uncertainty and the construction of film as cultural capital-intensive and video as economic capital-intensive are manifested in the practices of organizational members. In line with the different principles of legitimization (Bourdieu 1993) reflected by the habitus of the employees, my interviewees repeatedly construct the two products and their departments as separate and completely unlike each other. Generally, the film department houses people with more cultural capital and / or a background in the film industry, whereas the video department consists of people with greater amounts of economic capital. The business backgrounds of the video people often include work experience from companies involved with fast-moving consumer goods. I will return to the topic of backgrounds in the next chapter. For now, I would like to bring to light the different departmental practices, mainly in terms of marketing and of how costs and profits are perceived.

In the distribution companies, most of the organizational members that I have interviewed comment on the distinguishing traits of the marketing activities in the two departments. The film people are said to and claim to focus on separate *marketing campaigns* for each title. Stressing the individuality of each title, these campaigns are often presented as a way of coping with the uncertainty intrinsic to marketing film. The video department, on the other hand, concentrates on *volume sales*, and seems to be more concerned about distribution systems and retailers. Not surprisingly, considering the differences in habitus, there seems to be a consensus among the video people that there is "too much film talk" (purportedly at the expense of sales) in the film side of the organization:

One feature of the culture of [Sandrew Metronome] is an obsession with film. Film, cinema and the acting are topics of endless conversations and discussions. But how the hell do you sell it to the consumers? How do you make money on your video product? How do you distribute it to the retailers and all that? *(man, video distribution)*

However, higher up in the organizational hierarchy, interviewees tend to be more amenable to a middle ground alternative. A senior manager at the production department admits that the film department allows itself some "pirouettes" (referring to the fact that every film has its own marketing campaign). Although generally positive towards these customized campaigns, he cautions against them becoming artistic ends in themselves. Still, he sees risks with the video department's focus on volumes as well; sometimes the individuality of the title is overlooked. Noting that at times this difference between film and video can be charming and important, he says it must not assume big proportions.

Some of my interviewees who distinguish the depart-

ments as marketing and volume oriented explain the differences by referring to video as being an ancillary market for film. Thus, they suggest that based on the fact that film is first out, and, thus, without any lessons learnt from previous releases of the title, film lends itself to different marketing methods than video. In the risky business of film distribution, a film is either a success (there are good reviews and good word-of-mouth) or a flop (bad reviews, bad audience response). However, on the video side there are supposedly more tools with which to handle a presumably bad film, for example, packaging and offerings.

Resonating with the profit-slippage discussion of the video revolution, there are clearly differences in profit margins between the film departments and the video departments. The income statements of the Sandrew Metronome Group repeatedly show that the video distribution departments have considerably higher profit margins than all other departments. However, the film people argue that the film departments take most of the costs associated with the initial marketing and launching of the titles. Frequently, organizational members from the film departments remark that video "just have to sell the product to the retailer".

Occasionally, people also criticize the orientation towards volume-maximization on the video side. One senior manager says that the video side tends to disregard "the bottom line". He explains that some films that are greatly successful in the theaters and on video may have been so expensive at the outset that the profits made from the title are almost negligible. Other films, however, such as *All About My Mother* (1999) and *Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon* (2000) are very profitable art house films because of the lower initial investment.

Cooperation between film and video

Most of my interviewees recognize some drawbacks that follow from the division between film and video. For example, they bring up the poor flow of information and conflicting release schedules. Sometimes, it seems as if people stick to their own side. For instance, if a person from the film department needs a particular poster, for example, he or she may rather call another film department / company within the group than contact the video department / company in their own building.

Yet, there are some departments and companies within the group that have worked against this trend. In particular, it seems like the newer companies have managed to create smoother communication between film and video. Some managers even claim to have overcome the division between film and video in their country. According to them, cooperation between the film and video departments has helped reduce costs, for example by jointly printing posters and making tv and radio spots. A few people also emphasize the advantages of having a common manager for film and video distribution. Two top-level managers explain how they have consistently worked to create a joint distribution company. Leveling salaries was an important step towards overcoming the division. Located closer to the economic pole than the film department, the video department's employees generally have higher salaries than their colleagues in the film department. On the whole, however, there is a tendency among some of my interviewees to say that there is a division between film and video elsewhere but not at their particular department.

I will leave the topic of the collaboration between film and video here, only to return to it when I discuss the

post-merger organizational culture after the following piece on the gendering of the organization.

In general, the personal fronts of the organizational members in Sandrew Metronome are very similar, most of them look typically Scandinavian (in fact, I have not come across any other ethnicity in the organization – but, on the other hand, I have not verified this impression through any personnel data) and clothing-wise there are only marginal differences. Gender and age seem to be the far most significant differences in personal front, and to some extent, expressional differences in language are also rather common. While the latter will figure in the discussion of fields and capital composition (see chapter 11) and the issue of age will be dealt with along the way, I will, given my research questions, concentrate on the gender issue. According to Ridgeway (1997), sex categorization is fundamental to interaction. Thus the gendering of the organization is the topic of the next section.

A GENDERED ORGANIZATION

Usually when I take up the subject of gender equity in the organization, organizational members turn to the number of men and women in the various companies within the group. Most of them emphasize the slight domination in numbers of women over men. This is particularly true of men in power positions. Indeed, only a handful of my interviewees comment on the gendered *power* relations. These are often women holding relatively high positions. The latter acknowledge that there are few women executives; there is a woman CEO of the Norwegian company (she is the only woman in the management group) and there is also a woman who is the vice-president of the distribution company in Sweden.

Furthermore, there are a few women in middle-management positions. However, the majority of the executives is male. Thus, Sandrew Metronome demonstrates the same kind of gender structures that characterize Swedish companies in general (Regnö 2003), and the Swedish film industry as well (Hermele 2002, Lindstedt 2003, Birgerson 2005, Carp 2005).

Structural discrimination

By and large, it is my female interviewees who experience indirect structural discrimination.

I think the executives, especially some of the CEOs are extremely blind to women and their potential competence. Really. They only see men. They relate to men in one way and to women in another. It's really bad. *(woman, production)*

However, the male executives, whom the woman above mentions, often state that the equality between the genders is very good. Some men appear a bit surprised by my question and do not seem to have given it much thought before. The woman cited above also comments on how a male boss takes all the credit from his (subordinated) female co-worker while letting the latter do just about everything. The woman in question says:

Bjorn and I have worked together for 11 years so we're like an old couple, you know what the other thinks, when and how, and so on. [...] But he's formally responsible, so in that way, it's very traditional. *(woman, production)*

The top two women in the organization reflect on the significance of gender from their minority position in the following terms:

> I don't see any problem [with being the only woman in the management group]. The only problem I see is that we will have the last management group meeting in Copenhagen on December 20, and then, I ought to be engrossed in Christmas preparations. I don't look upon being the only woman as a problem, but there are *minor* problems. Maybe it has taken some time to attain the same kind of respect that a man who is less important receives automatically. But I know that's how it works. *(woman, senior manager distribution)*

The last sentence may epitomize a normality of indirect discrimination based on gender in organizations (Wahl 1992). The woman cited stresses that by combining her work with several children at home, she needs to work efficiently and leave at fixed hours, something she hopes will encourage more women to pursue careers in the company. Furthermore, she expands a little on the gender distribution in her own regional company:

> Until two years ago we were only women, but that was just a coincidence. We started our business eleven years ago. Then, we got a man. Now we have two men. And it's working out just great! *(woman, senior manager distribution)*

Having built up the organization on her own, she maintains that she also has a better position than others. She has no "uninvited company". The other senior woman is in a different kind of situation: her position is more token-like because she is one of five CEOs in her office (the others are men) and her title has a "vice" appended to it. She does not elaborate much on the topic of gender equality, saying:

> I think the gender equality is very good here. I can't feel anything. I think it has very much to do with oneself. *(woman, senior manager video distribution)*

As Wahl (1992) writes, there is a tendency to individualize discrimination. Moreover, women adopt different strategies for coping with the male dominance while

255

maintaining a positive identity as women, something that is reflected in the citations above (see Wahl 1992). In line with Kanter's (1977) notion of the structure of relative numbers, a few women in high positions describe themselves as very visible in the organization. Possibly, the organizational members who belong to the Gesellschaft part of the organization, like the woman just above, are less inclined to highlight discrimination as Gesellschaft is characterized as ongoing competition. Thus, discrimination may be seen as a result of weakness rather than a consequence of certain categories of individuals being valued more than others.

Furthermore, many of the men who emphasize women's numerical superiority in the organization at large explain the male dominance in top positions by reference to an old tradition that changes very slowly due to the *uniqueness* of these jobs. Such statements are thus consistent with the Gemeinschaft construction. For example, a senior manager from the production department explains that there are only four positions like his in Scandinavia. As a result, he and his colleagues rarely change jobs. Juxtaposing this job situation with that of engineers who, according to this man, have more opportunities in relation to their position, he underscores the distinctiveness of the film business. He concludes by pointing out, ironically, that he has a rather special position.

Several women in the organization point out that they believe the management to be "too old" to be paying attention to competent women in the organization. In other words, they interpret the gender structures as a generational issue. One of my interviewees, a woman, says that she thinks the lack of women on top positions may also be a result of "women being a bit frightened". In doing so, she first leaves the male norm unproblem-

atized and looks at women as the deviating and deficient party (see Hirdman 1988, Wahl 1992). However, taking on a more structural view, she goes on:

The organization is very authoritarian, very hierarchical – it does not employ women with ambitions. So, during my time here, I cannot say that anyone has been passed over. *(woman, senior manager distribution)*

The gendering of departments and jobs

In a large group with companies in four countries, the gendering of the various departments and jobs naturally varies. Although seldom explicit, there is a tendency to gender film female and video male. That dichotomy is however only manifested in the contrast between film and video. A closer look at the film side itself reveals a gender order that marks top level film management as male. This resembles the findings of Alvesson and Köping's (1993) study on gender in an advertising agency where the work was constructed in feminine terms while the organization was still markedly male dominated. It seems as if women occupy positions where cultural capital is valued, for example in film production departments[49] and in cinema programming[50] (however, as I said, this is not true of the top positions). Furthermore, many women work in marketing. For example, the film marketing department in Sweden consists exclusively of women (five altogether). In addition, more women than men work as administrators. In the video sales department, the key account managers are all men while three women make up the customer service function. The positions of film sales managers are constructed as male.[51] Furthermore, the distribution departments (especially video) and finance and IT positions are mostly male-dominated.

Another woman says that her boss has been very positive towards parental leave, but when I ask her if many men in the organization go on paternal leave she says "No, the men here are very conservative. They're not exactly bohemians". In my interviews I notice a lot of descriptions that have a homosocial slant to them. Primarily manifested in the stories that the executives tell me, they are however also present in the accounts provided by younger male middle-managers. They range from one of the senior managers telling me about the old network of friends that constitute the male-dominated management group, many have previously been heads of the film institutes in their respective countries, to younger managers who confess to finding the leaders very accessible:

I think Sandrew Metronome is [an] open [organization]. If you have something to say you can say it directly to the person in question. You don't have to report to this person first, and then to this person. I could even go to [the CEO] if I have something to say. It's more like a family company. I feel very comfortable here. *(man, film distribution)*

Considering the opportunity structures in the organization (Kanter 1977), which determine expectations and prospects for the future, men obviously experience better opportunities. The power structures identified by Kanter also imply that the majority group (i.e., the men in top positions) through formal job features and informal affiliations will be given more freedom to act from their organizational positions. Further, when asked to exemplify or describe good co-workers, my interviewees tend to name male managers. However, a woman says that she has tried to point out to her boss that he is surrounded by "yes-men" and that, for this reason, nothing gets done. According to her, this senior manager is constantly disappointed in people not taking any respon-

sibility. Along similar lines, a woman tells me that she has learnt how devastating insecure male middle-managers can be to a company.

Moreover, the history of Sandrew Metronome is often told in terms of two men, Anders Sandrew and Bent Fabricius Bjerre, whose backgrounds are very similar.

On the face of it there seem to be reasons to believe that the gender order would manifest itself differently depending on principles of legitimacy (the cultural field being conceptualized as "the economic world reversed" by Bourdieu (1993)). Since femininity and masculinity are constructed as a dichotomy (masculinity being the norm and femininity the deviant) in Western Society (Hirdman 1988), one could expect there to be greater opportunities for women in certain top positions in the field of cultural production (either those based on the economic pole *or* those based on the cultural pole). As we know from statistics (Hermele 2002, Lindstedt 2003, Regnö 2003, Carp 2005) this is not the case. Male dominance prevails in all camps. Likewise, there is little in my material that suggests more gender equality around either pole of the organization. However, women near the cultural pole tend to bring up the topic of gender inequality somewhat more often (see also citations above).

POST-MERGER ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

Turning away from the film vs. video dichotomy and the gendering of the organization for a moment, I will focus a little on other aspects of the post-merger organizational culture of Sandrew Metronome. These aspects concern the integration of the employees from Warner Bros., Metronome and "the old Sandrews" in the new

Sandrew Metronome environment, manifested in differences and, occasionally, conflicting priorities based on economic and cultural capital, the structural features of the two original organizations and the conversion into ten independent subsidiary companies.

The merger in terms of economic and cultural capital

Only a handful of my interviewees in the headquarters remember Sandrews before the present-day CEO. Billed as "the old Sandrews", that era of the history of Sandrews is described as rather oldfashioned and characterized by a very strong leadership. Describing the middle-managers from that time as bullied, a few organizational members stress the lack of authority among these managers. Many decisions at that time required the CEOs approval, which of course added to his power and control. "Sandrews used to be technologically oldfashioned", says one of my interviewees. "It was the present CEO who brought in computers". The last statement may serve as an illustration of a remark frequently made by organizational members, that Sandrews has always been a bit "high brow" or, in other words, more cultural capital-intensive. The cultural capital of Sandrews has also been displayed in the marketing of its films and cinemas. Discretion about the sender has characterized the Sandrews endeavors, according to one of the long-time employees of Sandrews I interviewed. "We know we're good, but we just don't dare to say it out loud", she says.

The history of strong leaders began with the cost-conscious Anders Sandrew.

He used to bike around town and say things like 'the longer you bike, the nicer car you will be able to buy later on'. He also lived like that

The habit of being careful with money has remained since his days. Among the former Sandrews employees and managers, cost-consciousness is often celebrated, a theme I will soon return to when contrasting the cultures of Sandrews and Warner Bros. At headquarters, people often refer to various artifacts as constant reminders of Anders Sandrew's time. The photographic assignment that concerned "things that symbolize the organization" (see p. 211) seemed to engage the photographers from "the old Sandrews" the most. Those two photographers depicted a painting of Anders Sandrew (photo 1), the inhouse cinema (photo 2), the projectionist room, the main office building in Stockholm, and the old meeting room (photo 3). These artifacts are presented in a very positive light by the two photographers.

One member of the management group likes to point out the parallel stories of Anders Sandrew and Bent Fabricius Bjerre. He underscores that what unites these two companies is not only "a strong person with a great involvement" but also, "an involvement that has both an economic and a cultural quality". Still, there are some cultural differences within the group.

The merger between Sandrews and Metronome, along with the formation of a joint venture with Warner Bros. for distribution, took place in 1998. It marked a significant change in the company histories, from what my interviewees tell me. The background of the various companies within the group varies slightly. The company that at the time of my study constitutes Sandrew Metronome Finland Oy was established by Sandrews before the merger with Metronome, while the company

Sandrew Metronome Distribution Finland Oy was previously owned by Warner Bros. Likewise, the video distribution company in Norway was a subsidiary of Warner Bros. prior to the merger. However, already in 1991 Sandrews and Metronome had formed a joint film distribution company called Norsk Filmdistribusjon AS. This company was sold to Schibsted before the formation of Sandrew Metronome. Since 1991, Sandrews, Metronome, and Norsk Filmdistribusjon had collaborated in acquiring film. Thus, when Danish Metronome was bought by Schibsted and TeleDanmark, this collaboration was already established. When the telecom company TeleDanmark changed owners, the new owner wanted to withdraw from the film business. Schibsted then stepped in and undertook the merger with Sandrews, merging the Danish film company Metronome, Norsk Filmdistribusjon, and Sandrews.

Time and again, my interviewees bring up differences in the company cultures that they experience as being poles apart. Many of these dissimilarities stem from variations in capital compositions between the two companies and between departments and specific organizational members within the group.

Here is the voice of a manager formerly at Warner Bros., who expresses concern about the cultural capital basis of the group's business:

Here, [at Sandrews] people have been in the same positions for so long, longer than in any company I've been. I think the merger with Warner was a good injection. Many new people entered, and, with them, new ideas. [Sandrews] has had a reputation of being a bit old-fashioned, of upholding culture, of not being too commercial, endorsing more art house film. We have to get rid of that. We could compare it to a car. Benny, Bjorn and I, we would like to see us as a fast Porsche. The customers have been apt to look upon us as a rather tired car. *(man, video distribution)*

Only one of the three participants in the photographic study without a Sandrews background commits herself to capturing artifacts that symbolize the organization. Although very similar to the ones taken by the photographers from "the old Sandrews", listed on p. 261, the descriptions that accompany the pictures are different. The same painting of Anders Sandrew (photo 1) comes with the following explanation:

It's cool with companies with long traditions, with a history and so on, but at the same time it can be a burden too. Sometimes when you try to introduce something new, a new way of thinking or something like that, you may hear 'yes, but we've never done it that way before'. *(woman, film distribution)*

Still, this woman describes a photo of the main office (photo 4) in very positive terms, saying that it is a "fantastic building", "a great location", "a place that does not have a classic office feel to it, it's very cosy".

Coming from "the old Sandrews" vantage, a woman from the production department comments on the culture clash:

[…] there are big culture clashes between the commercial and the old. Besides, there are so many new people without any feel for 'the old Sandrews'. And, some of the ones who have been here for a while will do anything to throw away everything that was 'the old Sandrews'. They don't find anything good in having all those art films we used to have. They think we should just go for big and commercial. *(woman, production)*

While bearing in mind that the merger has affected the entire group, the change resulting from the merger appears to be felt the most in Stockholm. According to the employees that I have talked to, "the old Sandrews" (i.e., the original Stockholm company) was the one company most concerned with art house film. Staffed mostly by marketing people, the other companies specialize primarily in distribution and exhibition, not in production.

In addition to the art film focus resulting from the more cultural capital-intensive business, the leadership (labeled "oldfashioned") characterizing the Stockholm headquarters is often subject to comments from organizational members in companies in neighboring countries. For example, criticism about the lack of dialogue between the companies is coupled with skepticism towards the decisions made by the Stockholm office. The latter are sometimes perceived as "not modern enough", or "not young and aggressive". "It's typical us to make movies like *Alfred*, about Alfred Nobel. We would never make films like *Fucking Åmål* or *Jalla! Jalla!*"[52], says one manager who resides outside of Sweden.

The joint venture with Warner Bros. has drawn attention to differences in money-handling. As mentioned above, "the old Sandrews" (in this case, its managers) has taken pride in advocating cost-consciousness. However, the Warner Bros. tradition focuses much more on marketing and turnover. One director in Stockholm portrays the two companies' stands vis-à-vis money:

Employees from Warner London arrive in limos.[...] They have manuals for everything; what class you travel in if you're a vice-president, what class you travel in if you're on the board of the company, etc. I don't see the point in such a culture; it's so obsessed with volume. It's all about turnover, but never about costs. It could cost anything to reach that volume. It's entirely against the philosophy of good old Sandrew. [...] We're dealing with two different guiding principles, one concerned with marketing, and the other one related to costs. *(man, senior manager)*

Moreover, numerous people in the distribution companies mention the constant reporting to Warner Bros. headquarters as something new. Most employees, including those who worked for Warner Bros. before the joint venture with Sandrew Metronome, are negative to these reporting practices, complaining about experiencing a

lack of time for other tasks. However, there are some directors who have positive feelings towards some aspects of the reporting, for example the frequent evaluations it enables.

Coordination and hierarchy

The integration of all companies including Warner Bros. into a joint group is a long process, and judging from my interviews, many organizational members experience a lack of affinity with the group as a whole. "We have lousy company soldiers", says one executive. A good number do however claim that progress is being made; the more they talk to each other, the better it becomes. Management is working on the Sandrew Metronome group strategy and objectives, trying to find some shared company values. Nevertheless, a few people prefer to talk about their own regional company. In addition to the general division between film and video mentioned earlier there is also one between exhibition and distribution. These tendencies, carried to their extremes, allow the representatives of each side to describe their relationship with the other party as competitive, similar to that of a competitor. However, the regional companies benefit from some freedom, according to my interviewees. One of the senior managers says that the initial phase of the merger was characterized by all parties trying to mark their excellence. They still stress positive aspects of their own company / department by contrasting it with the mainstream company culture. For example, organizational members point to their "flat organization", their relaxed leadership style and flexible work hours, their frequent information meetings with personnel and their better knowledge of the local market.

Drawing on Abrahamsson (2002) it is interesting to note how notions of masculinity are transformed to comprise whatever is important in an organization. Constituted by mainly two organizations with different capital compositions, and, hence, possibly different constructions of masculinity, the merger may be seen as a restoration process as men from both organizations benefit from the merger (and are now represented in the management group). Similarly, in a study of gender and management in a merging Nordic organization, Tienari et al. (2003) identify how the gendered substructures in the transnational organization are reproduced through, among other things, references to extensive traveling requirements.

The people who come from Warner Bros. often judge the present organization against their previous experience at Warner Bros. Examples of their observations abound in the larger size of Sandrew Metronome, along with "more complicated decision processes" that follow from what is perceived as a more hierarchical organization. On a positive note, however, many people also mention that Sandrew Metronome is a stable company with a long tradition. A few interviewees from the distribution department point out the sporadic mis-communication between Warner Bros. and Sandrew Metronome. According to them, Warner Bros. in the U.S. ignores the local market knowledge in Sandrew Metronome.

The group CEO admits that management needs to communicate better with its employees and mentions the launch of an intranet that is under way. "If someone has criticized the internal company communication, he or she is completely right". He says that although the implementation of the intranet has been delayed, he has so far focused on trying to build up a good executive team. "[The management group] needs to work well

before you can deal with the next problem in line. It works very well now, socially." One of the things the CEO finds the most crucial in his job is being a sounding board for all the CEOs of the subsidiaries, particularly when it involves great amounts of money for example in acquisitions and movie theater investments.

In my interviews, the topic of coordination within the group is often brought up. Several organizational members underscore the advantages of being part of an integrated film company that is present in four countries. Areas of particular interest from this perspective are production and acquisition. In terms of production, the critical advantage lies in the possibility of making co-productions and thus entitling the company to funding from several different sources (e.g., Nordisk Film and Television Fund, and Eurimage). As regards distribution, the bargaining position of the company is supposedly stronger with a larger, Nordic market than with separate, national markets.

Another theme introduced in the first section of this chapter was the dissatisfaction with the lack of collaboration between the film and video department. There are, nevertheless, a number of interviewees who testify to some cooperation between film and video in marketing.

When asked about the relation between the production department and the distribution department, a few interviewees emphasize the advantages of the company having the rights from the very start and being involved as early as the script stage. Some people engaged in production tell me that they occasionally try out an idea on some distribution people just to find out whether they believe that the idea is sellable and profitable.

No doubt organizational members vary in their stance towards production. Some prefer to engage in co-productions, but never to assume the key responsibility for a whole production. Others emphasize the advantages in having an inhouse production company, crediting the productions with early involvement among organizational members onward from the script stage. Among most organizational members, the owners are perceived as having expressed serious interest in production. These interviewees point to the involvement that comes from having seen the entire project develop from script to film and video. "They know two things: first of all, there might be money in doing this, and, secondly, you then have the rights which can be used again and again", says one executive about the rationale of the owners. However, a few interviewees express doubts regarding the sincerity of the owners' involvement in production. Similarly, there are concerns that the group may lack the necessary competence for production in some countries. Some interviewees caution against the potential risk exposure that would follow upon a greater production involvement. So do the interviewees who stress that local productions require more work due to the closeness of the film team. "You always have the producers, the directors, the actors around you, and they're watching what you're doing. They also want the film to be successful here", says a marketing director.

Exhibition and distribution

Just as there is a division between film and video, there is a separation between exhibition and film distribution. This may give rise to conflicts, for example when the former wants exclusive screening rights to Sandrew Metronome titles and the latter wants to distribute

widely in order to maximize its profits. According to my interviews, this is an ongoing conflict in Denmark and Finland. One distributor says:

Do we have to support [the movie theaters] more? Do we have to make the theaters successful? I believe that because we are distributors I think we must always think of what is best for our mission – to distribute films. *(man, film distribution)*

He argues that as distributors they cannot rely on Sandrew Metronome theaters alone. Likewise, an executive from the distribution side says that giving priority to the Sandrew Metronome theaters when it comes to the screening of blockbuster films implies giving up on market share and profit. Smaller, art house films allow for exclusive Sandrew Metronome showings though. The picture is slightly different in Sweden, where Sandrew Metronome owns many theaters. Most Sandrew Metronome titles are shown in the theaters with the same name. By contrast, people from the exhibition company sometimes remark on what they experience as a pressure from the distribution company to screen its films in the largest theaters:

For a distributor, the best thing can sometimes be to have the biggest theaters possible, in as many weeks as possible, in case it turns out to be a success. But for me, that's the worst thing. It implies a lot of risk-taking, to wait for an audience that then doesn't turn up. For me, the best thing is to have a film that goes very well, which is followed by a new film that goes very well. […] The group perspective may imply that if the [Sandrew Metronome] distribution company says that they need to play its movie at these particular dates, I tell them that we'll miss three big American films in order to screen your small Chinese film. *(woman, exhibition)*

However, she stresses that cooperation is predicated on the people involved. The film distributors maintain that, in general, they have very good relations with exhibiting companies. What they acknowledge as a major problem is the great number of films available today.

One organizational member claims that some people from "the old Sandrews" fear that after the impending retirements among many of the present directors (predominantly from the Sandrew side of the merger), Schibsted will step in to restructure the organization.

Despite the organization's presence in four different countries, I will expand neither on the constructions of the nationalities within the organization nor on the construction of the national markets, as I consider this beyond the scope of my research interest (see also p. 217). Still, I want to mention in a few words something about the power relations between the offices and the respective "markets".

Organizational members' exposure to the various offices throughout the group is often quite limited. Meeting each other on a Nordic basis every month, members of the management group have the most experience of working across the national boundaries. It is not surprising, therefore, that other organizational members usually emphasize that when answering my questions they only consider their regional company.

Numerous Finns and Norwegians, as well as a few Danes, point at the different sizes of the companies within the group. Home to the largest companies, Sweden naturally has a major influence on the other countries, according to many of my interviewees. Not only has Sweden more specialists, but also, it represents most productions and acquisitions within the group. In most cases, Swedes are considered "wise guys". With the headquarters located in Stockholm, the Swedish com-

panies serve as the main addressees for Warner Bros. This makes the other companies even more dependent on the Stockholm offices, something that is a source of irritation for several of my interviewees from Finland. One of the few women who has regular contact with the Nordic offices perceives the Finnish and Danish office at not only "very American", but also very male-oriented.

National markets

The Nordic market is considered relatively review-driven. A recurring theme in my interviews is Swedish film critics and their positive inclination towards art house films. One executive also contrasts Swedish critics with those of the other Nordic countries, saying that the company usually works more closely with critics in most other countries. In Norway for example, the critics are perceived as "nicer, or more balanced", as one manager puts it. Another one claims that the Norwegian critics are "more generous".

Often interviewees claim that big, mainstream American films do well in all countries. However, one Finnish representative says that in his company Sweden is considered the most Americanized country. To him, American films always do well in Sweden but are occasionally not embraced by the Finnish audience. A Swedish interviewee suggests that in general Swedes are better cinemagoers than their Scandinavian counterparts.

CHAPTER SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The preceding presentation of the organization was brought in at this early stage since it may provide some

useful context to the following chapters. In closing, I would like to reiterate that the film *vs.* video division, the gendering of the organization and the post-merger organizational culture are included here because these subjects relate closely to my research questions and overall objective. The film *vs.* video division, introduced through the notion of a film Gemeinschaft and a video Gemeinschaft, as well as the post-merger organizational culture, relate to the issue of competing principles of legitimacy, or different capital compositions, fundamental to an understanding of the various uses of taste. A section on the gendering of the organization is necessary to understanding the relation between taste performances and gender. Now, it is time to move on to the chapter on the organization's competing principles of legitimacy.

39. *Schibsted Annual Report to Shareholders* (2001).

40. Exhibition refers to the sector where an audience is able to watch films in movie theaters (Moran 1996).

41. Production is the business of making movies (Moran 1996).

42. Distribution comprises not only the warehousing and shipping of films but also the booking, marketing, advertising and PR activities (Moran 1996).

43. The section on Metronome is based on the company history as described on www.sandrewmetronome.com.

44. A power-point presentation obtained from the company, as well as information available at www.sandrewmetronome.com.

45. I will not concern myself with the Sandrew Metronome Group's 25% ownership in "Nordic Media Link AB", a company operating in the cinema advertising business.

46. In these figures I have left out part time employees at the movie theaters, as well as temporary workers currently involved in Sandrew Metronome film productions, as they have not been part of my case study (see p. 202). Thus, these figures are considerably lower than those presented in the annual report (see p. 233).

47. Since I will only concern myself with the history of the relation between film and video, I recommend Bordwell and Thompson's (1994) *Film History*, for an overview of film history more specifically.

48. "New Hollywood" marks the Hollywood that emerged in the 70s when a new group of filmmakers, for example Coppola, Spielberg and Lucas, made films, e.g., *The Godfather* (1972), *Jaws* (1975) and *Star Wars* (1977), whose earnings were unparalleled. The filmmakers represented a new style where emphasis was placed on making the film into an "event". Furthermore, the films of New Hollywood were supported by an unprecedented distribution and marketing apparatus (Wasser 2001). See also p. 280 in chapter 11.

49. In one production department there are three and a half women (one is part time) and one man; in the other there is just one man.

50. In one exhibition department, two women work with cinema programming, and in another, one woman has the sole responsibility for programming, and in a third country, a man is responsible for cinema programming.

51. In one office, two men occupy these positions, which may be regarded as sales positions for film.

52. *Alfred* (1995), *Fucking Åmål* (1998), *Jalla! Jalla!* (2000).

One day, one of my interviewees recounts an episode from an executive conference for managers in the Sandrew Metronome group. As the story goes, a newly appointed director of exhibition with a business background from the service industry was to inform other decision-makers about his program to promote the movie theaters. It turned out that he had launched a "yes-sir, yes-ma'am" strategy. The program was designed to encourage employees of Sandrew Metronome to act based on a "yes-sir, yes-ma'am" attitude in the face of demanding customers. Next morning at breakfast, the same manager materialized in a shirt that read, "I have a 'yes-sir, yes-ma'am' attitude". Apparently the organizational member telling me this story finds it very funny, despite reservations that include "the obvious need for service-mindedness" among service personnel at the theaters. So what is so funny about this incident? "In this context", says my interviewee, "such statements serve as great comedy". Beyond the fact that a "yes-sir, yes-ma'am" strategy and its accompanying promotional sweatshirt do not fit to the situation, my interviewee has great difficulties in articulating the humor of the incident. Language differences are mentioned. My interpretation is that the "yes-sir, yes-ma'am" attitude is not in line with "the old Sandrews" way of presenting oneself. Obviously, there are different principles of legitimacy within Sandrew Metronome, which imply different definitions of the situation. This chapter is devoted to examining Sandrew Metronome as an organization located in the field of cultural production, with two competing principles of legitimacy, and comprising different field definitions.

Resuming the discussion from Part I, I want to belabor field issues a bit more in light of my interviews and my photographic study. I have also gathered some relevant

background information in a questionnaire. In Part II I concluded that Sandrew Metronome, like any organization in the film field, stands at the intersection of different fields. While I then left the question of an autonomous film field open, I claimed that various fields overlapped with the boundaries of the organization at the center of this study: the economic field, the field of cultural production, the field of cultural consumption and the field of power. I argued that there might be different, parallel games and accompanying rules, as well as occasionally competing definitions of the situation. Furthermore, I touched upon the topic of goffmanian teams, suggesting that there may be situations where the team definition of the situation is inconsistent with the individual's wish to present him or herself.

In this chapter, I examine how the different principles of legitimacy manifest themselves in an organization in the field of cultural production. I will first address the issue of an autonomous film field by conducting a brief literature review (re autonomous fields, see p. 114). Against this background, the chapter predominantly concerns the two opposing principles of legitimacy within the field of cultural production as well as the two subfields represented by the parties of the merger, the "film field" and the larger "media field". My efforts to study the materialization of different legitimacy principles within the organization include a discussion of the variety of goals that organizational members endorse in the interviews. In addition, I reflect on the field repositioning in the wake of the merger, both from the perspective of the executives and of organizational members in general. Also, I chart the company structure according to capital composition and principles of legitimacy. I approach the topic of fields by having my interviewees answer questions on the meaningfulness of their work. My ambition has been to capture the organ-

izational members' way of presenting themselves, regard-less of background (the latter may, however, be an integral part in one's presentation of oneself). I did ask sketchily about my subjects' background, but because of my the-oretical framework as well as my structuring of the empir-ical study (i.e., the lack of a number of identifiable protag-onists, see p. 214) I will deal with the backgrounds of the organizational members collectively, trying to describe the *typical* background in each part of the organization. Thus, I will only add to the description of the various trajectories I briefly introduced in the previous chapter (especially in relation to the film and video dichotomy).

Most of the first half of this chapter is devoted to aspects of the relation between organizational members and / or departments and the two poles of legitimacy in the cul-tural production field. Although these issues remain inter-esting in the second half of the chapter, I add the organiza-tional arena to the discussion. In other words, I wanted to explore the relation between the organizational arena and the fields, which I do through a collaborative photo-graphic study. A rather uncommon method in organiza-tion studies, the photographic study lends itself to a longer discussion on the methodology behind it (see appendix 1). The reason I am interested in the relation between the organization and the fields is that it may hint at what room there is for improvisation by individual organiza-tional members (cf. p. 107) or, in other words, room for deviation from the two poles of legitimacy that character-ize the overall field of cultural production. For example, the organizational culture may mediate the impact of the dominating principles of legitimacy. In the last sections of the chapter, I elaborate on the notion of teams and prob-lematize it in the setting of competing principles of legit-imacy. I close the chapter by discussing how the question of field relates to my research questions at large.

Moran (1996) identifies three phases of the organization of cinema: *the artisanal phase* with local small-scale productions (around 1894 – 1907); *the Hollywood studio era*, distinguished by the market oligopoly (around 1908 – 1960); *the package or agency system*, characterized by profit slippage (around 1960-the present day). In the Hollywood studio era, eight vertically integrated American motion picture companies dominated the film industry, both in the United States and internationally (Gomery 1986, Bordwell and Thompson 1994). At that time, the cinema functioned as the first and last outlet for the film. In the package or agency system era that followed, the number of secondary viewing outlets after the theatrical screening escalated, causing what Wasser (2001) calls profit slippage (see chapter 10, p. 240). As distribution was recognized as the most critical ingredient to success in the market, the ancillary markets grew to include for example rights to novelization and to soundtracks (see Björkegren 1996, Moran 1996). What came to be known as the "New Hollywood" can be summarized as follows:

In its present form, the industry is no longer simply a film industry nor is it solely American. New Hollywood defines a field of commercial interests that include film, broadcast television, cable television, satellite broadcasting, music and recording interests, newspaper, magazine and book publishing, theme parks, merchandising, professional sport, and a range of other activities in the areas of entertainment and leisure. (Moran 1996, p. 5)

Thus, during the 1980s and 1990s, Hollywood majors established links with other creative industries, for example, publishing, television and music, which contributed to the creation of media conglomerates. Like Wasser (2001) and Bettig and Hall (2003), Moran (1996) argues that the expansion of the ancillary mar-

kets has benefited the distributor, who owns the initial distribution rights, most. Ever since the First World War, national cinema (i.e., non-American film) has been subject to regulatory and legislative support (see Moran 1996, Blomgren 1998). Thus, according to Moran, outside of the USA, the term "film industry", roughly speaking, refers to a dual system where the distribution and exhibition are run commercially (often tied to the Hollywood majors) and where the local production is actively supported by the government. Moran does however hedge his claim: "a more detailed delineation of the two sectors would certainly have to note the many occasions on which, in particular national settings, the distribution/exhibition sector is frequently involved in production and the state is involved in exhibition" (Moran 1996, p. 8). Although I will not discuss the concept of "national cinema" at length here, I want to stress that national cinema has often been conflated with high culture (as in Williams third sense, see p. 170) or, in other words, cultural capital-intensive cinema (see Moran 1996). Debates about European art cinema and Hollywood cinema, for example, have resonated with frequent discussions between high culture and mass culture, or, between cultural capital and economic capital.

At the risk of major oversimplification, I would like to argue that during the Hollywood studio era (as well as during the artisanal era, but to a lesser extent) there was a film field characterized by its own rules of the game. The agents struggled to succeed in film, and although there may have been minor overlaps with for example the field of theater (e.g., for directors as well as actors), the focus remained on film. However, in today's package or agency system of media conglomerates, the film field is integrated into a greater media field where agents struggle to thrive in film, music, publishing/literature,

video games or, even better, a combination of all. Translated to the case of Sandrew Metronome, I would argue that "the old Sandrews" along with one of the owners, the Anders Sandrew Foundation, represents the Hollywood studio era, i.e., the film field, and Schibsted, as the new owner, along with Warner Bros., represents the package or agency system, i.e., the media field. Sandrews had its core in production and exhibition, and had, over time, produced some cultural capital-intensive national cinema, while Schibsted and Warner Bros. were both big media conglomerates with a strong interest in distribution. Although individual organizational members concede that the market has undergone substantial changes, these two rival field definitions may still affect the organization. As they say the best proof of the pudding is in the eating, let us now turn to the organizational members and find out how they relate to field.

FIELD DEFINITIONS AND POSITIONS

I will organize the section on the organizational members' relation to field around two field definitions. First, I will describe, in a few words, the changing subfield (from film field to media field) then I discuss the organization's repositioning in the field of cultural production at large, and finally, I examine how the various departments relate to the two principles of legitimacy that characterize the cultural production field. The emphasis of the chapter lies on the latter definition of field, the field of cultural production.

From film field to media field

As the story of Sandrews, Warner Bros., Metronome,

and later Sandrew Metronome more or less spans the history of film and video, the organizational members of course take notice of and act upon the varying and changing field definitions (and, thus, assist in constructing the fields). Most of my interviewees talk about "selling entertainment" or being in the media business. In other words, they talk about an extended field; the organization and its members are, according to them, no longer struggling solely in the film field. I have chosen to name the extended field "media field", but "entertainment field" would work just as well, as many organizational members refer to working in the "entertainment business". However, a few interviewees, primarily the ones with a long background in the organization, prefer to talk about the film industry.

A field repositioning: in terms of goals

In addition to the expansion of the subfield itself (i.e., from film field to a greater media field), the organization also seems to have repositioned itself in the overall field of cultural production. As I wrote in chapter 6, the field of cultural production is structured along two poles where one pole is based on cultural capital (representing an autonomous and internal principle of legitimacy) and the other one is based on economic capital (representing a heteronomous and external principle of legitimacy). In Bourdieu's conceptual framework, "high art" leans towards the cultural pole, and mass/popular culture is based on the economic capital principles of hierarchization. Needless to say, a film company that encompasses both blockbusters and art house films will be located in the middle of the field. However, judging from my interviews, a shift seems to have taken place towards the economic pole with external principles of legitimacy

in connection with the merger. Reflecting the tradition within arts management that is concerned with performance indicators (e.g., Jackson 1991, Chong 2002), the organization's goals are often articulated in terms of revenues and profit. This shift is undoubtedly most evident among the executives, especially the new ones, whereas many employees and a few executives from "the old Sandrews" remain in the former position, which I would regard as closer to the cultural pole. This group of executives encourages a balance between "cultural and economic values", and they like to highlight the fact that three executives have been heads of the film institute in their respective countries. All in all, executives stress the importance of economic capital over cultural capital, or they place the two forms of capital on a par. Yet no one argues for the precedence of cultural capital over economic capital when they discuss the overall goals for the company.

Below are some voices on the goals of Sandrew Metronome. Executives frequently return to them, or open their general descriptions of the organization with a reference to these goals (very much unlike organizational members further down in the hierarchy). The first three quotations signify the economic pole and the latter two represent the half-and-half version of economic and cultural capital.

I belong to the ones who don't have to work in film. But many people here have a strong interest in film, a strong love for film. Some have remained here since the theater days and they also entertain an interest in theater. That's also in line with the general interest in culture. [...] Most of the people here think positively about bringing in people from other industries; after all, we're running a business. For some, this is easy and natural to admit to oneself, but others probably wish that we didn't have to be so crassly commercial, that we could take more cultural factors into consideration. But we don't have the necessary profit margins. I don't think our owners would want that either. *(man, senior manager exhibition)*

The most important thing is that people in the organization want to join us and fulfill our goals. But in the end, our revenues and our goal are the ultimate yardstick. Do we make enough money not to make the owners really dislike us? And if worse comes to worse, we may go bankrupt. *(man, senior manager distribution)*

It's important that we don't just have art house film. Since we need to produce a return for the owners, we need to have commercial film as well. *(woman, senior manager video distribution)*

Our goal is to maintain the same balance that goes back to the days of Anders Sandrew, that is, to have enough profitability that allows for developing the company while maintaining a dimension of quality and great enjoyment. It's important that everything we provide for the market has some quality – whatever that is. […] It's the sum of what our employees define as quality. *(man, senior manager)*

It's perhaps most difficult for the people from Sandrews, who worked there for many years. They worked with cinemas and theaters and had high quality in everything they did, including what they produced themselves. And now the commercial eye is much stronger and you don't talk so much about quality anymore – it's all about turnover, turnover, turnover and profits. […] And that's a real adjustment. *(woman, senior manager distribution)*

Another senior manager puts equal weight on cultural and economic capital when discussing the company objectives. On one hand, he emphasizes the importance of an interest in the film medium. On the other hand, he underlines that such an interest must be coupled with a profitable business. Coming from the production side of the organization, he stresses the need for a long-term perspective on profitability. Just because a director makes an unprofitable film one year, it does not necessarily follow that his or her next film will be unprofitable as well.

A great many descriptions also involve the ownership structure, where Schibsted and Sandrew represent two very different cultures. Schibsted, on one hand, is seen as an economic capital-intensive organization, which concerns itself with profit margins on a quarterly basis. Executives with a more balanced capital composition

describe some of the protagonists on the Schibsted side of the merger as "McKinsey-consultants". The Anders Sandrew Foundation, on the other hand, is commonly perceived as more passive by my interviewees. Endorsing both cultural and economic values, its goals remain somewhat vague to the organizational members. However, several Swedish executives stress the long-term approach to doing business which they recognize as Sandrew's hallmark. Some executives from "the old Sandrews" claim they had to educate Schibsted. "It's necessary to pass on knowledge to Schibsted, earlier they were hesitant towards exhibition and production", says one. The high costs involved in each film production (around 15-20 million SEK, according to one senior manager) of course also make the company dependent on the more affluent owner, Schibsted. Before moving on to the field repositioning from the perspective of organizational members further down in the organizational hierarchy, I would like to highlight how executives describe the organization as a whole.

A field repositioning: in descriptions of the organization as a whole

Apart from the discussion of overall goals, few executives with an economic capital-oriented trajectory (e.g., from Warner Bros. or from outside of the film industry) are particularly keen on describing the organization as a whole. Rather, these executives seem to prefer to emphasize the business-orientation and skilled personnel of their specific department. Conversely, the executives who highlighted both economic and cultural capital aspects of the business in the section above also enjoy describing the organization as a whole. Possibly, this shows executives rich in economic capital not valuing

286

and not knowing how to present the departments and employees comparatively prosperous in terms of cultural capital. However, my interpretation is that because the executives and organizational members closer to the cultural pole are somehow subordinated to the economic and external principles of legitimacy, they "retaliate" by asserting their interpretation in describing the organization and its members in general. Similarly, since the cultural production field is "the economic world reversed", cultural capital is indeed highly valued within the field. Another likely reason for this prerogative of interpretation is the fact that "the old Sandrews" people remain in the same physical space as before, and thus, have a stronger base in the building. The photographic assignment concerning organizational symbols (see p. 261) also points in this direction, as photos highlighted artifacts from "the old Sandrews" era.

One executive from "the old Sandrews" characterizes the organizational members in the following terms:

Very many who come to us are interested in film, or they become interested in film, but when they start in the company they are interested in literature and culture, and I think those who work here read the editorials in the newspapers, they like it here, and wouldn't change jobs just like that. [...] Only two people are golfers. It's not the right industry. *(man, senior manager)*

Two other organizational members concur:

Sport is the least common topic of conversation, I think. Interest in sports is not widespread. [...] It's most about culture, film, cds and so on. Food, news, but also, because you know each other so well, personal matters. *(man, senior manager exhibition)*

These are people who go out a lot and have many other cultural interests, they go to exhibitions and to the theater, etc. *(woman, production)*

In the statements above I interpret "culture" in Williams third sense, as signifying cultural capital. Another executive who has a long background within the film industry, although not at Sandrews, comments on how the focus of the organization changed after the merger. In doing so, she evokes the shift from a film field to a distribution-driven greater media field. However, she also suggests that despite the economic pole-oriented goals, the capital composition of the organizational members still remain mixed. Thus, these organizational members may have a harder time pleasing both the management and themselves:

Most of the people who work here enjoy film very much, and they want good film. So of course we sometimes miss the good films that we once built the companies on. It's hard to make it as good these days. The demands are harder to meet. […] it's become expensive to launch film, the time in the cinemas becomes shorter and shorter. *(woman, senior manager distribution)*

Outside of the management group, among the organizational members who may not discuss the goals of the company on a daily basis, the field differences manifest themselves in everyday talk. Faced with the subject of film, organizational members whom I interpret as being located closer to the economic pole (i.e., with a non-film background) and who do not demonstrate any proficiency in what others perceive as general film knowledge, may produce irritation among their fellow workers in the film field. When presenting themselves, a few of the interviewees from "the old Sandrews" mention their footing in the "cultural world", thus constructing themselves as being dependent on the cultural pole of legitimacy. For example, one woman who has worked for Sandrews since the early days admits to having "benefited enormously from working with the greats, so to speak. I have seen what art and quality are."

Nevertheless, there is also self-criticism among some of the organizational members from "the old Sandrews". One woman says: "we've considered ourselves a bit above marketing ourselves and our films. Really stupid, but that's how it's been." Likewise, there are some organizational members who argue that there are very small differences between the administrative departments and the creative departments:

I could imagine there being a much bigger division between the administrative part and the creative part in other companies. It's not like that here. The boundaries are not so clearly marked. […] We have high quality products, so I think there is a certain pride. *(woman, senior manager video distribution)*

It is possible to contrast assertions about the importance of constantly creating new market shares with the statements regarding the review-driven character of the Nordic film field. While the former are clearly economic capital-oriented, the latter indicate a reliance on cultural capital as well. As I said in chapter 10, the dependence on reviews is considered strongest in Sweden. Still, my interviewees seem unanimous about what kind of films are most subject to this dependency. As much as art house audiences read reviews before they go to the cinema, mainstream audiences ignore them. At least, that is how the audiences are constructed by my Swedish interviewees. Many organizational members, especially those by the economic pole, show frustration at the power of the reviews. Consequently, art house films are considered as high-risk projects. In terms of marketing, one of my interviewees from the video distribution department questions the need for review extracts from the largest newspapers and television shows, arguing that citations from the target group of consumers would work better for the marketing department and the consumers. Although this man acknowledges the fact that

"people accept it just because it's printed in a news-paper", he seems to regard this practice as a convention rather than as a principle of legitimacy (in terms of cultural capital). Along similar lines, another marketer suggests that all films get good reviews, "since they're targeted at different audiences anyway".

To conclude, the shift towards the economic pole is all but complete. Several parts of the organization remain oriented towards the cultural pole (and the *film field*), despite management's endorsement of goals defined in terms of economic capital. Turning to the various departments and subsidiaries of the Sandrew Metronome group, it becomes evident that they operate with slightly different field definitions or at diverse locations along the two poles of the cultural production field.

Capital composition and the company structure

I proceed by examining the principles of legitimacy in each of the three main sectors of Sandrew Metronome, i.e., production, distribution and exhibition, relying on interviews and to a much lesser extent, the survey (see p. 197 and 208 in chapter 9) that I conducted in the organization. The social and relational nature of Bourdieu's (1984, 1993) open concepts *habitus, field,* and *capital* implies that the distinction of whether the department shapes the organizational members in terms of principle of legitimacy or capital composition or whether the organization, and in turn, the department, recruits people with a certain principle of legitimacy or capital composition is of little importance to my study. I propose not to explain but to understand the organizational members' performances of taste at work. However, I have chosen to organize my text around the three departments.

Consisting of three interdependent sectors (production, distribution, and exhibition), the integrated film company's key activity is distribution, according to Moran (1996) who seems to write from the perspective of a greater media field (see also Aksoy and Robins 1992, Wasser 2001). Moran (1996) writes "distribution is seen as a distinctly mundane and prosaic activity, perhaps the most commercial part of the film industry; it is not surprising that it receives the least amount of public attention" (p. 2). I will soon turn to this economic capital-intensive part of the organization, but first, let us have a look at the production departments.

THE PRODUCTION DEPARTMENTS. The two production departments within the Sandrew Metronome group are located close to the cultural pole in the field of cultural production. The combined size of the departments is very small; one of them is mostly involved in coproductions and centered around one person, and although the other one has a major production under way at the time of my study, it encompasses only two people (a producer and a script developer). However, together with the acquisitions department, the production department in Stockholm constitutes a company of four to five people. Located in the same building and cooperating a lot, I will treat them collectively. Since Scandinavian film is auteur-driven (i.e., it is the director who receives the financing), production companies, the producer, and the crew at large are all dependent on the director who presumably is rich in cultural capital (see for example Lantz 2006a). As a result, the producer and the distributors cannot conduct test screenings and determine which ending works best (which is often the case in the American market). Moreover, in order to strengthen the "national cinema", film funding from the state is available in all four countries (see Moran 1996, Blomgren 1998), which makes the

films even less commercially driven. These characteristics of film production in the Nordic countries of course contribute to the construction of "producing" as a cultural capital oriented activity.

You wouldn't believe the piles of rubbish I get. But if there's something I still remember and think about after two months, then I feel there's something more. […] it's all about a good story. But I can't tell them that I would like this kind of story. You can say that it would be nice with a love story or that it would be nice with a comedy. Most of them can't write comedies though, and they're not particularly good at love either. There are an awful lot of drugs, crimes and police. Oh God, I refuse, I won't do those. *(woman, production)*

This woman thus underlines her capability of judging what constitutes a good story.

We operate in a small enough context that the film production environment is very oriented towards culture, it's not that economically oriented. And the films are partly publically financed, so the most important financial aspect is to *find* funding. *(woman, senior manager distribution)*

The above citation is from a woman who has previously worked in production and who claims to be very familiar with both parts of the industry. It is interesting to note that production is constructed as a cultural capital-intensive activity in this integrated film company, whereas, on the film team, the producer may be constructed as someone relatively rich in economic capital (see Rabiger 1997, Soila-Wadman 2003, Lantz 2006a). The production departments accommodate people with backgrounds in film. Some of them have studied film or general arts, whereas most of them combine a brief university education in some other subject with long working experience from the film industry. In addressing open-ended questions in a questionnaire on taste, people from the departments of production emphasized cultural capital more than any other organizational members.

Asked what films, music, literature, television shows and restaurants the respondents missed in my questionnaire they answered: "Opera, troubadours, French singers", "Mozart etc.", "a number of world classics and Nobel Prize winners", "Dostoevsky etc.". Refraining from adding television shows, they often indicate that they like cultural capital-intensive shows such as *Röda Rummet, Bildjournalen, Filmkrönikan, Kulturnyheterna,* and *Rapport.* A senior manager comments on the question- naire itself, having reservations about what is to be included in "culture" (in Williams' third sense): "I ques- tion the restaurants' role as a taste factor, I miss art, design, and theater [in the questionnaire]. For me, this is more of a trend questionnaire." In opposing Holt's (1997) take on cultural consumption patterns, in the drawing of this distinction, this man may still be said to objectify his cultural capital.

THE DISTRIBUTION DEPARTMENTS. In contrast to the production departments, the distribution departments are more commercially oriented, just as Moran (1996) remarks. The economic capital-based principles of legit- imacy dominate over the cultural capital-based ones, despite the dichotomy between film and video within the distribution companies. Often, organizational members from the distribution departments point out, rather proudly, that they do not share the film background of organizational members in other parts of the organiza- tion ("we're not film freaks"). Instead, training in busi- ness is highlighted.

You have to be pretty outgoing and marketing-minded because we're primarily a marketing and sales organization. Everything else, for ex- ample, the accounts department is just – get me right now – a necessary method to make things work. We buy everything else, for example, handling services and logistics, from outside. *(man, film distribution)*

We're very diverse. All ages are represented, 27, 48, 55... We have commercial backgrounds; most have business degrees from university. There are not that many with a film background in the video department, rather, we have more of commercial backgrounds. (man, video distribution)

The fact that quite a few of the people who work in the video distribution department have previously worked in the music industry supports the notion of Warner Bros. as representing a greater media field rather than a film field. Another common trajectory is via fast moving consumer goods, a background that probably synchronizes with the greater media field (as the latter also includes merchandising and collaborations with manufacturers of consumer goods). The level of education among the personnel at the distribution department varies. Some of the most recently employed have a university degree in business, something that is also true of the distribution executives. A few distributors have a background in cultural studies, but they are identified as exceptions. Lacking a university education, most other employees have taken marketing classes at private institutes like IHM.[53] Numerous organizational members who now belong to a distribution department first came into the film / video industry by chance. A few had the intention of getting into the film world and started out as for example cinema projectionists, script supervisor and film conserver. These people often remain on the film side of distribution, but one or two have moved on to video.

The precedence of the economic pole can also be traced in the organizational practices, such as the video department's reporting to Warner Bros. Although frequently subject to complaints, this reporting is sometimes compared favorably with reporting to Sandrew Metronome. On one hand reporting Sandrew Metronome is considered substantially easier to handle, but on the other hand,

the vague and less frequent reporting is often taken as a sign of imperfect control and lack of goal-orientation.

The most important thing is that we reach our profit goals. We're very goal-oriented despite being in the film business. [...] we begin every week by examining the results of the cinema as well as the video over the weekend. Every week we need to make a report on how we see the next quarter of the year. You have to do that in order to keep up, to feel your pulse. *(man, senior manager distribution)*

Judging from the quotation above and more than a few others, it appears that several of my interviewees seem to relate to the "fact" that film in general is not business-related. Having constructed distribution as a commercially oriented activity, against the stream in the culturally versed film industry, both film and video representatives often cast light on the creativity that marketing activities call for. One man says: "you have to do everything right; it's a business where you must optimize in a vast number of areas. It's great fun to make everything work: to find the right date with the right competitition, to find positioning strategies and marketing strategies." He rounds it up by claiming that "it is a business where you use your creative side more than the operational or logical side". Thus, he highlights a dichotomy within the economic field. The espoused creativity in Sandrew Metronome's distribution departments (see also next quote) seems to be what Ericsson (2001) labels "democreatic", a brand of creativity that rests on the notion that everyone is creative (and may not be the same construction of creativity that prevails by the cultural pole, cf. Williams 1983). However, this inherent creativity needs to be triggered, a requirement that will be studied in closer detail in chapter 12.

However, the situation in the distribution company is not so cut-and-dried; there are numerous people with

backgrounds in film and who personally lean towards the cultural pole of legitimacy. Occasionally they claim that although they have to prioritize success in economic terms, they ascribe an added value to a project when they "make good things, when we get good reviews and the audience is satisfied". Distribution people with production experience tend to value the integrated film company more than those who entered into distribution after holding jobs in other sectors of the economy. One woman who presently runs a distribution company but who was formerly involved in production lists some of the advantages of having an inhouse production office:

> You can probably win market share from day one of the film. You can create a feeling of 'our film', so that people feel loyalty towards the film. [...] Plus the creativity that you gain... It's very dissatisfying to only work with an American company. You're not allowed to think yourself. You are told what to do. *(woman, senior manager distribution)*

Although dichotomously constructed, the division between film and video as described in the previous chapter does not fully correspond to the two competing principles of legitimacy in the organization. The film *vs.* video dichotomy is most evident within the distribution department, where film is constructed as relatively more cultural capital-intensive than video. However, a comparison between, for example, film distribution and film production would still demonstrate differences in terms of field position, the former being slightly closer to the economic pole.

THE EXHIBITION DEPARTMENTS. The three exhibition departments are comparatively small (especially in Denmark and Finland). The organizational members who constitute these departments usually have diverse backgrounds. Some tasks are said to require competence defined in terms of economic capital (for example, prop-

erty management and personnel issues) and other jobs supposedly require cultural capital (for example, cinema programming). The capital compositions of the people at the largest exhibition company in Sweden differ further since it also includes an accounting department and IT people. Furthermore, the exhibition department administers a great number of part-time employees at the cinemas. In other words, there are some people with business degrees coupled with experience in other sectors of the economy, some with general arts degrees accompanied by work experience from the film world and a few without higher education (sometimes with a film background though). Not surprisingly, the mix of people gives rise to conflicting field definitions and competing cultures. Some of the citations that identify tensions deriving from the Gemeinschaft / Gesellschaft conceptual figure (see p. 245) are taken from one of the exhibition companies. The mixed principles of legitimacy in the exhibition department are also epitomized in a statement by a cinema programmer:

I'm torn. We have to meet our budget every week, we know that we sometimes have to show things that we don't feel like screening, in order to get money into the business. We're more attached to some films. For example, I loved *Amélie*. I really protected it. People have to see it, I thought, and tried to keep it on the largest screen in the theater instead of downclassing it to a smaller theater. So I work with my heart a lot too. It's a combination. Sometimes we have good films that nobody sees, and then you have to consider yourself defeated. It didn't work. But at least we try. If you mix *American Pie* with *Italian for Beginners*, and if both run successfully at the same time, then we're happy.[54] *(woman, exhibition)*

CAPITAL REPRODUCTION IN THE ORGANIZATION. A few observations regarding capital reproduction follow from the account above of the three main sectors of the organization. In accordance with the two principles of legitimacy in the organization, organizational members are endowed with different capital compositions.

Although a far cry from the dominant classes, *professions*, in Bourdieu's (1984) French study, there are still people all over the organization with an inclination to legitimize their own and others' actions by means of cultural capital. Most pertinently, the latter principle of legitimacy prevails (often parallel to the economic pole though) in the production departments, the exhibition departments, and, to some extent, in the film distribution departments.

In line with Bourdieu's (1984) study of the reproduction of social class through taste, the organizational members near the cultural pole have a disposition for objects that classify them as belonging to a class in the *cultural domain*. For example, the objects highlighted by the organizational members from the production department in the taste questionnaire clearly marked a distinction based on taste. The comment by the senior manager (see p. 293) also testifies to a wish, on the part of the cultural capital rich, to equate the meaning of culture with that of "legitimate culture" (cf. Bourdieu 1984). This use of cultural objects as distinctive class markers does not characterize the responses of organizational members in the economic capital-rich departments (in the questionnaire the latter generally stress more *popular* films, television shows, musicians, authors and restaurants).[55] Through a frequent emphasis on their business background, these organizational members objectify their economic capital. Hence, the shared taste and background of the people in the production department and some in the exhibition and film distribution departments unite them, while the dissimilarities vis-à-vis the organizational members near the economic pole distinguish the two groups in the organization. Through the "choice of the necessary" organizational members of either class choose a job and department that complies with their

capital composition. The people with a business background may not engross themselves in art house films because they lack a "market" where this experience is greatly valued. These two classes based on cultural and economic capital, respectively, are continually reproduced in the organizational arena, in everyday cultural consumption practices.

As I stated above, the capital composition of Sandrew Metronome bears only a faint resemblance to the classes identified by Bourdieu (1984) in 1960s France. Even if organizational members by the cultural pole objectify cultural capital in their cultural consumption, I would refrain from considering them part of the dominant group in the cultural domain, due to the fact that they often lack a long university degree or a "true" profession, such as that of a lawyer or a doctor (see also footnote 73). Bourdieu (1984) notes that organizations in the field of cultural production are often subject to creative redefinition.[56] This may have been the case in "the old Sandrews", as organizational members from the Sandrews years highlight Gemeinschaft, i.e., their connections and long friendship (suggesting cooption). However, it appears as if formal qualifications are emphasized more after the merger and the consequent expansion of the Gesellschaft (in particular among the organizational members with authority to hire people). Still, the male dominance in top positions of course hints at cooption (see Lindgren 1996, Holgersson 2003).

As we saw earlier in the chapter, the organization is undergoing a shift towards the economic pole of legitimacy in the greater field of cultural production. Although there are still plenty of organizational members who legitimize their own and others' actions by reference to the cultural pole, there seems to be few new

recruits with this inclination. Hence, the reproduction of economic capital seems to be more extensive within the organizational boundaries. Drawing on Weick's (1995) notion of organizing, organizational members have to make sense of the situation and reduce uncertainty by assuming one principle of legitimacy that determines the situation (often by division of definitional labor). Thus, depending on situation as well as the people and departments involved, one of the poles will be triggered. One way of making sense of the situation is to rely on situational factors, such as *personal fronts*, linked to the relevant pole. It is rather difficult to find *typical* characteristics, but to me, the people endowed with more cultural capital seemed slightly more articulate than people near the economic pole. Or rather, they did not use much of the business / Gesellschaft vocabulary that permeates the opposite pole. Moreover, the average age of the organizational members near the cultural pole is higher than that of those near the economic pole. I did not discover any obvious differences in dress based on capital composition, but certainly, such distinctions may be known to the organizational members who have spent considerably more time in the organization than I have. Accordingly, these situational features of interaction may contribute to the reproduction of capital, and the social order, through the evidence that they possibly provide of the capital endowment of the interactants. However, I will later expand on the potentially mediating role the organization plays on this reproduction.

MEANINGFULNESS

In this scenario with mixed principles of legitimacy, I have decided to take a closer look at how the organizational members present their jobs as meaningful. It is an

effort to find another indicator of what game they are in, and thus, what capital they claim to value the highest. At the same time, their answers may point at how they *combine* economic and cultural capital in a context where the management over and over stresses the primacy of economic capital, a theme I will return to in the next two chapters. The issue of meaningfulness also touches upon the notion of teams and what meanings are considered appropriate to sanction in the organizational arena. Something drastic happens in the interview room when I say: "I assume you find your job meaningful. What in your job makes it meaningful?"[57] Suddenly, there is a lot of laughter and giggling. Sometimes appearing a little ill at ease, my interviewees say things like: "now we're getting into really existential issues, what's the meaning of life?" and "we're going into philosophical thoughts". The dedication with which they address the question varies; some are brief and concise, others develop their thoughts more fully. For some, this question seems to be the lasting memory of my interview.

Most of this attests to the apparent unexpectedness among the organizational members of my question regarding what is meaningful in their job. I interpret the answers that I am about to present as performances of meaningfulness; they represent what is somehow acceptable to put forth as "meaningful", and, also, what is congruent with their respective positions. This section is structured along two dimensions: capital pole (based on capital status of department, see previous section) and position in the organizational hierarchy. I thus begin by turning to the commercially oriented distribution department where I highlight the constructions of meaningfulness, and then proceed to identify the themes of entertainment and results, money, and teamwork. People from the end of the organization more oriented towards

cultural capital offer very similar answers, save the occasional emphasis on the role of film in society. Under both headings, I also bring to light hierarchical differences in the answers given.

Meaningfulness by the economic pole

In the economic capital-intensive distribution department, a few organizational members immediately mention the Red Cross. One of them says that

[...] sometimes I think I would like to work for the Red Cross or something like that, saving lives. I become very philosophical... But the most fun part is the dialogue with colleagues. *(man, video distribution)*

Another states that she finds it meaningful but

[...] only for myself. It's an egotistical meaningfulness. I have given it much thought as I have friends who work in marketing for SOS Children's Villages and the Red Cross. [...] They serve a totally different function. When you work in entertainment, it feels like...what difference does it make? After September 11, and during fundraising programs for the prevention of starvation, I sometimes feel I'm in a puny business. If we closed our business, it would not mean anything for the welfare of the people. All the same, in my defense, culture and entertainment are important parts of people's lives too. [...] In our times with more unemployment, more people to share the same number of jobs, when we have more spare time... then, we become even more important. *(woman, film distribution)*

Evidently, these organizational members measure the meaningfulness of their jobs against the activities of the Red Cross. The woman also says that there are several products that she would not fancy working with, for example, canned food and car parts ("although, as a marketer you should, perhaps, at least if you're good, be able to sell just about anything"). "I feel my heart would not be in it with those products". Thus, although she dilutes the importance of culture and entertainment

in the face of more basic needs such as food and shelter, she still recognizes the value of entertainment. She shares this view with several co-workers in the distribution department. Entertainment is a key word in their constructions of meaningfulness in their jobs:

I find my job enormously meaningful. Entertainment is important. Everybody wants it. [...] Whenever I go out, at dinners and so on, and I tell people what I do for a living, they become extremely interested, and they want to discuss their favorite films with me. [...] Film is important, everyone has seen something that has meant a lot to him or her. [...] So I have a very important job for the Swedish people. *(man, video distribution)*

I satisfy people's needs for entertainment. [...] it gives me satisfaction, a measurable satisfaction. We have top lists, sales lists. We go: 'we nailed it!' [when it works]. *(man, video distribution)*

I think I... if I have some kind of role in my job, it's to entertain people. That's my mission. And I think that without entertainment our lives are much duller, you know. Hahaha. And I don't think that entertainment must be comedy, it can also be art, it can be very serious. All of it is entertainment. *(man, film distribution)*

These three men touch upon the same theme, the meaningfulness of entertaining people. Again, these quotes evoke the notion of a media field, rather than a film field, as a subfield to the cultural production field. The second citation shows a man who adds to the meaningfulness of entertaining people the ability of "measuring" the extent to which one has reached that goal. I interpret this rational, economic language as typical of someone close to the economic pole (see for example Simon 1957, March and Simon 1958, Sjöstrand 1985), a statement that serves as a good transition to the organizational members at least as rich in economic capital, but higher up in the organizational hierarchy. Roughly speaking, their answers concern money, results and relations to their particular team of employees.

It's important that my job is meaningful, yes. For me, my job is meaningful when I develop personally and I see results. For other people, I guess it's meaningful to have a CEO for each company in the group. For society at large, I'm more uncertain. *(man, senior manager exhibition)*

The meaningful lies in the fact that one has to make a living. You have to be honest, that's why you work. *(man, senior manager distribution)*

For me it's of course [meaningful] if we reach the goals for our business that our owners have set. […] It's the be-all and end-all to reach these goals since that's what gives us the freedom that we need in order to keep this boat afloat, and to grow as well. But on the other hand, I think the work satisfaction I get from my job is not that, it's when I'm out in the organization and inspire people. It's when I stand in front of colleagues in different contexts. […] it's an enormous satisfaction knowing that the teamwork between the person in question and me satisfies both of us. That's what's fun. *(man, senior manager)*

Their position in the company may certainly affect executives' performance of meaningfulness; executives may feel that the question requires an emphasis on goals and their collaboration with their employees. It may be in their interest to present themselves as "good business leaders" (cf. Alvesson and Willmott 1996, Sjöstrand 1997, Sandberg 2001b). In other words, they may produce idealized performances in order to avoid inconsistencies in terms of principles of legitimacy. Since constructions of leadership and masculinity go hand in hand (see for example Collinson and Hearn 1994, 1996; Connell 1995; Holgersson 2003), it comes as no surprise that the male executives present themselves in this way.

In light of these executives' constructions of meaningfulness, it is interesting to note that the organizational members lower in the hierarchy, but still near the same pole, emphasize "entertainment" rather than profits, results, etc. I interpret the construction of meaningfulness around entertainment as being more oriented, relatively speaking, towards the cultural pole than the constructions espoused by the executives.

Further, the idealized performances of some of the marketing people I meet accentuate the flexibility that allegedly "comes with being a marketer". Thus, they construct it as a profession that allows for any kind of business direction (making the woman cited on p. 302 deficient, as she could identify certain areas in which she would not be interested in working). An example of this reduction of meaning associated with the industry or products is also available in the second quotation above, where money is presented as the main source of meaning. One interviewee stands out; he alone reflects on the process itself:

I think everything is meaningful from the perspective of your decisions. Otherwise everything is meaningless. [...] [My job] is not more meaningful than anything else, but I give it meaning. So during my four years working with music I found that to be the most meaningful thing to do, more meaningful than working with cinemas. *(man, film distribution)*

In an attempt to find out what meaning he ascribes to his work as a distributor, I ask him what other jobs interest him. It turns out that the realm of culture attracts him. "Sometimes when I work with directors and actors I realize I would much rather have their jobs. They are allowed to be artists with a capital A, with 'big egos'." Judging from his presentation of himself, he seems to be endowed with slightly more cultural capital than some of his coworkers in distribution. My impression is that marketers normally resort to the elasticity aspect ("I could market almost any product") so central to the construction of the marketer, resisting any comparison with artists wealthy in cultural capital. It remains, however, to be seen what the interviewees closer to the cultural pole in the organization have to say about the meaningfulness of their work.

Meaningfulness by the cultural pole

Those drawn to the cultural pole are people from "the old Sandrews", presently holding positions in production and exhibition, and one representative from distribution (but with a background in production). It soon becomes clear that the only difference in comparison with the interviewees presented above is that organizational members near the cultural pole stress the role of film in society slightly more, not only as an entertainer, but also as a medium for ideas and as a cultural expression. Most of the answers from this group are variations on the previous themes of entertainment and results, but these interviewees refrain from using the word "entertainment", and they do not rush into discussions of profits. Rather, they prefer terms such as "experience" and "expression".

On the topic of meaningfulness, a senior manager from the production department points to the fact that he likes film, and that he is not alone; more people than ever go to the movies. According to him, "film with a content" is important to our society. This construction of meaningfulness as hinging on film as a cultural expression resonates with the answer of another senior manager:

I find it meaningful to work with National cinema. It's important that we have a film expression of our own. [...] It's important for our culture, for motivation. For the filmmakers, it's important that their films get to be seen by others, that their work reaches out into the world through festivals, markets, and television. [...] It's meaningful in a wider sense. It's fun to have a challenging profession, and I enjoy the industry. But [the meaningfulness] is not only related to your results. It is also a result of the fact that you bought a film, you marketed it, you distributed it to an audience and the audience wanted it. And through this you create positive results for your owners. [...] And you get incredibly happy when you have a film like *Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon*, that you just love, and then that many people want to see it! And you make extra money for the owners. It's a dream scenario.[58] *(woman, senior manager distribution)*

Similarly, meaningfulness is constructed in terms of the provision of movie experiences:

It's meaningful if we manage to create a program that appeals to many people and gives them a nice time for their 80 SEK. They return happy or sad, they experienced something. Then you have succeeded in creating something. *(woman, exhibition)*

Others stress the production process:

It's always meaningful to work with people. [...] Then of course I find it especially interesting and meaningful with production. [...] You meet a lot of people in this business, some crazy people, interesting people, all kinds of people, and you have to be aware of how to treat them. They are artists, and you have to treat everyone differently. *(man, senior manager production)*

The last man goes on to describe the infinite possibilities and great variety of films that he works on (see citation on p. 248). All these interviewees enjoy their work very much, "I forget that I go to work each day. There aren't that many people who can say that, so I'm lucky", says one woman cited above.

The purpose of the preceding discussion of meaningfulness was not to find the iron cage of the organization, but to identify capital compositions among organizational members. I wanted to get an idea of how much they alternate between meanings which rest on the cultural pole, such as "film, and culture in general, is important to society", and meanings which belong to the economic pole, such as "provide profits for our owners". It was my ambition to see how they dealt with the fact that management leans more towards the economic pole than towards the cultural pole. In the next two chapters I will continue to examine how malleable organizational members are when they legitimate their practices. However, before I proceed to the chapters on the con-

307

struction and use of taste, I will linger a little more on the topic of field and the organizational arena. For this reason, I will now turn to my photographic study.

ORGANIZATION AND FIELDS:
A PHOTOGRAPHIC STUDY

As we have seen so far, people in an organization in the field of cultural production tend to apply different principles of legitimacy depending on department affiliation and position within the company. Drawing on Goffman (1959) and Weick (1995), I suggest that the principles of legitimacy used may also hinge on the situation and the sensemaking process that it is subject to. In the chapters to come, I will focus even more on how organizational members combine economic capital and cultural capital in various situations and under varying circumstances. Having devoted the first part of this chapter to how the organization intersects with different fields and, consequently, different principles of legitimacy, I will now attempt a look at the influence of the organizational arena in relation to field. As a corporation, the organizational form automatically evokes the economic field and economic principles of legitimacy. However, there may also be other aspects of the institution "organization" that affect how organizational members act in the organizational arena. Before I present the photographic study (which is explained in detail on p. 209), I want to turn to a discussion on manifestations of the fields and of the institution "organization" in this particular substudy.

The aestheticization of everyday life

Dick Hebdige (1988) characterizes consumer culture in

308

the 20th century as a culture where commodities are increasingly valued in terms of their symbolic or expressive qualities. He exemplifies this aestheticization by recounting the history of the scooter. In the subcultural milieu of the Mods, the scooter signifies the general aestheticization "through the invention of the Image, through the conflation of the 'public' and the 'personal', 'consumption' and 'display'" (Hebdige 1988, p. 113). Along these lines, Zetterlund (2001) suggests that in late modernity, objects have become more expressive, or "story-telling".

The aestheticization of everyday life of course also includes the working life. Strati (1999) argues that in following Weber's (1946) ideal-type of the formal organization, mainstream organizational scholars have neglected the corporeality of organizational members by focusing only on the minds of these people. In doing so, these researchers construct the organizational arena as something built on pure thought, "which the organization equips with work instruments and thus reclothes" (Strati 1999, p. 3). Only when the organizational members leave the organizational arena will corporeality be resumed and with it a capability to perceive and judge aesthetically. As this "idealized organization", according to Strati, neither corresponds to everyday organizational life, nor to how organizational members understand organizational life aesthetically, he proposes a study of aesthetics in organizations. While Strati primarily draws on aesthetic philosophy (ibid.), I still believed his ideas might have bearing on the study at hand. Maybe, the collaborative photographic method would bring in corporeality to my organizational study. Corporeality, I reasoned, was somehow harmonious with the notion of field, as the field is not confined to either non-organizational life or organizational life. Against the background

of Bourdieu's (1984) notion of capital, it seems likely that aestheticization is greater in an organization operating in the field of cultural production than in an organization in the economic field. In addition, it seems probable that aestheticization is more pervasive near the cultural pole.

However, there is also a possibility that the institution "organization" is stronger than the impact of the fields in which the organization operates. Drawing on Berger and Luckmann's (1966) notion of institutionalization (see p. 38), I suggest that organizations may be regarded as institutions, i.e., habitualized social actions.[59] I would argue that organizations are subject to a great deal of habitualization, to the degree that certain features of organizations become taken-for-granted and crystallized, e.g., ideas that meetings, office and work space, managers, the division between the private and the public sphere, wages, goals, tasks, and colleagues are central to any organization. In other words, the institution "organization" may prompt an organization-specific set of actions and opinions among the organizational members, in accordance with their roles. Furthermore, because organization implies cooperation, the effect of field struggles may decrease in the organizational arena. Hence, the organizational arena may influence, to a greater extent than the composition of the field, what the organizational members like and dislike in the organization. This study focuses on organization-specific, nevertheless socially significant, cultural objects (see footnote 36 and 37).

I structure the presentation of the photographic study along a number of themes (primarily based on two of the photographic assignments, "things I like" and "things I dislike"). In line with my overall empirical presentation in Part II I continue to avoid charting the individuals

involved in the study. I proceed by mentioning, in a few words, something about the style of the photographs, as it may reflect the capital composition of the organizational members. Then, I turn to the "things I like" category, followed by the "things I dislike" category. These subjects and interpretations (of interpretations) are then analyzed consecutively in terms of the organization's relation to field. I round off the section on the photographic study by briefly interpreting the pictures in terms of gender, a discussion I resume in chapter 12.

Photographic style

Most photographs are very "direct" in that the descriptions given by the photographers refer to (what I perceive as) the object depicted (e.g., a picture of the parking lot suggests something about car parking, a photo of the canteen evokes something regarding the canteen). However, there are some exceptions, for example a woman calling attention to what she perceives as a bad information system by depicting a nail that to her symbolizes the old-fashioned system used today where information aimed to the entire staff is put on a nail in the reception area (photo 5). She argues that not only do employees sometimes miss the information, but also customers, competitors, or others who are not concerned with the information may get hold of it. Furthermore, there is a picture of the door to the salaries office (photo 6), which the photographer describes as "a symbol for the low pay". Still, typical of the photographic style of the study in Sandrew Metronome is that all my photographers refrain from any "artistic" expression, supposedly leaving that to the people more involved in producing culture. Perhaps, it is quite easy to lose face in artistic endeavors in Sandrew Metronome since the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

317

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

organization is located in the field of cultural production and thus incorporates larger amounts of cultural capital than organizations in the economic field.

"Things I like in the organization"

Under the "things I like" heading fall four pictures of the "canteen" where all employees have lunch each day, a lunch made by the company chef. My select group of photographers describe the food that is served in the canteen as superlatively good. Moreover, they stress the social function of the canteen:

That's the canteen. That's where we have lunch, and we have this woman who cooks. It's very nice. It's a way to meet up once a day, when we're all spread out in different buildings. *(woman, video distribution)* (PHOTO 7)

It's great to have access to the canteen. Everyone gathered at the same place at about the same time. That's where you find out what is happening in the organization. There is always someone to eat with. It's a time to relax and a time to speak informally about what is happening at the moment. *(woman, video distribution)* (PHOTO 7)

Another common motif is fellow employees (three photographers took such pictures). The photographers either claim that they like the organization because of the people with whom they work or because of the teams they represent. For example:

This is our incredible customer service. She symbolizes [the customer service department], she works close to me, with my customers. [In the customers service department] they are very down-to-earth, customer-oriented, they know what the customers demand and that's what they provide. And they get very good reviews on the market too, it's not only my opinion. *(man, video distribution)* (PHOTO 8)

Here is my colleague, a very nice man. We've known each other for very long, and we work very well together. *(man, film distribution)* (PHOTO 9)

These are my work-mates. [...] We had a brief meeting and I ran away and got the camera. What is so positive in this is that we're five women – Anni-Frid was away – who work very tightly together, often under a lot of stress and time pressure in this special kind of business. But we almost never fight with each other. That's something I find quite amazing. My sister works in a very female dominated sphere, she's in child care. And there it is like a 'sewing circle' all the time. There are intrigues and tensions, something I think is very common when you have a large group of women working together. But really, here, it's so frictionless that's it's just plain unbelievable! *Why is that, do you think?* It's because we're quite similar, we're often in agreement, we're not particularly status conscious, we don't have any assertiveness issues, or any hierarchy between us that you need to comply with. [...] No matter how hard it is, how stressful it is and how boring it is, you always feel support in your work-mates, you still think it's great fun to go to work. *(woman, film distribution)* (PHOTO 10)

Although my photographers seem to have the same take on the canteen (the food is excellent, it is nice to gossip, it is a great meeting place to find out about what is going on), their descriptions of the pictures of fellow co-workers differ slightly. The two participants from the film camp highlight the nice teamwork and long friendship, and the man representing video points to the professionalism of and market satisfaction with a woman at customer service and a salesman, thus echoing the Gemeinschaft / Gesellschaft dichotomy that I described in chapter 10. These aspects identified as positive in the organization are not specific to the field of cultural production.

Then again, in one way or another, the photographers have chosen to focus on films / videos or the filmmaking process, emphasizing that they like the company's products.

This symbolizes film. It's because I love the product I work with. I love film. The experience. I loved film long before I even considered working in the film business. I'd much rather sell a really bad movie than a toothpaste, canned product or whatever. I like what I do, I like the products we're dealing with. The experience, the escape from reality,

emotions in all directions, just like fear, drama and laughter and anything that film can mean. *(woman, film distribution)* (PHOTO 11)

This picture symbolizes our incredible products. What's so good about them? It's so much fun to work with news. You never see a product turning old. Whenever you finished working with a product you take on a new one, and you continue like that, you keep going. *(man, video distribution)* (PHOTO 12)

This is the door to Agnetha's room. She's the head of the production department. I think it's great working in a place where all these creative people are running around. That's what I wanted to convey by this photograph. *(woman, video distribution)* (PHOTO 13)

The last citation comes from a woman of "the old Sandrews"; she started to work at Sandrews when the company still comprised theater. In the interviews she repeatedly returns to the "running around of theater and film people in the old days". Similarly, the man from film distribution who has a long Sandrews background as well calls attention to "the stables" where the production department is located (photo 14). The other two quotes above come from former Warner Bros. employees. Despite being an organization that belongs to the field of cultural production, which partly relies on the cultural pole of legitimacy, the importance of culture (in Williams third sense) seems to stop at the threshold of film and filmmaking being more than a fun and interesting place to work. There is no indication that the organizational members in distribution value aesthetics in the organizational setting and few signs that they prefer "high culture". Nobody brings up any aesthetic words in their descriptions of the photographs. A woman shows a photograph of a painting, which is part of an art lottery:

This is a painting in the art lottery, which is run by the art club. I was never a member of that club, nor did I join the art lottery, but I still think it's great that there are activities that you can be part of if you feel like it. *(woman, video distribution)* (PHOTO 15)

Thus, she does not legitimate this photo based on the cultural pole, rather, she identifies it as "an activity". The same woman also explains a picture of her calendar (photo 16) by reference to the economic pole. According to her, the agenda demonstrates the dates for a sales conference which serves to inspire the sales personnel to sell a new title on VHS or dvd.

These [sales] conferences are great fun. We always try to come up with some special ideas for each occasion. [...] We have to be creative. (*woman, video distribution*)

Depicted as something that the photographers like (and even love), film and the filmmaking process are of course specific to this organization. There is a chance that there would be photographs of the products at the business core in any organization, but I believe that in most other organizations these products would only appear in the "things that symbolize the organization" category. Still, based on how my participants describe the pictures of films / videos and filmmaking, I suggest that most of them (especially those from video and former Warner Bros. employees) highlight film and video as popular culture. On one hand they underscore the construction of the infinite differentiation possibilities and the range of feelings associated with the products while, on the other hand, they claim a preference for selling film irrespective of quality and content over marketing other products. Thus, these photographers do not justify the pictures by reference to distinction (as in, "it's nice to work in an organization that produces quality art house films"). Rather, they seem to refer to film as an interaction medium. There are, however, two photographers from "the old Sandrews" (one presently working in film and one in video) who describe their photographs in terms of the filmmaking process (by referring to the production department and the accompanying creative people), thus

327

signaling a greater interest in the filmmaking craft (but not necessarily cultural capital). Coupled with a picture of the *Hero*[60] poster (photo 17), under the "things that symbolize the organization" assignment (see p. 211), and the comment "one of the best films this year", the film distribution man does however present himself as richer in cultural capital than his fellow video distributors. Prior to discussing the relation between organization and field, let us have a look at the disagreeable aspects of organizational life.

"Things I dislike in the organization"

In the "things I dislike" category, there are even fewer field-specific aspects in the photos. I identify only one photo and its accompanying description as a consequence of field. It is taken by a woman with a long Sandrews background:

This is the salaries department. I took this photo when everyone had left. I think the salaries here are far too low. But, I guess that's common when you work in the cultural sphere. *(woman, video distribution)* (PHOTO 6)

Conceptualized as "the economic world reversed" (Bourdieu 1993), the cultural production field comes with lower salaries than the purely economic field. Judging from my interviews, this seems to be especially true for people from "the old Sandrews", who by tradition have been closer to the cultural pole than, for example, the Warner Bros. people.

With the exception of that one statement, there are hardly any comments that are typical of an organization in the cultural production field. Rather, they seem typical of an organization in the economic field, or maybe just

328

typical of any *organization*. These photos mostly concern stress, reporting, and technical equipment, motifs that hardly reflect a reversal of the economic field.

This is meant to show my mail inbox [on my computer]. I photographed it as something I don't like. I think I get too many emails, and I don't have the time to answer them all. *(woman, video distribution)* (PHOTO 18)

This is an empty office space, symbolizing the lack of personnel. I experience a very heavy work load, I work under great time pressure. I always have upcoming deadlines. We have a pretty tight organization in general. In the marketing department in particular, you always need an extra two or three hands that are never there because of both economical and practical reasons. [...] You don't earn so much money on film. On video you earn a lot more. Since the margins can be pretty small, you constantly think of ways to cut costs, and the easiest way is to do it in the number of employees. [...] If you wouldn't have enjoyed working with *Harry Potter* so much, you would probably have left for another job. It was really very very hard. Two of us have small children [...] and then you have to be at home as well. I could tell from my children, that I had been away too much, and then I get a bad conscience. Absolutely. If I didn't love this job so much I wouldn't have worked here for five years. [...] When you work in the film business, it's hard to let go of your work, because once you open a newspaper you will find something about film, you check the movie ads, you discover some collaborations. There's always a little, little, little thought on work. *(woman, film distribution)* (PHOTO 19)

It is very stressful here. We have this fairly new, elaborate reporting system, which means we spend hours just summarizing each week. It feels like we do nothing but report. (*woman, video distribution*) (PHOTO 20)

This is a scanner. There are lots of scanners at Sandrew Metronome. I took a photo of it because I think we don't have enough time to learn how to use our equipment. No one had time to teach me, and as I was new, I didn't know how to go about. So it just stood there for quite some time. (*woman, video distribution*) (PHOTO 21)

The film distribution woman partly echoes the complaint about the salaries, but she does not link it to "the cultural sphere" in general, only to film and the "fact" that it is difficult to make a large profit in film. However, most of her quote refers to the strained work situation. The stress-

ful working conditions captured by the two female photographers above are not present in the men's pictures. The man who works, rather independently, for the film distribution department, and who belongs to "the old Sandrews" group, claims that he could not come up with anything he disliked. When I meet him for an interview, he jokingly mentions the department cashier. The other man who took part in the photographic study has photographed two things that he dislikes. First, he shows me a picture of the sky, which he explains:

The air in our department is beneath contempt. It was 34 degrees this summer. So the air – part of the work environment – is not good. It's a hot potato, there are discussions with the landlord and lots more. *Is it like that everywhere around here?* Yes, I think it's just the same everywhere, but some people don't think about it. But it's really disturbing to me. There's an endless grumbling about it. *(man, video distribution)* (PHOTO 22)

The same man has also snapped the courtyard parking lot. He explains that there are too few parking spaces outside. In his view, parking possibility should be reserved to those with cars supplied by the company and used in their daily job, for example the sales personnel. Today, incidents in the parking lot (for example not finding a spot to park or being parked behind other cars) often cause him delays. Moreover, the photograph of the nail and the accompanying description (see citation on p. 311) also indicate something that the photographer dislikes. Just like the pictures of the stressful work situation somehow point to a lack of control over one's work situation, so does the nail-photographer call for more information on the organization's undertakings, and, by extension, more control. Control is a fundamental aspect of modern organizations (Etzioni 1964).

Interpreting the photographs

Given the descriptions of the photos at which we have now arrived, it is possible to interpret them in view of the overriding question of the relation between organization and field. As I pointed out in the introduction to the photographic study, the organizational form of Sandrew Metronome, the corporation, of course highlights the economic pole. Moreover, it may be difficult to single out what is primarily field related and what is predominantly inherent to the institution "organization". However, I would argue that the positive descriptions of social spaces such as the canteen and the coffee rooms as well as of the co-workers are aspects of *organizational* life rather than of a field struggle. I refer to the fact that a defining feature of organizational life is cooperation. I understand these social spaces as *arenas for sociability* where divisions between different departments and poles of legitimacy are trounced (cf. Simmel 1949 [1911]), paving the way for what Lindgren (1992) calls a "communicative element". In other words, these pictures emphasize the autonomy of the *form* of interaction (Simmel 1949 [1911]). Similarly, I interpret the pictures of people taken in the spirit of Gemeinschaft as indicators of the importance of sociability. Obviously, interactions between the subjects and the people depicted also center on content, but given the emphasis on the absence of fights and the friendliness of co-workers, I believe the offering of sociability opportunities is a central element for the inclusion of people in the "things I like" category. Considering the dominant portrayal of film as an interaction medium, rather than as a means for distinction, the importance of sociability in the organizational arena is further underlined. Aside from the sociability aspects of social spaces, people and film, descriptions of the parking lot, the air and the criticized information sys-

tem also relate to general *organizational* issues such as work situation and leadership.

In "things I like in the organization" there is scarcely one description that I identify as directly based on the economic pole. Arguably, the photograph of the young woman representing the customer service department and the associated description could be read as being based on the economic pole. The photographer says: "this is our incredible customer service", indicating his Gesellschaft view in reducing the young woman depicted to a function and making her anonymous. A view further confirmed by his reference to the market and the customers. Similarly, the picture of the calendar that highlights the sales conferences stresses the creativity that the planning of such conferences requires. There are however more positive descriptions related to the cultural pole (from representatives of "the old Sandrews"), for example, the creative people associated with the production department and the excellent films, exemplified by *Hero*. As I pointed out above, film is highlighted as an interaction medium and constructed as a product of infinite possibilities. Thus, the cultural pole provides organizational members with interaction mediums, but the interaction itself may not always be content-driven.

If we move to the dislikable class, there are quite a few things which are directly related to the external, heteronomous economic pole: stress, reporting, lack of control, as well as lack of time to figure out how to use technical equipment. Although these properties may be said to be typical of the economic field (see for example Weber 1930), they may also be interpreted as typical of modern *organizations* (see for example Etzioni 1964, Mintzberg 1979) and, especially, of corporations. Greenberg (1963) cautions that as soon as efficiency has been legitimized

as a rule, it will turn into "an inner compulsion and weighs like a sense of a sin, simply because no one can be efficient *enough*" (p. 31). Also related to field is the complaint about the salaries which are seen as a consequence of operating in "the cultural sphere".

In brief, positive aspects of organizational life are related to sociability offerings, sometimes provided by the cultural pole, and negative facets of the organization are primarily associated with the economic field. For some (representatives of "the old Sandrews"), the cultural pole serves to positively legitimate film and the organization. I would hold that the significance of sociability offerings in the organization might mediate the reproduction of the social order in the organizational arena. In other words, the organization has a mitigating effect on the impact of fields.

While stressing the explorative character of the photographic study, I still want to draw attention to the gender differences in motifs and descriptions of the photographs. Although it is difficult to say something about the relation between the organization and the field in terms of gender, I want to highlight some thematic differences in these photographs. For example, the stressful work situation is brought to my attention by all three female participants, while it is left unphotographed and uncommented by the two men. This is in line with numerous studies on gender and organization which demonstrate that women are subject to more pressure in the organization (Kanter 1977, Cockburn 1991), as well as in the everyday life at large (SOU 1997:138, Elvin-Nowak 1998). Furthermore, the fact that it is a woman who reflects on the necessity of improving the information system may be a result of her not having access to the informal networks (dominated by the male execu-

tives) where much information is passed on (cf. Kanter
1977, Fuchs Epstein 1981, Lindgren 1996, Holgersson
2003). The linkage between dissatisfaction with one's
work situation and different conditions for men and
women in the organization is further supported by the
film distribution man not being able to come up with
anything that he dislikes in the organization.

In an attempt to focus on the impact of field and the two
principles of legitimacy that characterize the field of cul-
tural production, I have largely left aside the issue of gen-
der in this chapter. When I return to the topic of gender
in next chapter, I will focus on the gendering of taste per-
formances.

TEAMS

The remainder of this chapter will be devoted to a dis-
cussion of team-related aspects of an organization with
competing principles of legitimacy. Just like the photo-
graphic study, this section is concerned with the relation
between organization and fields. Goffman's (1959)
notion of team is applicable to both the organization at
large and the individual departments or work groups.
Several organizational members testify to the ambiguity
of group boundaries after the conversion into a group
with subsidiary companies:

I think that when we were broken up and distribution became a com-
pany on its own, we turned into 'us' and 'them'. I think it felt more like
an inclusive 'we' before. *(woman, production)*

A man calls the mix of cultures within the group a
"witches' cauldron", "that has to be cooked a little bit
more". A central theme with respect to the break up into
subsidiary companies and team performances is the lack
of any clear ideas as to goals and strategies. As should be

334

obvious from the preceding description of differences in principles of legitimacy, some people emphasize solely economic results, whereas others, alongside profits also stress "quality". It often seems as if organizational members (especially those lower in the organizational hierarchy) avoid getting into a discussion of company objectives and values because they are only too aware of these discrepancies. In spite of a current executive program that is supposed to arrive at a set of common values that the organization stands for, it looks as if "values" will remain a complicated issue as long as there are conflicting definitions of the field (film field vs. media field), and, by extension, different capital compositions. An indicator of this complexity is the fact that only organizational members from the economic capital-intensive sector of the organization want to have a list of company values. Others, advocating cultural capital, oppose any such instrument, often with reference to the advantages of direct communication. If any goal or value is to be adopted, the team cannot assume a rich definition of the situation but would have to adhere to a "thin party line" (Goffman 1959), despite the range of principles of legitimacy among the organizational members of Sandrew Metronome. Perhaps the company benefits from the vagueness surrounding goals, objectives and values since this vagueness enables the organizational members to adapt to a variety of situations; endorsing whatever goals or values (i.e., principles of legitimacy) that the situation calls for. This is something I will return to in chapter 13. The ambiguity concerning team position may nevertheless have an impact on how individuals perform taste in their work.

As Goffman (ibid.) notes, performances may often serve to express the properties of the task, regardless of the individual's opinion about his or her performance (see

p. 92). The dependency and familiarity that characterize these team relations may cause problems for the organization and its members when the ambiguity about the company goals and values give rise to uncertainty about how to stage the individual performances. Then, any organizational member could give away the performance by presenting a set of goals or values other than those his or her teammembers endorse, for example by presenting quality film as the sole or main focus of the company. Thus, in order to avoid ruining the performance and the espoused impression of reality, a shared team position should be established before the individual members take a stand. The familiarity rights of organizational members at Sandrew Metronome include knowing about the ruptures between various departments, as well as between film and video, which are often due to diverse capital compositions.

CHAPTER SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

I began by identifying a field transformation from *film field* to a larger *media field* where one of the owners, the Anders Sandrew Foundation, represents the film field, and the other owner, Schibsted, the media field. These two fields are both subfields within the field of cultural production, a field where all practices are situated along the two poles of legitimacy, the economic and the cultural pole. As much as there has been a field transformation, so too has a field repositioning taken place in the overall field of cultural production. However, this repositioning is only partial. The ambiguity regarding the organization's position implies that departments, individuals (depending on position within the organization), and, possibly, situations may evoke different poles of legitimacy. Stressing the precedence of economic cap-

ital over cultural capital or their equal importance, executives who attempt to pin down the company goals clearly point in the direction of a shift towards the economic pole. This tendency is however not manifested in the general descriptions of the organization and its members. When it comes to these accounts, organizational members who lean towards the cultural pole or with a mixed capital composition (mostly from "the old Sandrews") have the prerogative of interpretation, emphasizing a shared footing in the cultural world. An examination of the various departments shows a prevalence of the cultural capital principle of legitimacy, alongside the economic principle, primarily in production departments, exhibition departments, and, to a limited extent, in film distribution departments. Representatives of the economic capital-intensive distribution department are apt to stay away from overall descriptions of the organization, somehow treating the other departments as being "too culturally versed" and still too entrenched in film field thinking.

In an effort to examine not only how organizational members combine the two principles of legitimacy, but also how thoroughly they rely on either pole, I studied constructions of meaningfulness along the two poles. Around the economic pole, organizational members often linger on the importance of entertainment for people. Higher up in the hierarchy, a position near the same pole prompts meaningfulness constructed in terms of money, results and relations to work teams. Closer to the cultural pole, organizational members highlight the provision of experiences for the audience, or a content-driven film with a unique film expression. Results are also mentioned, as a given feature of corporate life, but hardly as something that contributes to making the job meaningful.

The photographic study then explores the relation between the organization and the fields. In highlighting sociability, descriptions of photos of social spaces such as the canteen and of co-workers were interpreted as features of *organizational* life rather than as consequences of field struggles. Hence, the photographic study stresses the disconnection between content and form in the organizational arena, sociability representing the autonomy of *form* (Simmel 1949 [1911]). Likewise, film is often brought up positively as an interaction medium rather than as a means for distinction, further underscoring the significance of sociability in the organizational arena. Yet, it should be emphasized that the photographic study was conducted in the commercially oriented distribution department where distinction based on film is not expected to be extensive. Positive field-related descriptions seemed to be related to the cultural principle of legitimacy to a somewhat higher degree than to the corresponding economic one. Conversely, and more pertinently, far more negative factors emanate from the economic pole than the cultural pole, according to my photographers. In brief, one could say that the cultural pole is quite often used to legitimize the organization, its films and one's work. I also note in passing that Bourdieu's (1993) description of the economic pole as external and negatively connotated is consistent with how most organizational members account for their experiences in the organizational arena. However, this is less clearly the case among executives who tend to legitimize the organization through economic capital.

Roughly speaking, the gender structure seems equally strong at either pole, something that leads me to explore in greater detail some of the processes behind these structures in the upcoming chapter where I focus on taste at

work. The photographic study suggests different working conditions between men and women in the organization.

It is difficult to conduct team performances as these rely on a "thin party line", which precludes the rich definition of the situation required for an organization with two competing principles of legitimacy. In chapter 13 I will relate team performances, or the lack thereof, to the taste performances by individual organizational members, and also, to a more indepth discussion of the dichotomous construction of the economic and cultural pole.

The competing and still changing field definitions obviate the emphasis on the field idiosyncrasy, which is common in industries where very little in terms of formal qualifications distinguish that particular field from others (see for example Alvesson and Köping 1993). By the same token, it makes sense that the representatives of "the old Sandrews" stress their own peculiarity more than others, previously having been part of a distinctive field, namely the film field. Their historical association with the clearly defined film field may be the reason why the Sandrews people have a prerogative of interpretation regarding overall descriptions of the organization (see p. 286). More important, the vague definition of field also implies that agents of the organization may be struggling hard to affect the rules of the game by questioning the value of the capital that they lack, by, for example, downplaying the necessity of knowing film, or, in the converse case, of having a business education.

Furthermore, the varying capital compositions in the organization, along with the differing requirements from one situation to the next, imply that organizational members will sometimes have difficulties in finding a suitable front (emphasizing either cultural or economic

capital, or both), and that they will at times perform in an idealized way, underplaying certain aspects of their activities or rationales (see p. 82). These idealized performances may for example include appearing business-oriented while censoring any interest in film as an art. Or, they may involve espousing of film as a cultural expression which requires cinema theaters for screenings, while construcing all other media as redundant and inappropriate to bringing out the cultural qualities of the film. I will bring with me the notion of idealized performances when I turn to the topic of constructions and uses of taste in the upcoming chapter.

53. IHM is a privately owned training institute with a business focus and a website that heralds an education provided by representatives of the business community (see www.ihm.se).

54. *Amélie* (2001), *American Pie* (1999), *Italian for Beginners* (2000).

55. However, since I want to restrict my use of the questionnaire (see p. 198 and 208), I only draw on it to describe the production department.

56. When the properties of the occupants of a particular position change, such a position may be "creatively redefined" to a certain degree, depending on the elasticity of the original definition as well as the social origins of the new occupants. In order to avoid downclassing, some representatives of the young bourgeoisie generation tend to move into either "indeterminate" existing professions or new professions (Bourdieu 1984). Locating such professions, Bourdieu points at the creative industries: "This 'creative redefinition' is therefore found particularly in the most ill-defined and professionally unstructured occupations and in the newest sectors of cultural and artistic production, […] where jobs and careers have not yet acquired the rigidity of the older bureaucratic professions and recruitment is generally done by co-option, that is, on the basis of 'connections' and affinities of habitus, rather than formal qualifications." (ibid., p. 151)

57. The reason for assuming some feeling of meaningfulness was that I did not want my interviewees to feel questioned, or become offended and therefore defensive. I did not ask for degrees of meaningfulness, just what aspects made it meaningful.

58. *Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon* (2000).

59. However, such a view conflicts with mainstream institutional theory within organization studies (see for example Meyer and Rowan 1977, Scott 1995, Sjöstrand 1995).

60. *Hero* (2002), a Chinese art house film that received very good reviews in Swedish and international newspapers. See for example Manohla Dargis' review in *New York Times* August 27, 2004.

Taste at work

Following the merger, the organization transformed out of the film subfield into the media subfield, and underwent a repositioning in the overall field of cultural production, which testifies to a growing emphasis on external economic principles of legitimization. By the same token, "results", "rationality", and "measurements" are repeatedly stressed by managers and organizational members from the distribution department. Echoing Weber's writings on the relation between modernity and instrumental rationality where means become ends in themselves (Weber 1930), many researchers have highlighted this tendency towards a more economic rationale in the field of cultural production (see, for example, Greenberg 1963, Adorno 1978, Stenström 2000, Chong 2002). In brief, Weber argues that in Western capitalism, everything that has to do with religion, traditions, values and beliefs is increasingly perceived as irrational. Characteristic of instrumental rationality is the economic view of humanity as means-ends driven, i.e., calculability of risk and profit determines choices and actions. Scientific management assisted in increasing control through science and technology. Furthermore, instrumental rationality rests on the assumption of stability. Thus, bureaucratic structures are emphasized, and similarly, the impersonal is preferred to the personal. I interpret instrumental rationality as a fundamental feature of Gesellschaft (Tönnies 1979 [1887], Asplund 1991, see also chapter 7, p. 145).

Still, the importance of taste is conceptualized as *typical*, and sometimes even a defining feature, of the field of cultural production (Bourdieu 1993) and is likewise considered vital by the CEO of Sandrew Metronome:

Taste is always important. If you start to speculate about the market, for example, who wants this type of film? it's very difficult. [...] Of

course taste is really important. You can't judge anything without being subjective. You can never... those who enter the film world and believe that they can calculate when an investment is going to be paid back, they could just start doing something else. You can't do that. You can never assess an acquisition of a film and say: 'this is going to do well'. It just doesn't work that way. Of course you can't disregard the finances, but the greater part of it is made up of irrational factors. Such as taste. *(man, senior manager)*

I will now proceed to examine how organizational members perform taste in an organization subject to the changes described above. To approach these issues, some definitions seem to be required. Restricting myself to "work-related performances of taste", I try to make it clear that my endeavor is not to conduct a *reading* of the manifestation of taste among the organizational members. In other words, without denying the importance of studies on taste in terms of clothes, as well as of cultural consumption outside of the organizational setting, my ambition is to analyze how my subjects relate to taste in their work. The reasons behind this focus is the fact that the location of the organization in the field of cultural production makes this relation to taste a distinguishing mark of many of the jobs offered in the organization. Again, I am of course restricted to discursive accounts of taste performances.

The preceding chapter showed that the two poles of legitimization are used differently by organizational members depending on their position and department. For example, it became clear that although the cultural pole provides meaningfulness for many of the organizational members and, moreover, serves as a basis for the description of the organization at large, the economic pole dominates management's goal definitions and legitimizes the negative aspects of the everyday work situation experienced by organizational members. Drawing on Goffman's division of definitional labor, I would like

to add that the principle of legitimization triggered might also hinge on situation and the question at hand.

Conceptualized as an operationalization of cultural capital (Bourdieu 1984), taste is, according to the dominant rules of the game, located and legitimized at the cultural pole. In this chapter, I will leave the definition of taste open and examine how the organizational members construct and perform taste in the organization. This involves attending to their associations to "taste" (i.e., their local constructions of taste), as well as practices that, based on the theoretical framework in Part I of this dissertation, are to be regarded as taste performances. In addition, I will take a particularly close look at the relation between gender and taste performances. As I mentioned in chapter 10, despite the conceptualization of the field of cultural production as an inverted "economic world" (Bourdieu 1993), the gender order in the field of cultural production, at least in the Swedish context, mirrors the order in the economic field (see p. 17). As we saw in chapter 10 (p. 253), the gender structures in Sandrew Metronome show considerably more men on top positions (i.e., gender hierarchy), and also, the gendering of departments and positions (i.e., gender segregation).

On the basis of my interviews I have been able to identify a few, sometimes competing, performances of taste in the organization; *talk of taste as an interaction medium*, *a professional approach to taste*, *distinctive taste*, *balancing taste and market potential*, and *taste as a resource for market knowledge or influence*. Whereas the first is *form*-based, the others are linked to either the cultural or the economic pole. *A professional approach to taste* is related to the economic pole, *distinctive taste* and *balancing taste and market potential* both belong to the cultural pole. *The taste as a resource for market*

knowledge or influence obviously comes in two versions, one for each principle of legitimacy. I will present my material in a way that is fairly consistent with the discussion of principles of legitimacy in the previous chapter: I regard the production departments as located by the cultural pole, and the distribution departments as situated by the economic pole, while I assume that the exhibition department is located somewhere in between (and, thus, I will be susceptible to what role each individual from this department has in the organization, and what principle of legitimacy that position implies, when I place them under the respective headings). Before turning to these taste performances, I would however like to present some themes from the interviews that concern the origins and definition of taste according to the organizational members. Most pertinent are the idiosyncratic constructions of taste and some situational / social perspectives on taste.

WHAT IS TASTE?

Frequently, and not surprisingly considering the context of my inquiry, my interviewees equate the concept of taste with *film taste*.

The majority of the organizational members express difficulties in identifying the origins of taste. Conceding that it is a tricky task, they often claim that it has partly to do with "where you come from" and partly to do with "what kind of person you are". For example, one woman from video distribution claims that you may "be a person of strong or weak opinions". An idiosyncratic view of taste, where it is conceptualized as something unchangeable and fixed to a person, prevails along both poles of legitimacy in the organization. I interpret this

348

notion of taste as resting on self-as-character rather than self-as-performer (Goffman 1959). Thus, "what kind of person you are" and whether you are "a person of strong or weak opinions" is based on the character performed in everyday interactions.

Sporadically, a competing construction of taste surfaces; taste is then conceptualized as hinging on the number of films one has seen. One woman among my interviewees also points at the possibility of one's taste being influenced by other forms of cultural consumption, for example, reading.

Some of the organizational members representing both cultural and economic capital stress "situational" aspects of the reception of cultural objects. In doing so, they take on a more sociological view of taste, highlighting its social features. These people either work in acquisitions or in film marketing. Thus, they have visited numerous exhibitions and festivals or they have arranged test screenings and dealt with various target audiences. From this they have learned how audiences may react differently to the same cultural product. One man from the production department explains that he thinks that you have to take into account your own experience of the film, a process that requires some self-reflection; what made the film appeal to you in the first place? According to him, taste is important, but you must remember that even if you find a film lovely, it may still flop at the box office. Referring to something called "the festival illness", he describes situations where the audience affects one's perception of a film. At a film festival, seeing a film with a press audience may imply exceptional silence in the theater, whereas watching a film at night with a typical festival audience often entails extraordinary reactions to the film. My interviewee tells

me that festival audiences consisting solely of filmloving people tend to laugh and marvel at all places where an ordinary audience does not.

This description from the relatively speaking cultural capital-intensive part of the organization also points at different dispositions for film involvement, signaling that only relatively cultural capital rich people can *fully* appreciate a film (that is not to say that "ordinary" audiences cannot appreciate a film). Moreover, a woman from film distribution claims that although she now has a sense of the taste of different critics as well as of various organizational members, both groups sometimes surprise her. She believes that has to do with the impact of one's state of mind on the movie experience.

You perceive a film as good or bad not only because of its qualities but also owing to your state of mind. So sometimes people surprise me by saying 'I didn't like it at all, the film you thought I would like'. But I think it has to do with the situation more than anything else. *(woman, film distribution)*

Highlighting the social aspects of taste, these organizational members still do not problematize at all the reproduction of social structures through the monopolization of taste (Bourdieu 1984). Although they often get into lengthy discussions about some people in the organization being snobbish (for example, when describing situations when taste is important, see p. 361), they leave out aspects of hierarchy and power in direct questions about taste. However, by asking a set of questions on the theme of taste and its usage in the organizational arena and in everyday work, I have identified several work-related practices. Let me start with taste as an interaction medium.

Almost all of my interviewees assign great importance to film as a common interest among the organizational members. Linking the assistant of the finance department to the movie theater director, film is often seen as something everyone can join in and have something to say about. It functions as a least common denominator, what Lindgren (1992) calls a communicative element. Likewise, other cultural products (tv, literature, theater, music) are also discussed during lunch breaks and social gatherings, at those arenas for sociability (see Simmel 1949 [1911], 1950) identified in the photographic study (see p. 331).

A woman in the production department points to the sociability function of talk of taste by illustrating how views on films are exchanged: "Have you seen it? Did you like it? Isn't he good, that actor? It's great that they're doing that movie." She says the talk is often slightly negative when it concerns films from other organizations. For example, a statement such as "[the competitor] is making that film, that is bound to fail, isn't it?" may be a manifestation of jealousy, which is what the interviewee herself believes, but it may also be a means to draw the team boundaries. A few of my interviewees point out that although they always divulge their "personal" opinion of the films, these views are seldom expressed in more elaborate terms than "I like it" / "I don't like it". "We rarely analyze the films more deeply than that", says a woman from the exhibition company. Instead, she says that they move on to discuss "everything around the film", such as the launch and the cinemas. This may be interpreted as regulations against intense mutual involvement among a subset of organizational members (Goffman 1963), as some topics of

conversation, e.g., more indepth discussions of the content of the films, cannot be sustained by all the interactants (primarily those with less cultural capital).

Managers often stress the role of having as a core business something that everyone can relate to and talk about, claiming that this helps smooth communication. Organizational members often regard the talk of taste as an important source for market knowledge, a topic I will return to below. Some people near the cultural pole underline the value of wider cultural consumption, for example, literature, music, theater and television (adding that television is the main source of income for the company nowadays), in order to stay attuned to cultural trends.

In separating between "oracles" and "normal consumers", some organizational members call attention to the cultural pole. It is generally felt that both categories are needed, but views on the power relation between these two groupings differ. Some people claim that the film buffs constitute an important asset by informing the rest of the organization about film titles, whereas others regard the information asymmetry as an important medium of power. I will go more into detail on this topic in the following pages. Similarly, "oracles" or "film buffs" are constructed differently depending on their wealth in cultural capital. In the distribution departments, film buffs are often knowledgeable about all kinds of films and likewise endorse a wide range of films. In the departments richer in cultural capital, film buffs often have more specialized preferences (art house films) although they claim to like some "high quality" blockbuster films as well.

Still, talk of taste as an interaction medium is not on the agenda of one or two organizational members. One female manager from the film distribution company claims that there is "little time to go around small talking. The work load does not allow that".

In the discussion of pole-specific taste performances that now follows, I will first cover taste performances typical of the economic pole. Then, I turn to those typical of the cultural pole, and, finally, I bring the discussion of taste performances in the organization to a close with a section on taste as a resource for market knowledge or influence, which will reveal different constructions of the market.

A "PROFESSIONAL" APPROACH TO TASTE

Endorsing a "professional" approach to taste, many interviewees describe how they leave their "private taste" behind. The defining characteristic of the "professional" take on taste seems in fact to be the ability to avoid being too influenced or "carried away" by one's "personal taste", according to several organizational members. The impact of "personal taste" is seen as inimical to the business interests of the organization. One man from the distribution department emphasizes that he prefers not to be surrounded by "film freaks", as you

[…] shouldn't be misled by your personal taste, you shouldn't let your taste determine things in business life. Unfortunately, that may happen, but you have to try to understand what your customers think about [different films]. […] Many times, I'm thinking 'I would never go and see that', but since it's easy to make money on it… You can have your personal taste, but it shouldn't affect your decisions. If you're the servant of the people you should let the people's taste be decisive. Give people what they want! *(man, senior manager distribution)*

Thus, he seems to base his argument on the idea that marketers could identify what consumers want in terms of cultural products (cf. "taste and numbers" in Chong 2002), defying the construction of an uncertain demand (see reference to Caves 2000 on p. 178). And, although he does not say it explicitly, he may construct "film freaks" as only rich in cultural capital and thus commercially *disinterested*. This "professional approach" to taste is advocated by distribution people in general, and by video people in particular, i.e., by the economic capital and the Gesellschaft representation. Similarly, a woman from the video distribution department says that she cannot recall any situation in which her taste has influenced a decision. Rather, she says that she attaches great importance to "the ability to picture the product from the customer's point of view".

However, there are instances of this kind of "professionalism" in the exhibition departments as well. For example, a cinema programmer says that he does not think that his film taste is important in his job. Although he prefers a certain type of films, for example, *Moulin Rouge* (2001), "the best film of the year",

[…] that doesn't affect what kind of films I book in our theaters [to any greater extent]. […] You can't let [your taste] take charge. You have to evaluate differently […], not what you think is good. [The latter] is not exactly the same thing as what the big audience wants.[61] *(man, exhibition)*

In the sales department, one man expresses concern regarding the employees' ability to "step out of" their own taste and to view the film "from outside" so that they are able to address questions such as: Who would want to see this film, and who can buy it? A customer must never know that you as a seller think the film is a turkey, he points out. Likewise, a film marketer cautions against

allowing yourself to "dominate the film politics and marketing with your own taste". According to him, remaining "neutral" and "unneurotic" is critical when you work in film. By the same token, a video marketer says:

Taste is one of the most difficult things in this job. If you really love a certain kind of films and you get films that you personally don't like, it's really difficult ... When you sell, when you think in marketing terms, you have to forget your own taste completely. I regard films in terms of numbers. That's what I do. I contemplate if the film is commercial. I look at statistics. *(man, video distribution)*

A sales person reckons that "money talks", construing the value of a film as directly related to ticket sales. Coming from the same strand, an exhibition manager expresses irritation at the dismissal of consumers' taste as banal, when, according to him, these consumers' willingness to pay for tickets / videos constitutes the basis of the organization.

Troubled professionals

As much as "the professional approach" is endorsed by the distribution people throughout the organization, so too is it a contested stance, among both its advocates and its natural opponents closer to the cultural pole. The man from the sales department cited above confesses to the difficulties involved in trying to sell something that you do not like:

I don't like horror movies and we have a movie I just can't see. It's a guy with a mask and a huge knife, and I can only take ten minutes of it. I can't make it. I'm the worst when it comes to evaluating a movie like that. So, in that case, I have to listen to others. *(man, video distribution)*

A woman working in the marketing department says that she has become a professional movie viewer over the years.

I sit thinking of what target audience one could have, I'm going over problems of censorship, I'm constantly worried about the unifying theme – have they lost it?, I'm thinking of lost tempo, etc. Sometimes it's a bit sad, I wish I could just put aside all those professional thoughts and just take in the film. But it's a professional injury. *(woman, film distribution)*

Although she claims that she has a "professional eye" when watching the films, she still expresses some worries regarding the homogeneity among the marketing people. The film marketing department consists of five women of about the same age and life situation. This means, according to the woman quoted above, that some movies, for example teenage movies, appeal to none of them. "Even though I feel like leaving after thirty minutes of a movie where every other word is "fuck", there might still be a vast audience for such a movie", she says. In light of what she regards as "the shortcoming" of being too much alike and sometimes "too subjective", the women in the film marketing department rely on test screenings for the target audience.

A man from the film distribution department comments on his role as a leader when it comes to promoting a professional approach to taste in the organization:

You have to involve yourself. That's what you do as a boss. […] so that [people's] personal taste doesn't affect [our decisions]. Often, I think people try to do some kind of [personal] lobbying [for a film]. That's one of the most difficult things. If you know that your subordinate has a very strong personal taste and opinion, and you know that things are starting to go wrong, [it's very difficult] to get him to realize that he's going in the wrong direction. You want to avoid having to tell him 'don't do it that way'. *(man, senior manager distribution)*

Along with the oft-stressed skill of "stepping outside" of your personal taste, there is a persistent emphasis on having "broad taste", i.e., a taste profile that never conflicts with the assortment of titles offered by the com-

pany. In other words, the adherents of this latter position fit the idea that "personal taste" is important to job performance into the keyhole of "the professional approach to taste". In the sales department, a man says that he is very traditional and simple in his taste. With his very broad taste, he does not risk hyping a title out of the mainstream nor imposing his own taste on the customers, something he articulates concern over. Thus, he has covered himself against being "accused" of unprofessionalism (from not "stepping out" of his own taste) and for having narrow, unrepresentative taste (in case one's "personal taste" does matter after all). The ambivalence regarding the professional approach to taste is further manifested in organizational members' occasional questioning of the professionalism (in terms of taste) of employees of other organizations. For example, the same sales person elaborates on the professionalism of some of his customers:

I often realize that they lower the volumes of titles that they don't like. Art house films, films that didn't go to the movies. They think it's just another b-film. For example, *Sånger från andra våningen*, was one of those films that customers were very cautious about. But today they've bought substantially more than they once thought. It's good that things like that happen too. Sometimes you have to take everything back. They have bought too much of a title. Sometimes they weigh in too much of their personal taste. So it has to do with how professional you are.[62] *(man, video distribution)*

Another man from the sales department claims that the sales personnel have never been hired just because of their broad film interest, or on account of their film interest at all. Even so, he acknowledges the role of the taste of the sales personnel:

You still take notice of it. For example, we've had this rental title, *Witchblade*, it's about some cartoon figure, it's a fantasy-oriented film. Now, it turns out that Benny loves these fantasy films. So he made a staggering sales record on a relatively small film. And there are more

examples like that, if you, as a seller, love a film, and speak very favorably about it. I think it has to be like that. [...] I mean, the big titles, for example, *Livvakterna*, *Swordfish*, *3000 Miles to Graceland*, you sell based on actors, movie figures, etc. Your own taste may be of less importance in that case. The customers know what kind of product it is. [...] But when you turn to smaller titles, that the customer hasn't seen, hasn't had the time to see, you have to bring the film to life: 'You have to see this because of this and that.' [63] *(man, video distribution)*

Thus, it seems as if using your taste is sometimes ok or even welcome. In this case the sales person in question managed to sell an economic capital-intensive title[64], although small, by being able to talk positively about it in an allegedly "genuine" way. Furthermore, a representative of the film distribution explains: "what I think we're best at, here at film distribution, is that we try to have a *different* taste – that is not too much taste. We speak of what works". Thus, he assumes the right to define just what "different taste" is. Just like the salesman cited before, he covers himself against "too much taste" by claiming a very broad taste. "The people who do well in the music and film industry are the ones who have a taste which coincides with the company products". Stating that his personal taste is very similar to the selection of titles available in the company, he adds: "I don't only like German movies from the beginning of the century".

Professional enthusiasm

A marketer in the video department steers our talk into the significance of enthusiasm when I raise the topic of taste. Arguing that taste matters quite a lot, he goes on to say that the more enthusiastic you are about a title, the better campaign ideas you will come up with. This is in line with the "democreatic" construction of creativity that I regard as typical of the distribution departments

(see p. 295); enthusiasm may be seen as one way to trigger creativity. However, the interviewee claims that an individual organizational member's enthusiasm for a film is not only vital to what ideas he or she will generate for the marketing campaign, but also to the perception of the film throughout the organization and by extension by the customers.

If you're enthusiastic about a film it usually spreads. Maybe you run down to Bjorn, or the girls at Ordering. It doesn't have to be to the sellers, the point is that you're spreading your enthusiasm. If you get them enthusiastic about a film and you've given them a copy to watch, then they will start to 'bubble'. The following day they will say 'it was great, that film'. The rumor starts to spread. People are thinking, 'so maybe I should watch that film'. What once may have been thought of as a strange, small title may have become a film that the whole department is enthusiastic about. Then, one only has to spread the same rumor to the sellers so that a domino effect will take place. *(man, video distribution)*

He goes on to distinguish between two sorts of enthusiasm, a distinction that parallels the aforementioned division between "personal" and "professional taste". On one hand, he says, there is "personal enthusiasm": "This is exactly my kind of film. I love films about talking dogs". On the other hand, there is "professional enthusiasm": "Even if you can't get it yourself, you may be professionally enthusiastic about a film, realizing that there is a target audience for that particular film." He illustrates this with a title called *100 Girls* (2000). Despite being far from his favorite film, he thinks that all he has to do is reach out to a particular target audience because he finds this film very similar to *American Pie* (1999), which lots of teenage boys loved. Only "professional enthusiasm" can guide the film in the right direction. Referring to the notion of professional enthusiasm, he rejects the idea that one needs broad taste for this job. But he admits "having broad taste may make the job more enjoyable for yourself since you have to see all films. If you only like black-and-white Hungarian movies, it may be a tough job after a

while, having to watch all the other movies."

Once again, however, a general ambivalence to taste in the organization materializes when a representative of the distribution department tries to separate between "professional" and "personal" aspects of taste. Underscoring the import of having the sales personnel see the various films, he acknowledges that in comparison with other businesses, these sales personnel have a constant flow of products to try. In highlighting the construction of the infinite possibilites for variation, he points out that the task of the sales personnel of a film company differs considerably from that of organizations in the fast-moving consumer goods industries.

If you sell Coca-Cola, you don't need to taste it every time you're selling, it's enough to taste those five flavors you've got. But our sellers have to watch [films] each time because every product is unique. They can't sell through fake enthusiasm. It will be seen through in a second. So it's very important that the sellers see every film. [If they see it early] they may talk up *A.I.* already in the preceding sales round: 'next time I'll bring *A.I.*'. In that way, you've already built a foundation, you've got an opening for next time. *(man, video distribution)*

In this context he rejects the idea of "faked enthusiasm", which could be seen as another name for "professional enthusiasm" so that abandoning your "personal opinion" is sole defining characteristic of the latter. Apparently, "professional enthusiasm" requires some sincerity, i.e., having seen the film, but not perhaps the sincerity of the enthusiasm.

To conclude, for now, it is very common among some of my male interviewees from the distribution department to maintain that they themselves possess the ability to separate between private and professional, whereas other people's ability to do so is often strongly cast into doubt (especially those further away in the organization).

If we, for a moment, return to the discussion of film buffs and "normal consumers" that I initiated under the heading of "talk of taste as an interaction medium" (see p. 352), I would like to pick up the thread of film buffs with specialized preferences for, above all, art house films. This category of film buffs use taste in a *distinctive* manner à la Bourdieu (1984). Put differently, taste talk functions as a *power resource* for them in the organization. Many interviews demonstrate that certain people in the organization feel subordinated in relation to the organizational members with a more "sophisticated taste" (i.e., more cultural capital). One director, from the economic pole of the organization, explains that this hierarchy makes people with different backgrounds in terms of work experience and education (i.e., other than film or culture) more cautious when it comes to statements regarding film.

We know that [our opinions] are not valued as highly as those of others. On the other hand, most people, even those that are very knowledgeable in film, realize that it is important to recognize everyone's opinion since people will be buying this. So in that sense, people are prepared to listen to everyone. But I would hesitate twice before engaging in a discussion of a film in detail, for example, regarding the performance of an actor, the direction, or something like that. I wouldn't have the courage to do that. There is a hierarchy, and some snobbery; certain films are just considered better and others worse. I sometimes find that a bit irritating. It's too bad that there is that side [to our business]. *(man, senior manager exhibition)*

Juxtaposed with the following statement from a long-time employee from "the old Sandrews" (i.e., from the cultural pole), taste emerges as a source of power.

You often have lunch with pretty much the same group of people. This group of people I eat with, they don't have any problem expressing their opinions. *(woman, production)*

Conceding the likelihood that film talk in general makes some organizational members feel very insecure, she nevertheless recognizes her position in the hierarchy. Along similar lines, a senior manager claims that because the organizational members know each other very well, he finds it unnecessary to bring up what has been said on *Kulturnytt* [65] with certain coworkers. Another organizational member says that she only trusts the taste of a select few in the organization: "if someone whose taste I don't share or care about says 'this was a wonderful film', it doesn't make any difference to me. God, maybe I wouldn't think so at all."

Prerogative of interpretation

A director of production, who stresses the importance of cultural consumption, and who apparently entertains a great interest in film himself, says he does not think that the organizational atmosphere is intimidating for newcomers. He characterizes the organizational atmosphere as "open and unpretentious", declaring that it was this feeling that once brought him to the organization. Irrespective of the purportedly humble atmosphere, other people in the organization identify him as someone who believes he has a very good taste, "he's culture personified", says one woman, most likely referring to Williams' third sense of culture (see p. 170). A woman from a department close to the cultural pole says a propos taste snobbery, that few people among those dealing with film would stand up and say that they like Schwarzenegger and the like. "They're a bit snobbish", she says. A group of managers in the department close to the cultural pole collect art and are considered cultural snobs by some other organizational members. Yet, when asked to describe their taste these managers also claim to

have a very broad taste. One interpretation of this is that these interviewees realize the problems associated with having a distinctive taste in an organization that also operates according to economic principles (see the introductory chapter on p. 16 and Erickson's (1996) discussion on domination and coordination on p. 127), and therefore they discursively reject having a cultural capital-based distinctive taste. Rarely exposing themselves to comparisons with others in the organization, it could however also be that this group of managers close to the cultural pole experience themselves as having a broad taste. They may regard their taste as broad because they determine what films are acquired and what films are produced. In other words, they have the interpretive prerogative regarding what films are to be considered. It is hardly surprising, then, that these are the people whose taste other organizational members trust as good estimates of what is going to work, and what has "both artistic value and commercial value", as a film marketer puts it.

In general, the group of managers considered cultural snobs by many others in the organization are quite old. With a background in "the old Sandrews", they epitomize the Gemeinschaft, and may, because of their interpretive prerogative when it comes to taste, keep others from entering the same positions by the cultural pole.

The snobs are elsewhere

Some managers further away from the cultural pole argue that there is snobbery in the organization and, especially in the industry, but not in their particular department or company. Says one manager:

Of course there is [snobbery]. Not that it's disturbing, but in certain situ-

ations it surfaces. It's easy to see through though. It is present in some people. It's tempting to think that they like films that in some way *seem* refined, a little too much. But I wouldn't say that our particular organization suffers so much from it. *(man, senior manager distribution)*

Likewise, in these companies towards the economic pole and above all in non-Swedish companies, there is great emphasis on making do without too many snobs – "people who prefer 'Woody Allen films' to commercial films". One financial manager completely discards the notion of snobbery in her company. A few interviewees argue that journalists are much snobbier when it comes to film taste than the people at Sandrew Metronome. "It's not so politically correct to like certain films. You cannot give a '5' to a big commercial film which really isn't about anything", says one woman in film distribution. Although she somehow points at the cultural capital-based principle of legitimization, she does not enlarge on the topic. Nor does she discuss it in the organization. One man, a marketer, who has worked in the creative industries his whole life, says that there are a lot of people who like to consider themselves as opinion leaders or "gurus", but he thinks those people can be found in any business. Still, along with several others, he refers to the people at the cultural pole as the "most experienced" in the organization, and people to whom you ought to listen. In doing so, he reproduces that status of those whose positions are legitimized through the cultural pole without mentioning their snobbery, only their knowledge and Gemeinschaft qualities (experience in the industry and contacts).

Presentation of oneself

A woman from film distribution admits that everyone may feel, from time to time, that they have to demonstrate that they are a little intellectual; "that they can take in

364

something else than *Terminator*". She thus highlights taste performances as strategies. Prior to discussing *balancing taste and market potential performance*, I will give some examples of the problems of balancing economic capital and cultural capital in everyday presentations of oneself in the organization, as conveyed by my interviewees.

Coming from a cultural vantage point, a long-time boss in the company formulates "the taste question":

Taste determines very much what you choose to go to production with. I mean it's not every film, even if you say that 'this could maybe be a success' that you want to put your name on. And that has to do with taste. So it's the balance between being commercial – believing that the product has a commercial possibility – and not sinking too low. That's what I would say is not the taste problem, but the taste question in this business. *(man, senior manager production)*

A woman from the cultural pole underlines that there are no taste police, but admits that organizational members sometimes "harass" each other by saying "how can you think so?" She adds, "But the atmosphere is very open, we're very tolerant." Coming from the cultural capital-intensive part of the organization, she does not notice any snobbery. "No, I really don't think it's snobbish. I was one of the few here who liked *The Lord of the Rings*. But maybe that was because it came from a competitor." Of course, the latter may be true, organizational members may prefer to praise films from Sandrew Metronome. However, this woman may be authorized to express a taste for a blockbuster film every once in a while just because of her relatively secure position by the cultural pole. The same taste performance may be considerably riskier for another organizational member with aspirations to advance along the cultural pole.

Prevalent in the organization is also a notion of taste as being tightly linked to knowledge of the specific cultural

365

sphere, i.e., film, something I also touched upon in the section on "film buffs" vs. "normal consumers" (see p. 352). Although never articulated, this concept of taste is often manifested as the distinctive practice based on cultural capital (Bourdieu 1984). For instance, a female manager in distribution expands on the topic of the incompatibility of sustaining one's self-image as knowledgeable in cinema while trying to sell a wide range of film titles. To use Goffman's terms, such a taste may give rise to substantial role distance (see Goffman 1961). While emphasizing that she did not take cinema studies herself, she asserts that she thinks there are certain rules that determine the quality of a film (she does not exemplify these rules though, but as she repeatedly returns to the topic of cinema studies she may well consider them as a guideline to these rules). Parenthetically, this belief is echoed by a couple of other interviewees from the economic pole of the organization who reflect on the definition of quality. Furthermore, the distribution manager regards this knowledge-based taste (i.e., cultural capital-based taste) as an organizational problem if the people who hold this kind of taste are in positions where they have to sell commercial products:

I think those people are afraid to claim that something [commercial] is good in front of a journalist despite the fact that that could help the film commercially. I think people are afraid of appearing to have trivial taste, or just plain wrong [taste]. That can be a drawback. But it varies from person to person. In the video department, the sales personnel are more like traditional sales people. They find the [sales] arguments without embarrassment. [...] I think it's very different from what it's like in the film division of the company. I believe it's more embarrassing to find the smoothing arguments when selling film. No one feels like claiming the film is any good. I think people are very scared of that. *(woman, senior manager video distribution)*

Thus, she points at the problems inherent to an organization that partly relies on the cultural principle of legitimization; the distinctive practice of taste among organ-

366

izational members may be seen as problematic by people from the other pole since they are often perceived to challenge or run against the economic principles of legitimacy on which the company goals rest. This problem of perceived disinterestedness in commercial matters of course also applies to situations where organizational members have to balance their taste and the market potential of the various titles, for example in acquisition and production.

BALANCING TASTE AND MARKET POTENTIAL

Organizational members by the cultural pole are also concerned about the relation between their own taste and the market potential of the products that they deal with. Often, they stress the need to recognize a *variety* of tastes. Furthermore, personal taste is generally considered a resource. Along these lines, a man from the film distribution department argues that while it is necessary to understand different kinds of tastes, it is also crucial to know the distinction between good and bad: "if you don't have any kind of taste in this business, that's a very bad thing because then you don't understand the films." As we will see, this approach entails the emphasis on experience over the use of statistics, in line with the Gemeinschaft orientation of this section of the organization. Although some citations seemingly resonate with the *professional approach to taste* in their emphasis on the separation between a personal taste and the market, people who represent the *balancing taste and market potential* approach never seem to strive to abandon fully their personal taste. Behind this difference lies an alternative construction of the market, to which I will soon turn.

A senior manager with considerable experience in film distribution and acquisitions says:

I think taste is very important. It means that you have a taste of your own. [...] it means that you like film. You have to separate between your personal, private taste and what you're paying for [when you acquire distribution rights]. I remember many films that I found amazing but which I would never buy. You have to be able to sell them. *(woman, senior manager distribution)*

According to this woman, trends and timing are central when assessing films. While she considers films in general, the cinema programmer quoted below casts light on the significance of taste when estimating art house films in particular.

Taste is incredibly important when it comes to quality film. Being able to predict what will get good reviews. That's the most important at Polar cinemas. [It's more about that] than about what is my personal favorite film. *(woman, exhibition)*

Drawing on experience

Without using any of the Gesellschaft vocabulary earlier described (characterized by wording such as "professional approach", or "stepping out of your own taste"), organizational members from the cultural pole often describe how they draw upon their *experience* of having seen a vast number of films when evaluating synopses, manuscripts or finished films. "If I only bought what I liked the most, [the selection of films] would be very, very narrow", says one woman. Nevertheless, they do not claim to "abandon" their "own" taste. Rather, organizational members near the cultural pole seem to attempt to balance their taste against their market experience in many work situations where they are required to relate to a "market".

In a similar vein, a woman in the production department says that she relies on her "experience, competence and gut feeling" when deciding on which ideas to proceed with.

When she receives a synopsis, she does a bit of research:

Who is this person? What has he or she done before? If someone pro-
poses a costume drama from the 19th century I will probably consider
it too expensive. There are a lot of factors that make us say no. But if
Lukas Moodysson sends us a costume drama from the 19th century we
would still say 'yes'. Do you get it? You have to use your whole breadth
of experience to judge the ideas.[66] *(woman, production)*

She tries to instigate projects by actively searching for
newcomers with promising ideas. Having told me about
her outgoing approach to her job, she does however
hedge her claims, saying that her view may not be repre-
sentative of the organization at large. "I don't think
Benny would agree with me, for example. Maybe he
would stress the money aspects a little bit more. It's of
course a mix of everything."

What is good film?

In the production department, the same manager that
talked about "the festival illness" (see p. 349) stresses the
point that films are not perceived as good or bad solely
on the basis of the audience and the social setting / situ-
ation. According to him, there are also some "objective"
parameters when it comes to evaluating film; a "good
production" can be characterized by certain objective
standards in terms of technique, direction, acting,
dramaturgy, etc. With a background in production, and
studies in general arts, this man represents a department
near the cultural pole, and thus, his reference to "object-
ive" criteria is in line with Bourdieu's conception of dis-
tinction (Bourdieu 1984). Together with a woman from
the production department, he is one of very few inter-
viewees who refer to production quality when address-
ing taste and the evaluation of films.

369

A senior manager of production who describes his taste as comprising just about everything save "crazy terminators" and very violent films, explains how he draws on his own taste in the film development process. As a rule, he wants the story to interest him and to encompass characters that he can relate to and identify with. If so, he knows "it's not rubbish". A bold interpretation is that he is less concerned with market experience / potential than with his own taste. A more modest interpretation is that the identification criterion may be a consequence of what, according to this interviewee, characterizes the films that have worked in "the market".

Frustration

The woman from the acquisitions department articulates a bit of frustration regarding the limited market potential for films that she really likes. Declaring that she often says, "oh, that's such a nice film, but we can't buy it", or "this was great, but no one will have the time to see it", she demonstrates how she has to take into account the likely market reception of the titles.

It could be that if people just went to see these films, they would love them, but how on earth do I get people to go and see that strange film from a strange country. A film where you don't have a celebrity name as far as the eye can see. And then, it's like you can't market it. It's more or less impossible. Then, you often say 'no thanks', even if it's really good. *(woman, production)*

Similarly, a senior manager says:

Almost every day you feel great frustration because of the difficulties in reaching out to the big audience with a certain kind of film that you think is extraordinary. [...] you're convinced that the audience would like [them] if they just came to the movie theaters. If only you were able to make them go to the theaters. That's not very easy though. *(man, senior manager)*

Pointing to the impossibility of marketing the cultural capial-intensive titles, the woman from the production department cited above confirms the notion of mainstream cinema (i.e., economic capital driven) as marketable and art house cinema (cultural capital-driven) as review driven (see chapter 11, p. 289). In the face of the uncertainty that supposedly characterizes the organization (see Caves 2000), she claims that it is not very easy to balance one's taste and the film's market potential:

After all, I think you have to like what you buy in one respect or another. I don't believe in speculating on other people's bad taste. I think you have to follow some kind of gut feeling. *So what is the drawback of speculating on other people's bad taste?* If it, in the end, doesn't work, then I think it's a twofold failure. It's one thing to buy a film that you really think is amazing, and then it doesn't work out; OK, it's nasty, but to buy crap that doesn't work and which doesn't even pay for itself, yes, that's a twofold failure. *(woman, production)*

As this citation testifies, organizational members near the cultural pole view the market as an enactment (Weick 1995) or a social construction (Berger and Luckmann 1966), something I will develop in the section below.

Furthermore, the same woman from the production department comments on the subjectivity inherent in the acquisition process:

[Bjorn and I] often have the same opinion, but it's essential to be conscious of one's own preferences and of not always being entirely representative. [...] but when we visit bigger film markets, it's not just us. We're accompanied by people from Norway, Denmark, and Finland. People who don't always agree with our opinions, they might have completely different opinions. So, we do have other opinions to weigh in. That's necessary because otherwise it would be... biased in some way. *(woman, production)*

Hence, this woman situated near the cultural pole underscores the necessity of avoiding a judgment that is too "subjective" or biased, that is similar to yet less assertive

371

than her colleague's judgment in the film marketing department (see p. 356). I would argue that these slight variations reflect different constructions of the market, something I will expand on next.

Before ending this section on the *balancing taste and market potential*, I want to stress that people with mixed capital compositions, primarily those in exhibition and in film distribution (see for example citations on p. 368), sometimes adopt taste performances which are close to the professional approach. Still, based on their overall take on taste at work, their relation to the market and their capital composition, I have located them here.

TASTE AS A RESOURCE FOR MARKET KNOWLEDGE OR INFLUENCE

The two taste performances, *a professional approach to taste* and *balancing taste and market potential*, which represent, respectively, the economic pole and cultural pole, reflect two distinct constructions of the market. The professional approach, endorsed by the distribution department and other economic capital-intensive parts of the organization, is based on a kind of disconnection between the organization and its market. Negotiating how the market is to be perceived, organizational members seem little concerned about how they "produce part of the environment they face" (Weick 1995, p. 30). The balancing taste and market potential approach, on the other hand, seems to stipulate that while one cannot abandon one's taste, one can actively construct and influence the market. In this section, I will give further examples of the two underlying logics by introducing a fifth taste performance, *taste as a resource for market knowledge or influence*, that can be divided into two subcat-

egories depending on underlying market construction.

Taste as a resource for market knowledge

Representatives of both the economic camp and the cultural camp, but predominantly the former, cast light on using the taste of organizational members as an indicator of market potential. This view of taste as a *resource for market knowledge* seems to rest on the notion that the organizational arena does not influence organizational members' taste performances. Thus, taste as it is practiced in the organization serves as an exploratory survey of film taste in the market.

Several organizational members acknowledge that talk of taste is a resource for market knowledge even in its present use as an *interaction medium*. Although some interactions over films may function as pure sociability (see Simmel 1949 [1911]), others may assume a more informative role. Recognizing that talk of taste is a resource for market knowledge, the identifier either temporarily abandons his or her role as an active participant in the interaction in order just to listen to what other interactants have to say about a particular title, or he or she asks direct questions regarding films. A production manager tells me that it is desirable that all organizational members enjoy film; it creates a common interest. For example, a visit to the accounting department may be accompanied by a conversation about a film that one of the employees just saw. In that way, this man from the production department receives input from sources outside of his own department. Describing the organization at large as a reflection of society rather than a small group of people harboring the same opinions, he argues that the different starting points, represented by the

373

employees throughout the organization, provide a good frame of reference for the organization's business.

Accordingly, from this perspective, all opinions are welcome and appreciated (see also citation above, p. 361). One such organizational member, a finance manager, whose main job does not relate directly to film acquisitions or estimates, says that she can only express what she personally thinks about a movie:

I don't know how to estimate what's commercial. Instead, I evaluate them based on my opinion. […] I understand that in this business you have to keep a cool head – if you're a cinema programmer you can't rely on your own taste though, you have to estimate. *(woman, exhibition)*

In one country, it is customary that all employees watch the films together when they are screened inhouse for the first time. This is done partly to overcome the division between film and video, partly to examine, at an early stage, the market potential for the title.

We watch the films together, the first time, all of us, here. It's very, very important that those from video are there at the first screening. I'm not sure that's the way they do it in the other countries, but we are very occupied with this. It could be that we watch a film that we, from the film distribution, call 'awful', but the video people say 'yes, it's good!' Not that they themselves regard them as that great, but they see a good film for their customers. […] You see, we can come out saying 'it's a great film, but it's not commercial'. I prefer that, that we have started to speak the same language. We could say, 'it's small, there's no money in it', and video could say, 'it's small, but there's a lot of money in it.' *(woman, senior manager distribution)*

This view differs from the description above of the organization as a pilot market. Instead, organizational members' diverse *experiences* are brought to light in a way that is similar to the taste performances discussed under the name of *balancing taste and market potential*.

Taste as a resource for market influence

Taking on a slightly more interactive perspective of the market, many interviewees assert that cultural consumption, for example, television, literature, music and entertainment in general can be drawn on as inspiration for films and marketing campaigns. Primarily, they refer to the cultural consumption of the organizational members, but from time to time, cultural consumption trends in society at large are brought to light. A quintessentially cultural capital-based taste performance, *taste as a resource for market influence* is however sometimes also used by people from the economic capital-intensive departments.

In addition to talking about having seen a lot of films (which can be utilized as reference points), a woman leaning towards the cultural pole defines the necessary competence for a job in acquisitions as being general interest and an open mind. This will, according to this woman, give the organizational member a "feel" for what is going to work in the market. From the perspective of the cultural pole, *taste as a resource for market influence* thus involves capturing cultural trends and either converting them into films or using them as indicators of what kind of films will work in the market. This is also true of the rare interviewee from the economic pole that acknowledges taste as a resource for market influence. One marketer (with a background in cultural studies) says of trends in music and literature: "It's all going to be reflected in films". In general, cultural pole people refrain from highlighting the employees as a test market.

Yet others from the cultural pole are less concerned with the present use of taste than the potential use of taste. A

375

woman in the production department fears that the management has lost touch with the youth culture, the culture that, in her opinion, the company subsists on. She says that despite not being so young, she has "at least managed to keep in touch with youth culture". Demonstrating the gap between the organization and youth culture outside of the organization, she refers to aspects of youth culture not present in the company:

There is no one interested in music in this company. I don't know anyone. Well, Benny has some interest in music, but I don't think there is any one else who would ask if you bought the latest album from The Plan, for example. Do you know who they are? So damn good. I don't think there is anyone here who even knows who they are. So, no music. *(woman, production)*

She thus recognizes youth culture's potential as a means to product development. Not only could an awareness of that particular culture improve marketing possibilities, but it could also facilitate the identification of new screenwriters, new directors and general trends (ideas, aesthetic expressions, topics, etc). Seemingly influenced by this woman (who also tells me that she has passed on her point of view to her boss), a senior manager emphasizes the importance of bringing in a new generation to the company.

Having expressed great frustration about balancing taste and market potential (see p. 370), another woman from the production department exemplifies how she and her co-workers have been able to influence the market from time to time.

There are so many films out there. A film must be distinct in some way, so that it stands out from the average film in the movie theaters. We have several [successful] examples, for instance *Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon*, which became our greatest success in several years. But no one believed in it in advance. 'A Chinese movie?' Then it was released and became a hit.[67] *(woman, production)*

She gives another example of a film that took the film industry by surprise, *Italian for Beginners* [68], the success of which allegedly derives from it being "sufficiently unique".

Moreover, a cinema programmer points to a general change over the last ten years where films that used to be considered non-commercial are gaining ground:

It's good to see that films that used to be considered out of the mainstream and non-commercial have found an audience. People don't just go to the big titles anymore. In return, I guess you could say that the blockbusters have lost a bit of their audiences. I mean, right now we have a million viewers for *Harry Potter*. That's just amazing. *The Lord of the Ring* also has a million visitors. There used to be more blockbusters, such as *Titanic*, *Sällskapsresan* and those films. But it last happened a long time ago. So, the number of cinemagoers seems to be constant but their distribution has changed. *Amélie* had 200 000 visitors, and *Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon* had 300 000 visitors. That's a change I have noticed. [69] *(woman, exhibition)*

I have sought to demonstrate five taste performances based on my interview study at Sandrew Metronome. All of them can be read as *typical* of an organization in the field of cultural production. In the pages that follow, I will analyze these taste performances on the basis of the analytical model I outlined in chapter 7.

INTERPRETATION OF TASTE
PERFORMANCES IN THE ORGANIZATION

Following the notion of taste performances as strategies in an organization in the field of cultural production, this chapter takes a closer look at how organizational members legitimize these performances in the setting of mixed principles of legitimacy that was laid out in chapter 11. The varying principles of legitimacy across different departments, positions and situations obviously require improvisation on the part of the organizational mem-

bers. What follows next is an interpretation of the taste performances that I have presented in the first part of the chapter. I proceed in two steps, intelligibility being the sole reason for this gradual analysis. First, I analyze the taste performances based on the gender-blind theories in my analytical model in Part I. Subsequently, I add gender to the analysis by drawing on the feminist theories in my theoretical framework. The upcoming section is organized along the following headings: *form or content*, *what pole is triggered?*, *from the economic pole: a professional approach to taste*, *from the cultural pole: distinctive taste performances* and *balancing taste and market potential* and, finally, *constructions of the market*. I will outline the analysis of gendered taste performances in more detail after this initial analysis.

Form or content

As guidelines for improvising in the organization, organizational members may profit from knowing the *relevance structures* of their fellow co-workers and managers (see Berger and Luckmann 1966). Those structures may hint at what pole/field is triggered in a particular situation at hand. In other words, they influence the *content* of interaction. For example, in recognizing that one's local manager values cultural capital, one can assume that adopting a "professional approach to taste" is not critical in this department. Further, the division of definitional labor implies that organizational members will agree about whose definitional claims will be supported (Goffman 1959, see also chapter 5, p. 78). Thus, whether an interaction is defined as a meeting or a coffee break may be determined by the one interactant who attaches most importance to the matter. The definition of situation then specifies what taste performances are

378

employed. If the interaction is defined as "having a coffee", i.e., as an arena for sociability, then, a taste performance such as *talk of taste as an interaction medium* seems to be most plausible (see p. 351).

In situations where the relevance structures of the interactants are not known, projective (as well as defensive) practices may be used by the participants to save face for an individual who has misread the situation. For example, if someone adopts a *professional approach* in the informal company of coworkers rich in cultural capital, the latter may, if focus remains on the form, assist in saving their coworker's face by keeping the conversation going, by trying to find common ground despite the initial differences in taste performances. DiMaggio (1987) and Caves (2000) also note that people like to converse about creative goods, and that nonpurposive conversation is highly valued. It follows from the photographic study that arenas for sociability are very important to organizational members. These arenas provide the latter with interaction where form becomes autonomous from content (cf. Simmel 1949 [1911]). If the coffee interaction only involves people near the cultural pole, and nothing hinders mutual involvement (see p. 88), more indepth discussions of films are possible. However, interaction may now and then verge on being content-driven. As soon as content is important, one of the four other taste performances will be adopted (*a professional approach to taste*, *distinctive taste*, *balancing taste and market potential*, or *taste as a resource for market knowledge or influence*).

Which pole is triggered?

In content-driven interactions, typifications of people at

either the economic pole or the cultural pole may then serve as orientation for organizational members as to which pole is activated. In other words, they assist in the sense-making process. At least from my point of view, the personal fronts of the organizational members at Sandrew Metronome are very similar, except for gender, age and, possibly, language (see chapter 10, p. 253 and chapter 11, p. 300). This may, in turn, be a result of the scenario of mixed principles of legitimacy that I sketched in chapter 11; performing taste in an organization in the field of cultural production may imply difficulties when choosing among the available fronts. The established, stereotypical fronts (for example, "black clothing" by the cultural pole and "business clothing" by the economic pole) may not fit the organizational requirements perfectly. One front may imply too much cultural capital, e.g., by signaling too much intellectual status, and another may communicate adequate business knowledge but no cultural capital. This may impede the switching between different principles of legitimacy and taste performances. It may in other words be hard to find a "proper" front in organizations in the field of cultural production.

Therefore, it may be significant to know the capital compositions of the various *departments*. Provided that managers who lean towards the economic pole have defined the company goals in terms of economic capital (see chapter 11, p. 283), and other managers also endorse those goals (although with an equal emphasis on cultural aspects), organizational members along both poles may feel that their work-related taste performances should reflect those goals. Presenting oneself by reference to the cultural pole may foster an impression of a disinterest in these company goals (see Bourdieu 1996).

380

Indeed, the interviews manifest a repositioning of the organization in the overall field of cultural production, towards the economic pole. Most organizational members present themselves as "normal consumers" or as having a very broad taste, rejecting any kind of snobbery within the organization. The organizational members closer to the cultural pole do not present themselves as having a very distinguished taste. They embrace the broad taste as well (while not going into detail about the definition of a broad taste). Possibly, this could be interpreted as consistent with the discretion with which cultural capital is operationalized (Bourdieu 1984). Rather, *other* organizational members testify to the snobbier taste among people in production and, to some extent, in exhibition. I already mentioned some possible interpretations of this tendency among people rich in cultural capital to play down their distinctive taste, or to simply claim a broad taste (see p. 363), by pointing to the supremacy of the economic pole as well as to the interpretive prerogative of managers with cultural capital. The common description of the people rich in cultural capital as "very experienced" rather than snobbish or with a distinctive taste confirms not only the dominated position of the cultural pole, but also the status of Gemeinschaft (see also p. 364). The primacy of the economic field is also evident from the frequent references to snobs being elsewhere. Along the economic pole, organizational members are rather straightforward in their relation to taste, equating good films with high sales figures, by asserting that money talks (see p. 355).

I would like to linger a little bit on the respective taste performances of the two poles and discuss them in more detail.

A PROFESSIONAL APPROACH TO TASTE. The liberal use of the notion of "professionalism" among organizational members is entirely linked to the economic pole, primarily the distribution department. Part of the "common language" of the subworld to which the economic pole belongs (i.e., the economic field), this talk of "professionalism" serves as "reality-maintenance" (see Berger and Luckmann 1966, and see p. 43 in chapter 2). References to "professionalism" reflect the prevailing Gesellschaft language, a language that stresses the ideals of "stepping out of one's personal taste" (see p. 354), being able to market anything (see p. 305), embracing a wide range of commercial products (see p. 305), by being "unneurotic" (see p. 355), not letting one's personal taste affect one's decision (p. 354), and not having "too much taste" (see p. 358). Organizational members may try to underplay any inconsistencies with regard to this "professionalism", presenting idealized versions of themselves that reflect the socially sanctioned values from the perspective of the economic pole. In other words, they may perform taste in an idealized "professional" way. A prerequisite for this idealization of their taste performance is *audience segregation* (see Goffman 1959) which implies that the organizational members can play different roles for different audiences (for example, one role in their private life, and one in the organization). However, despite the extensive talk about "professionalism", I identified an ambiguity within the distribution department when it comes to adopting "the professional approach to taste" (see p. 356). For some, this approach means "stepping outside of one's personal taste". For others, this implies having a broad taste. The two constructions of "the professional approach" obviously rest on different notions of the significance of one's taste. The former assumes that "your

own" taste does not matter whereas the latter suggests that it does. I briefly discussed how some organizational members adopted the two constructions of this taste performance concurrently (p. 357). I interpret this as a strategy for advancing within the economic capital-based part of the organization.

Set against this background, it is also interesting to note that occasionally a specialized personal taste is portrayed in a positive light. An example is when a sales man is praised for having produced outstanding sales figures on a small-scale fantasy-title because of his strong personal taste for this kind of film (see p. 357). Assuming again that this fantasy-film only released on video is a small economic capital-intensive title, I tentatively interpret it as if personal taste may be acceptable from the standpoint of the economic pole as long as it is not legitimized by the cultural pole. However, I want to suggest the possibility that other conditions can stipulate where "personal taste" is allowed to shape work, also from the point of view of the economic pole.

As I have stated repeatedly, my goffmanian perspective implies a focus on taste performances regardless of habitus or "class" (see p. 218 in chapter 9). Despite this explicit focus on performances, I cannot disregard the fact that the authorization for performances may vary. Accordingly, an organizational member whose habitus contains little cultural capital is likely to have less problems in temporarily "abandoning" it for a, relatively speaking, atypical taste performance; such an organizational member does not construct his or her self upon cultural capital. On the contrary, as we will see next, an organizational member endowed with cultural capital has more authorization to perform the *distinctive* or *balancing taste and market potential* performances.

From the cultural pole:

THE DISTINCTIVE TASTE PERFORMANCE. Although a distinctive taste is discursively rejected in the presentation of oneself and of the organization / department, many organizational members still testify to its presence in the organization (see for example citations on p. 361, p. 362 and p. 365). Thus, just as chapter 11 showed that cultural capital in general is important to the organization at large despite having its importance denied by the economic capital-driven managers (in descriptions of the organizational goals and as a basis for making the jobs meaningful), the use of distinctive taste performances are characteristic of the organization. Conceivably, the dismissal and downplay of taste hinge on the fact that taste is a *typical* manifestation of the cultural pole.

The distinctive taste performance is used to reproduce symbolic boundaries around organizational members near the cultural pole and to maintain the social order in society at large through the monopolization of "good" taste. In the organization, the practices of organizational members hinge on "the choice of the necessary"; there is a fit between habitus and field. In other words, the organizational members at the cultural pole in the organization are by definition endowed with relatively more cultural capital and will thus not refrain from expressing their view on all kinds of films; organizational members at the economic pole, on the other hand, granted significantly less cultural capital, at times decline to voice an opinion on *some* films or keep a generally low profile in terms of taste (see for example citations on p. 361, p. 362). This phenomenon may also be interpreted by reference to the ritual order, which implies that interactants avoid losing face (hence the unwillingness to engaging in cultural conversations with

384

people rich in cultural capital), which inevitably leads to the reproduction of the social order. Furthermore, situational factors may contribute to preserving these symbolic boundaries (see p. 300). In interactions between representatives of the two poles, defensive and projective practices can mitigate capital reproduction through the interactants' joint effort to save the face of a person who has misread the situation. For instance, if a new organizational member from the economic pole begins to talk about films with a couple of "cinephiles" from the cultural pole, the latter may use projective practices to save his or her face. This may in turn make the person in question more apt to cross-pole collaborations.

I interpret the general resistance among people at the cultural pole to claim "superior" taste as a result of the discretion that marks the operationalization of cultural capital (see Bourdieu 1984), as well as of cooperation being a defining feature of the organization (in fact, *any* organization). As we saw in the photographic study, sociability offerings are highly valued in the organization. These may have a mediating effect on the reproduction of social order in the organizational arena. The organization cannot be regarded as an extension of the cultural consumption field; as an organizational member, your taste performances are naturally shaped by a different set of principles than those at work in the field of cultural consumption. Relations to coworkers are important, and cooperation is fundamental to organizational life. It seems however easier and more acceptable to stress the importance of a distinctive taste (as in "not sinking too low", see p. 362, p. 365) if you are older and have a top position in the company (near the cultural pole). Rarely arguing from the cultural pole, young people further down in the hierarchy seem to adopt *the professional approach* to a much greater extent. Thus, *the profes-*

sional approach is especially prevalent among organizational members aspiring to advance in the organization. Still, this may also be a result of the fact that organizational members endowed with little cultural capital have little authority to perform a *distinctive taste*, or, for that matter, a *balancing taste and market potential performance* (see, for example, citations on p. 361 (the man from exhibition who hesitates to engage in film discussions), p. 362 (regarding caring for *some* people's opinions)).

BALANCING TASTE AND MARKET POTENTIAL. From the point of view of the economic pole, organizational members with relatively large amounts of cultural capital will be regarded as "disinterested" in the game that the organization is in (see Bourdieu 1996). On the other hand, people in the departments closer to the cultural pole, i.e., production and exhibition, may not be authorized to perform "the professional approach to taste", and, if so, only by resorting to vaguely defined "broad taste" (cf. Goffman 1959). Instead, they attempt to balance their taste and what they perceive as the market potential of the films, based on their *experience*. The latter may be regarded as a manifestation of the Gemeinschaft quality of the cultural pole.

At the cultural pole, great emphasis is placed on being knowledgeable about a variety of tastes, a knowledge presumably derived from experience. Although many organizational members near the cultural pole testify to not adhering solely to their own taste, they do not draw upon the Gesellschaft vocabulary of having a "professional" approach to taste or "abandoning their own taste". Rather, they use their taste, coupled with experience, to guide them in their work. This foregrounding of taste and experience seems to be a central ingredient to their presentations of self, and thus, to their strategies

in this corner of the field / the organization. Still, these organizational members vary in their uses of taste and in the weight they give their own taste. For example, they talk about the use of taste in order to understand films better (p. 367), to identify other types of tastes (p. 367 and 354), to assess what films will get the best reviews (p. 368), to find the best films (p. 370) and to evaluate which script ideas are worth pursuing (p. 369).

Not surprisingly, representatives of the distribution department still find the people with more cultural capital somewhat unreliable and from time to time "unprofessional", suspecting that they do not wish to lose face in front of a journalist by praising a title that they "sincerely" do not approve of (i.e., there is a discrepancy between their presentation of self and the team performance). In this view, so-called cinephiles (i.e., the people at the cultural pole) are problematic for the organization because they risk giving away the team performance (Goffman 1959). The capriciousness associated with the cinephiles may be seen as a result of a lack of understanding of the underlying cultural rules of legitimization on the part of the economic capital people. From the point of view of the economic pole, the full meaning of cultural capital is often reduced to a course in cinema studies (see p. 366).

If there is a tendency to emphasize an "objective" (impersonal) *taste performance* at the economic pole, there is, at the cultural pole, an inclination to emphasize "objective" *criteria* for good taste while also acknowledging "subjective" (personal) taste performances. There are examples of applying "objective" rules to taste in the following citations: p. 369 (a man contemplating how to judge a production), p. 367 (the distribution man distingusihing between good and bad films), and p. 370

387

(the production man who wants to identify with the story). In addition to these citations, there are other comments that hint at objective rules for judging films, but where the interviewees express great frustration regarding the likely reception of these allegedly good films by the audience (see for example citations on p. 368 and p. 370). As I stated under "distinctive taste performances", the organizational members cited here reproduce social structure and organizational hierarchy by monopolizing the "objective" criteria for what signifies good films / productions. Furthermore, near the economic pole, there is a slight tendency among organizational members to believe that there are some to them unknown and irrelevant objective rules that determine the quality of films (see citations on p. 366).

Needless to say, organizational members near the cultural pole often stress the inevitability and signficance of personal taste; four male managers on the cultural side of the organization point out that one cannot disconnect from one's own taste (see citations on p. 345 (about the importance of taste), p. 365 (about the taste question), p. 349 (about self-reflection with regard to taste), p. 367 (about the centrality of taste)). To resume the discussion of class, or habitus, from above, I would hold that the organizational members endowed with relative large amounts of cultural capital through education or upbringing have a harder time if they are urged to "step out of their personal taste". The reason is that their sense of self hinges on a capital composition of which cultural capital represents a substantial part. To act as if they did not have this capital would involve a certain degree of distancing from oneself. Moreover, taste, in this case "good films", is important to these organizational members, as could be seen in the frustration expressed by them in their predictions that the audience will not turn

up, or in their disappointment that the audience in fact did not turn up, to the good films (see p. 370).

Still, I want to stress that the cultural pole at Sandrew Metronome is characterized by cultural capital and also by the Gemeinschaft. Thus, the capital compositions that prevail at the cultural pole cannot be equated with the capital compositions that distinguished the dominant classes identified by Bourdieu (1984) (see also p. 299).

Given the particular construction of the market that characterizes the cultural pole (i.e., based on enactment or at least a more interactive notion than the construction of the market from the economic point of view), the taste of the individual organizational member can be used as a resource. For example, to predict what films will get good reviews (see citation on p. 368). Thus, attempts to play down one's "subjective" or "personal" taste are rare.

Constructions of the market

The performance of *taste as a resource for market knowledge* disregards any impact the organizational arena might have on the taste performances of individual organizational members. This view assumes that organizational members can provide market survey material for new titles. Further, it also rests on the idea that one can disengage from one's own taste performances and field struggles, at least for a moment. Although I doubt anyone believes that the organization represents a nucleus of the Nordic market, many agree to use the organizational members' response to the various titles in an exploratory manner. Regarding *taste as a resource for market knowledge* involves being open to everyone's opinion about the films. As this perspective on taste in

the organization does not assign more value to the taste of organizational members rich in cultural capital, it leans more towards the economic pole, emphasizing the popular taste as reflected in the organization. The notion of taking advantage of the organizational members' taste as a resource for market knowledge rests on the idea of a reified "market" that people no longer consider a human product (see Berger and Luckmann 1966).

Underpinning the *balancing taste and market potential* performance is a construction of the market that emphasizes a possibility to shape the market to a larger extent. Constructed as something inevitable, the taste of *some* organizational members near the cultural pole is regarded as a resource. Hence, to adherents of the *taste as a resource for market influence* performance, speculation on the bad taste of others is not an appealing idea. It is also important to have representatives of other cultural expressions within the boundaries of the organization in order to capture new trends (see citation on p. 376). It is a more interactive construction of the market than the reified version evoked by the economic pole. The interactive construction of the market is further enhanced by references to market changes in favor of art house films (see p. 377).

These two constructions of the market can be juxtaposed through the distinction often made in marketing between product-and market-focused organizations (see Colbert et al. 1994). Exemplified by a chamber-music ensemble, a children's-theater festival or a contemporary art museum, product-focused organizations seem to belong to the cultural pole, and the market-oriented organizations lean toward the economic pole. However, this reduction to market and product-focus, in my opinion, overlooks the very interactive notion of the market that prevails at the cultural pole in my study.

Without a doubt, my material is amenable to analyses in terms of gendered taste performances, which is what the remainder of the chapter will be devoted to.

GENDERED TASTE PERFORMANCES IN THE ORGANIZATION

To explore the gendering of these taste performances, my plan is to return to the descriptions given above and interpret them on the basis of feminist organization theory. At this juncture, I would like to call to mind some of the manifestations of the gender structure as outlined in chapter 10. Organizational gender structures (Wahl 1992) comprise the proportion of men and women in general (in the case of Sandrew Metronome, slightly more women than men), the hierarchical distribution of men and women (men dominate the top positions in the company), and the degree of gender segregation with regards to occupations, tasks and positions (for example, roughly speaking, film is gendered female and video male, the sales department is gendered male, the film marketing department is gendered female) (see chapter 10, p. 253). All in all, there are proportionately more women who have jobs where they engage in taste performances on a daily basis near the cultural pole than the economic pole. However, as the gender order permeates both poles, the women's presence in numbers is not to be equated with power. For example, in the case of the three women in the production department who regularly conduct taste performances, it is their male boss who has the final call when it comes to development, production and acquisitions. Furthermore, I want to emphasize the situational aspects of taste performances, where the interactants reproduce the gender order by drawing on cultural superschemas of gender (cf. Goffman 1977, 1979; Ridgeway 1997).

Taste performances in the organization could be regarded as "local knowledge" (Smith 1987) as they are often taken for granted, constructed as part of people's interactional knowledge in everyday situations. Management may subordinate this knowledge even though it may be very important to the organization (see also chapter 3, p. 56).

Furthermore, the gender structures at both poles are similar: men dominate the top positions. However, since the two poles represent two different principles of legitimacy, the cultural pole conceptualized as "the economic world reversed" (Bourdieu 1993), one could expect different types of gendering processes. When I turn to these processes, I will use the two poles, the economic and the cultural, as organizing principles and discuss the gendered taste performances that belong to the respective pole. After a section on the gendering of the market constructions, I will wrap up this portion of the chapter with a general discussion on male normativity and the accompanying privileges.

From the economic pole: a gendered professional approach to taste

Having identified ambiguous stands vis-à-vis the meaning of "professionalism" among the champions of the *professional approach to taste*, i.e., to "step outside of one's taste" or to endorse a "broad taste", I will now take a closer look at how this approach intersects with gender. First, I want to mention that both takes on the professional approach are primarily supported and legitimized by men. Male organizational members claim a "professional" take on taste where they "abandon their personal taste" (see p. 355, p. 356), or remain "neutral" and "unneurotic" (p. 355) for example by referring to

"numbers" (i.e., statistics) rather than taste (see p. 355). Men by the economic pole also sanction "broad taste" (see for example p. 356), sometimes even concomitantly with the aforementioned "neutral" stance. The construction of the professional approach to taste thus seems to mesh with the construction of masculinity, something I will expand on under the heading of the *male norm and taste performances* on p. 402.

A few pages earlier (p. 383), I posed the question of what makes "personal taste" valuable in the organization from the perspective of the economic pole. I made the provisional argument that despite the dominant perspective there might still be room for some "personal taste" to shine through occasionally, if this taste is not markedly cultural capital-based. Thus, Benny's love of fantasy-films is welcome, as a source for added revenue (see p. 357. However, another interpretation is equally plausible. It may be that because of the privilege of the norm (Höök 2001b), it is not only acceptable but also encouraged for men to claim "objectivity" (i.e., to "step outside of their personal taste" and allegedly reflect the taste of the market) *and* to actively use their "personal", more specialized, taste. In other words, men may be allowed to represent both the positive and the neutral (see De Beauvoir's citation on p. 58).

Three women in my material endorse the professional approach to taste. Constructed as deficient in relation to the male norm (see Hirdman 1988), women in the economic capital-intensive distribution department are neither allowed to assert their subjectivity nor claim "objectivity" as easily as the men do (see more on men's interpretive prerogative below on p. 395). For example, the woman from the distribution department refers to the "ability to picture the product from the customer's

point of view" rather than to any of the terms mentioned above such as "professional", "neutral", "stepping out of one's personal taste" or "a different taste". Furthermore, the women in the marketing department considered themselves "too subjective" and too much alike (see p. 356) to make an adequate evaluation, and thus, arranged for test screenings. However, the salesmen do not raise any concerns about being too much alike despite being a men-only group. Rather, they tend to talk about other people being "more subjective", for example the customers (see citation on p. 357). "Subjectivity" and "objectivity" being constructed dichotomously, these salesmen reinforce their own "objectivity" in this way. Similarly, the film distribution boss admits to being watchful of his subordinates who, in his view, sometimes tend to be too influenced by their taste (see p. 356). Accordingly, he ascribes a more detached relation to taste to himself than to his subordinates. Another distribution director asserts that he and his male-dominated department are good at maintaining a level of "not too much taste" (see p. 358), something I also interpret as a claim to objectivity.

This does not imply that the women near the economic pole always agree with the claims to objectivity asserted by the men. For example, contrary to the allegations of the cinema programmer (see p. 354), who maintains that his taste does not affect his bookings, his female co-worker tells me:

Bjørn has a certain taste, and the selection of films available is dominated by his taste. We just get a specific type of film. *(woman, exhibition)*

The gendering of *the professional approach to taste* as male is, however, consistent with Hochschild's (1983) "doctrine of feelings" where women, and people in sub-

ordinated positions in general, are constructed as "irrational" because of their weaker claim to the right to define the situation and because less trust is placed in their judgments. I will elaborate on this theme in the final chapter.

In very much the same way, people in the distribution department generally question the professionalism of the people from the cultural pole. Accordingly, it is not surprising that a woman in a minority position in the distribution department (see p. 366) goes into detail about what she regards as "the cinephile problem" in the company, i.e., an alleged inability among people rich in cultural capital to abandon a "subjective" highbrow taste. Likewise, only a woman in a minority position stresses not having so much time for small talk about films (see p. 353), a statement which I interpret as a result of her token position in the organization (cf. Kanter 1977).

I interpret the two constructions of professionalism that are central to *the professional approach to taste* as based on men's interpretive prerogative (see more below). Men construct themselves as either capable of stepping out of their own taste (while others – women and people form the cultural pole – are constructed as "subjective") or as having such a broad taste that it is acceptable, from the organizational point of view, for them to be "subjective", since their taste, at any rate, is only a reflection of the market.

From the cultural pole: a gendered balancing taste and market potential approach to taste

Conversely, from the cultural pole, "personal" taste seems to be constructed as something inevitable.

However, the dominant taste performance *balancing taste and market potential*, highlights the role of "experience" and the combination of several "subjectivities" when practicing taste at work. As I pointed out on p. 387, in place of a search for "objectivity" as in the economic pole-driven *professional approach to taste*, there is a pursuit of "objective" criteria for *good* taste. Distinction based on cultural capital is often constructed in this way (see Bourdieu 1984). However, it is mainly men who seek to legitimize their taste by reference to "objective criteria" (see p. 369, p. 367, p. 370) and it is a man who is referred to as the incarnation of good taste (see p. 362). In the frustration expressed by organizational members who ponder over the assumed impossibility of launching certain "good" films, one can trace an underlying idea of "objective" criteria for judging films (see for example citations on p. 368 and p. 370, by two women and one man), but these statements are sometimes hedged by references to "my" and "I". Although women are well represented at the cultural pole, men are in power positions as senior managers (see p. 391 regarding the "final call"). Thus, reflecting the gender order in the organization, men and women often make somewhat divergent claims when referring to "good" taste or film; with men referring to "objective criteria", and women hedging their claims and referring to what they "personally like". Similar to the woman from the film marketing department who worries about the team members being "too much alike", a woman in the production department describes the reduced bias achieved by collaborating with people of different opinions (see p. 371).

Against the background of the study on gender in an advertising agency described on p. 158 (Alvesson and Köping 1993), where the gender order was interpreted as being reinforced in the face of vague professional iden-

tities and a business largely based on judgments, striving for "objective" distinction may be read as a means for male managers to legitimize their positions and consolidate the gender structure in the perceived vagueness of judgments.

As the film side, which is rich in cultural capital, is gendered female (see p. 257), more women than men adopt the *balancing taste and market potential* performance, and thus, one could assume that more women than men are concerned about affecting the market (see p. 375).

At the same time, women at the cultural pole point to gender inequalities in the organization to a greater extent than those at the economic pole (see, for example, p. 258 ("yes-men"), p. 254 and p. 257 (blindness regarding competent women), p. 254 (no credit)). I see these examples as references to direct discrimination in the organization (see Wahl 1992). Furthermore, no one assumes the *positive strategy* (ibid.) of the woman in the distribution department (see p. 255), even though not all see gender inequality as a *significant* problem. Whether this is a result of a stronger gender structure in the departments belonging to the cultural pole than in the distribution department or an effect of hightened awareness among the women in the former, I leave for others to explore.

Since people relate to each other as competitors in the conflict-based Gesellschaft (Tönnies 1979 [1887], Asplund 1991), the latter may create a notion of competence being the decisive factor when it comes to position (cf. Wahl 1996, Hultbom 1997, Holgersson 2003). However, the kin-based Gemeinschaft characterized by the unplanned and the "natural" (Tönnies 1979 [1887], Asplund 1991) that have long dominated the cultural pole may, instead, promote the idea of "innate leaders"

in top positions. The repositioning of the organization towards the economic pole implies that the Gesellschaft perspective may be extended at least in part to the production and exhibition departments, bringing to light "incompetence" and bonds between organizational members that contradict Gesellschaft. Possibly, it is the repositioning of the organization in the field of cultural production that makes women at the cultural pole more aware of some forms of gender inequality.

Still, the economic pole, the Gesellschaft, is characterized by a similar gender order although disguised by the endorsement of "competence" and "competition". If one regards taste performances as a form of competence, then an analogy could be made to the research on women as leaders. Female leaders are often constructed as deficient leaders (see Wahl 1992, SOU 1994:3, Sinclair 1998, Holgersson 2003), a construction which implies for one thing that women lack the required competence. An increase in gender equality in a work group is associated with a less negative view of women's competency among men (see Wahl and Holgersson 2003). Perhaps, women would be able to claim objective taste more easily (in Gesellschaft), and an objectively good taste (in Gemeinschaft) if the gender structures in the organization were more balanced.

From the cultural pole:
gendered distinctive taste performances

Despite the frequent downplaying of *distinctive taste performances*, I did identify a number of citations that bear witness to their existence. These citations (see p. 384) are rather general, and gender is mentioned only once ("he's culture personified"). Since taste, as an oper-

ationalizaton of cultural capital, is highly valued by the cultural pole (Bourdieu 1993), there are however reasons to believe that the men who dominate top positions at the cultural pole manifest some of their power through *distinctive taste performances*. On the other hand, given that there are many women at the cultural pole, these distinctive taste performances may also be gendered female. However, based on my material I simply do not feel qualified to say anything about the gendering of the distinctive taste performances.

Taste performances in negotiations across the poles

While bearing in mind the limited contacts between some of the companies and positions within the group Sandrew Metronome, I would like to say a few words regarding taste performances in negotiations between the poles. As examples of these types of negotiations are rare in my interviews, it will, to some extent, remain a hypothetical discussion.

My few examples do however point in the direction of the economic pole getting the last word. That is perhaps hardly surprising if one considers the general field repositioning described in chapter 11. A female cinema programmer who describes her job as full of "guessing games" based on experience, gives an example of such a negotiation:

This weekend, the film *Riding in Cars with Boys* opened. I was very negative towards it from the outset. I couldn't really explain why. I had seen Drew Barrymore and the poster campaign, and I didn't like the theme, the combination just wasn't right. But the distributor said it was a 'big movie'. It really flopped. [70] *(woman, exhibition)*

In the same way, the worries expressed by the woman from the distribution department who complains about "the cinephile problem" (see p. 366), may be regarded as a manifestation of the economic pole taking precedence over the cultural pole when it comes to customer relations, i.e., external relations (cf. Bourdieu 1993).

In arguing with people from the economic pole (in this case, the distributor), representatives of the cultural pole can only resort to their "subjectivity", valued by the cultural pole but entirely discarded by the economic pole. The latter being the external pole legitimized by the owners and the management group, these negotiations will undoubtedly be difficult for the cultural pole to win. Furthermore, the espoused "objectivity" of the economic pole hinges on constructing someone else as "subjective". At the intersection of capital composition and gender, being a woman and thus automatically deficient in relation to the male norm and, on top of that, affiliated with the cultural pole, may create even stronger requirements for performed "objectivity" or "professionalism" from the perspective of the economic pole. Moreover, without authorization, such performances may not even be an option.

Drawing on Simmel (1950) and DiMaggio (1987), I suggested earlier that talk of taste can also function as pure sociability, or as a communicative element (Lindgren 1992, or see p. 155) that fosters a feeling of boundary-free commonality beyond the two poles. Thus, arenas for sociability, as highlighted in the photographic study, may also be considered as potential openings for less "polarized" negotiations.

Homosociality and taste performances

The homosociality among men in top positions and in the organization at large is manifested in the frequent emphasis upon the judgment/taste/experience of other men, as well as in the positioning vis-à-vis other men. A man from the production department says that there is usually a great deal of "cultural talk" in the canteen. Claiming that when it comes to taste:

[...] we have some very experienced people within the organization whom you of course have to listen to. About what they think, what their taste is like. It's important to listen to them. *(man, senior manager production)*

When I ask him to name a few of these experienced people, he exclusively refers to male managers. Another man, a marketer cited on p. 363, refers to one of the (male) senior managers of production as the single person whose taste he trusts most in the group, besides his own. Sometimes, the homosociality is also manifested as a cross-pole phenomenon; e.g., two men from the economic pole mention men from the cultural pole as their rolemodels and competitors (see for example p. 364). One of the senior managers tells me: "Benny always has an opinion on how others should do their job". However, he still seems rather interested in my account of Benny's view (Benny is another senior manager). Another indication of homosociality is the statement by a woman who refers to insecure male managers in the organization (see p. 259). It is interesting to note the pervasiveness of homosociality across different capital compositions on the film team as well (see Lantz 2006a).

Women tend to orient themselves towards power, heterosocially (see Lipman-Blumen 1976, Lindgren 1983). This can be exemplified by the following citation of a

producer who describes a male director that she is to begin working with:

He's one of the greatest minds in this country. It's hard to define talent. He's poetic, a visual person, he's an excellent director, he knows very much about film, ... he's essentially a gifted person. *(woman, production)*

In passing, I want to add that when making this text anonymous by substituting the actual names with ABBA names (see p. 214), I dare to say, without having counted them, that an overwhelming majority of the new names in citations have been *Bjorn* and *Benny*. This may reflect a general orientation towards power (i.e., the men) by both men and women.

The last statement justifies a move to the section on the male norm. Before I leave the topic of homosociality I would like to draw attention to Kanter's (1977) assertion that there is a risk that people in power overestimate their competence. As I have mentioned earlier (on p. 397), in the case of an organization in the field of cultural production, competence could perhaps denote the prevailing taste performance by the respective pole. However, I will return to this question of competence in next chapter when I discuss role distance.

The male norm and taste performances

Earlier, on p. 363 and on p. 395, I suggested that the claim to broad taste and the alleged ability to "step outside of personal taste" were possibly examples of top managers at the economic pole exercising their interpretive prerogative. The latter notion can be understood as a result of male normativity and these men's positions of power. Because they are in a position of power they do not need a frame of reference as to what constitutes

"broad taste" or "objective taste". Furthermore, because opportunity structures work to their advantage (Kanter 1977), these men in power positions can more easily oscillate between two different conceptions of taste without appearing inconsistent. Indeed, one may even say that the opportunity structures determine whether these taste performances are feasible strategies for advancing within the organization.

The abovementioned claims to objectivity are largely absent in the women's descriptions of taste performances (see p. 393). Höök (2001b) demonstrates that being part of the norm allows for great differences within the group while still constituting an entirety. This "privilege of the norm" could thus imply that men could take a greater variety of stands vis-à-vis taste performances than do their female colleagues. It could be argued that alliances unite men of both economic and cultural capital in a common interest to maintain the present division of labor in the film or media field, just like Hartmann (1981) showed alliances between men from the working classes and the capitalists. Women are then constructed as either complementary or deficient (Wahl 1996, Höök 2001b, Holgersson 2003).

Male managers in Sandrew Metronome never comment on gender except for when asked a direct question; they take being gendered male for granted (see Eduards 1998), which is in line with studies on constructions of leadership as gendered male (see Collinson and Hearn 1994, 1996; Wahl 1996; Holgersson 2003). The interpretive prerogative of these men in top positions is manifested in numerous assertions about the state of things. Citations on p. 364 (the marketer who describes what people you ought to listen to), on p. 355 (the marketer who claims that one should be "unneurotic" to succeed

403

in the film business), on p. 356 (the boss who cautions against the influence of taste on his subordinates), on p. 354 (the male cinema programmer who argues that his bookings are not influenced by his taste), on p. 396 (references to where male organizational members refer to "objective criteria" for good taste), and on p. 353 (the distributor who warns against being misled by personal taste) can be contrasted with statements from their female counterparts which tend to be restricted to their own experience, or at least, somewhat hedged as to general applicability for the industry. The latter often talk in first person singular and express themselves in terms of "I believe" and "I think", see for example citations on p. 366 (the distributor who cautions against cinephiles on sales positions), p. 371 (the woman from acquisitions who expressess her opinion about speculation on bad taste). I interpret this hedging as a sign of the internalization of "gender-appropriate" performances in the organization (see Acker 1992), where the mental structures have come to reflect the gender structures in the organization.

I want to emphasize that it is a woman who calls attention to there only being "yes-men" around her boss, a woman who cautions the organization against being out of touch with the youth culture and a group of women film marketers who choose to conduct test screenings, all of which may be interpreted as effects of their subordinated positions. These women are used to being constructed as deficient, as non-representative; the norm however does not question its own typicality.

The interpretive prerogative of these men in top positions of course also affects the selection of titles eventually available to customers. For example, in employing identification with characters as a criterion for judging

the films, the male senior manager of production (cited on p. 370) will most likely reproduce the current gender order by backing films that reflect the current order. The male point of view has been internalized (cf. Bourdieu 2001). See also the citation regarding a male cinema programmer on p. 394.

If I had set myself to study the reproduction of the gender structure in an organization in the field of cultural production, I would probably have ended up discussing the differing conditions of men and women in terms of the relation between work and private life, and many other factors that may contribute to the reproduction of the gender structure. However, I have probed the *taste performances* that characterize an organization in the field of cultural production, and then, examined how these performances are gendered. Accordingly, there are many other reasons for the persistence of the gender structure in this organization.

To conclude, the taste performances in this organization in the field of cultural production are gendered to the advantage of men and to the disadvantage of women (cf. Acker 1990). These taste performances may be said to represent what Smith (1987) defines as "local knowledge" (taken-for-granted knowledge about how to interact in everyday life) in an organization in the field of cultural production. Thus, this knowledge can be regarded as subordinate to the knowledge based on ruling. However, as the latter influences the former through ideology and through the determination of "the stakes of the game" to speak with Bourdieu (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992), these taste performances may be seen as a manifestation of the dominated position of cultural capital as well as of the gender order which subordinates women to men.

In this chapter, I have identified a number of taste performances that can be seen as strategies in an organization in the field of cultural production. Depending not only on department affiliation, but also position, subject matter and situation, organizational members will take on one of these performances. Sometimes, organizational members aspiring to advance within the organization will demonstrate an idealized taste performance, playing down any inconsistencies. The great variety of taste performances can be explained by reference to the competing field definitions and principles of legimacy in the organization, from which it follows that it is hard to agree on an organization-wide "thin party line" (see p. 94), regarding, for example, values, goals and a company strategy. The five taste performances at the center of this book are: *talk of taste as an interaction medium*, *distinctive taste performances*, *a professional approach to taste*, *balancing taste and market potential*, and *taste as a resource for market knowledge or influence*. At the economic pole, the dominating taste performance *the professional approach to taste* by and large implies repudiating any influence of taste on organizational members' work practices. At the cultural pole, the prevailing taste performance *balancing taste and market potential* underscores that all judgments are subjective, and thus, judgments must be made in light of the experience of having seen vast numbers of films. In other words, it entails weighing one's "own taste" against one's experience of "the market". Still, according to the *balancing taste and market potential* performance, some judgments are *better* than others.

Further, I suggested that because of their interpretive prerogative men can more easily oscillate between different

meanings of the dominant taste performance at the economic pole, *the professional approach to taste*. Just like gender, "subjectivity" and "objectivity" are dichotomously constructed, which at the economic pole implies that women are constructed as more "subjective" and men as more "objective". At the cultural pole, where "subjectivity" is taken for granted, women are nevertheless constructed as applying fewer "objective" criteria when making their (subjective) judgments. Conversely, men's taste performances tend to be constructed as reflecting "objectively" good taste; men make larger claims about what is good taste, and their market experience is valued more highly. The latter is important for the *balancing taste and market potential* performance, which rests on a social construction of the market where organizational members can actively try to influence it. Based on the idea that the taste of the organizational members may reflect that of "the market", *the taste as a resource for market knowledge* performance belongs to the economic pole. A variation of this theme is the *taste as a resource for market influence* performance, which, on the other hand, belongs to the cultural pole and it takes as its point of departure a more interactive notion of the market and the necessity of subjectivity.

Given these gendered taste performances, I brought up the homosociality which seems to characterize relationships between men in higher positions, and which is facilitated, among other things, by management group meetings. When competitors and rolemodels are mentioned, men refer to men. At the intersection of gender and capital composition, women from the cultural pole obviously have a disadvantage when performing taste in this organization, as they belong to two dominated categories. They cope with this subordination by emphasizing experience and by referring to the judgment of others.

Of the five taste performances identified I have singled out three as emblematic of an organization in the field of cultural production: *the professional approach to taste*, *balancing taste and market potential*, and *taste as a resource for market knowledge or influence*. In other words, while *taste as an interaction medium* and *distinctive taste performances* will be used in all kinds of social interaction in the field of cultural consumption, the latter three taste performances are characteristic of an *organization* in the field of cultural production. This is not to say, however, that sociability and distinction are not important in the organizational arena; they certainly are. Yet, as we saw in this chapter, distinctive taste is discursively rejected by the alleged holders of such taste. I interpret this by referring to the inherent problem of distinction vs. cooperation in an organization in the field of cultural production (see the introductory chapter on p. 16 and Erickson's (1996) discussion on domination and coordination on p. 127). However, what is so special about the three *organizational* taste performances is that they signify some kind of *taste management*. This is the topic of next chapter.

61. This man belongs to an exhibition company that I consider more oriented towards the economic pole than the others. He has previously worked for American distribution companies and considers himself part of the "entertainment business", i.e., what I defined as the media field in chapter 11.

62. *Sanger fran andra vaningen* (2000).

63. *Witchblade* (2001), *Livvakterna* (2001), *Swordfish* (2001), *3000 Miles to Graceland* (2001).

64. I consider *Witchblade* an economic capital-intensive title since the film is based on a comic book and that it has also been successful on television (see www.imdb.com).

65. A daily radio broadcast on the arts.

66. Lukas Moodysson is a famous Swedish film director.

67. *Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon* (2000).

68. *Italian for Beginners* (2000).

69. *Harry Potter and the Sorcerer's Stone* (2001), *The Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring* (2001), *Titanic* (1997), *Sällskaps-resan* (1980), *Amélie* (2001).

70. *Riding in Cars with Boys* (2001).

PART III

Taste management

I started out probing taste as something *typical* of organizations in the field of cultural production, and, hence, something that organizational members of any organization in this field must relate to in their work. To this end, I explored the constructions and uses of taste in the organization at the center of this study, Sandrew Metronome, and identified five taste performances. Building on the theories presented in Part I, these taste performances should be common to most organizations in the field of cultural production with a positioning somewhere *in between* the two poles of legitimacy.[71]

Three of the taste performances used by organizational members are *organizational*: *a professional approach to taste*, *balancing taste and market potential*, and *taste as a resource for market knowledge or influence*. In this final chapter, I discuss the taste management represented by these organizational taste performances. All three of them feature some kind of taste management on the part of the individual as well as on the part of the organization. Most of the taste management attests to the field repositioning towards the economic pole that Sandrew Metronome is undergoing. Since the economic pole and the cultural pole are constructed dichotomously, and taste is a typical manifestation of the cultural pole, it is not surprising that both sides try to manage taste, although differently. With many organizations in the cultural production field undergoing similar repositionings (through mergers and acquisitions, and, in turn the growth of big media conglomerates), taste management will certainly become a familiar component of organizational life in the cultural industries. As we saw in the preceding chapters, cultural capital and the associated construction of taste are more often than not viewed as a *problem* for the organization, something that has to be *managed*.[72] I define taste management as an attempt to

control the taste of organizational members, either by the organizational member him or herself or by the organization.

Taste management is first and foremost required from the perspective of the economic pole, which, as we have seen, is often embodied by management. However, due to its rather resilient influence on organizational members throughout the organization, it also affects the taste performances at the cultural pole. Although the chapter concerns the manifestations and consequences of taste management in the organization at the center of this study, a guiding question for the chapter at hand is *What does my study tell us about organizations in the field of cultural production?* Primarily based on the concepts used and outlined in chapter 12, this chapter also draws concisely on some of the theories in Part I. To the extent that I draw upon theories from my analytical model, my analysis remains devoid of references. However, in order to gain a better understanding of the forces behind taste management as well as of its possible consequences, I bring in some "new" theories, i.e., theories that were not included in my analytical model. Accordingly, the chapter should not be regarded as a summary of the study, but rather, as an extended interpretation of the analysis presented so far. I begin by charting out manifestations of taste management by the respective poles, and by discussing to whom "management" can be ascribed. Then, I turn to an inquiry into the causes of taste management, which is followed by a section on the gendering of "objectivity" and "subjectivity", and its effects on taste management. Preceded by a discussion of some possible consequences of taste management and a few mediating factors, the chapter ends with an outline of my study's contributions.

Most taste management efforts are being made by the economic pole. In addition, most taste management efforts are being made by women at the economic pole. These two aspects of taste management are unquestionably related. However, I will initially turn to gender-blind taste management and delve more deeply into its roots before I move on to the gendering of this taste management.

As I have repeatedly stated, there is an ongoing repositioning towards the economic pole, a shift, which is, so far, most apparent through the merger (p. 282), and in the goals assumed by the management group (although sometimes coupled with a goal infused by cultural capital, see p. 283). Along with the field reallocation comes a greater emphasis on the taste performance by the economic pole, *the professional approach to taste*.

Characterized by the dismissal of all marks of "subjectivity" and influence of "personal" judgment, *the professional approach to taste* encourages organizational members at the economic pole to perform an "objective taste". Thus, organizational members need to control, or manage, the influence of taste. *The professional approach to taste* bears the mark of Gesellschaft, and, thus, resonates well with Weber's (1930) notion of instrumental rationality (see also p. 345), so beloved of corporations, managers and management consultants in Western industrial societies. Used to describe an organizational member who has accepted to perform the "abandoning" of his or her subjectivity, "professional" also seems to denote organizational members who can produce, market or exhibit *anything*.[73] Despite its more limited prevalence, the *taste as a resource for market*

417

knowledge performance shares with *the professional approach to taste* the cherishing of "neutrality". It is the latter taste performance that dominates the economic pole. Because the managers of Sandrew Metronome espouse the goals defined by economic capital, there is a lot of low-hanging fruit enticing organizational members, who have the authority, to perform the corresponding taste performance. As a strategy to advance in the organization, the adoption of *the professional approach to taste* thus offers the organizational member the most favorable career prospects.

I will soon inquire into some possible interpretations of the significance placed on downplaying "personal taste". First, however, I want to turn to the cultural pole, where "personal taste" is still considered inevitable.

TASTE MANAGEMENT BY THE CULTURAL POLE

I regard the two taste performances identified by the cultural pole, *the distinctive taste performance* and *balancing taste and market potential*, as located along a continuum where the former represents a "purer" form of cultural capital, and where the latter, although still markedly dominated by cultural capital, is slightly infused with economic capital in its focus on "the market".

As I stated in chapter 12, organizational members stay away from presenting themselves as having a distinctive taste although many confirm that *distinctive taste performances* are in fact typical of the organization. There seems to be little incentive to use such a taste performance as a strategy to advance in the organization. The fact that the *balancing taste and market potential* performance is considerably more frequent at the cultural

418

pole than the *distinctive taste performance* may be interpreted in several ways. Cooperation being a defining feature of organizational life, it may dilute the role of taste as a power medium. Moreover, the organizational form, the corporation, points in the direction of the economic pole. In addition, the popularity of the *balancing taste and market potential* performance could certainly be a reflection of the current field repositioning towards the economic pole.

Rather than emphasizing a distinguished taste, managing taste by the cultural pole consists in stressing one's experience in the film industry and, hence, one's familiarity with the market.

Yet, there are few young organizational members who perform *the balancing taste and market potential*. This may be a result not only of reduced recruitment at the cultural pole, but also, of difficulties in staging this performance with authority. Their lack of experience and cultural capital, which may sometimes be too obvious to cover up, may however be counterbalanced by reference to networks within the industry, i.e., by emphasizing Gemeinschaft. Still, it appears far more attractive for young organizational members who want to pursue a career in the organization to adopt *the professional approach to taste.*

Contrary to taste management by the economic pole, the inescapability of subjectivity is stressed. However, as we saw in chapter 12, this view is often coupled with the assumption that there is "objectively" good and bad taste. The gendering of "objectivity" and "subjectivity" will be the topic of a separate section on p. 428, which indeed pertains to taste management by both poles.

Before moving on, I want to add that it could also be argued that because of the general requirement for taste management in *content*-driven interactions, sociability based on taste, or rather, on cultural objects is highly valued (see photographic study p. 308).

ORGANIZATIONAL TASTE MANAGEMENT

However, the notion of taste management is decidedly unclear regarding who is managing whom. The question of whether taste management consists in organizational members managing their taste as a strategic move to improve their position in the organization or if it implies that they feel compelled to manage their taste in a certain way (i.e., "the organization" manages their taste), evokes the structure / action dichotomy, challenged by Bourdieu (see p. 109). Let me explain.

The great influence on my naming of the three organizational taste performances *taste management* is of course Arlie Hochschild's (1983) study on emotion management in front-line service work. Hochschild shows that in modern capitalist society emotions are managed not only by individuals but also by organizations. In her study of airline hostesses, she demonstrates how capitalism has found a use for emotional work, materialized in organizations' laying claims "not simply to [the air hostess'] physical motion – how she handles food trays – but her emotional actions and the way they show in the ease of a smile" (ibid., p. 8). The process by which the private emotional act (e.g., enjoying a party) is linked to a public act (e.g., performing a good feeling for a customer) is called "transmutation of an emotional system" in Hochschild's vocabulary.

It could be argued that the organization in my study manages the taste of its organizational members in very much the same way as the organization in Hochschild's study manages the emotions of its organizational members. It is possible that *organizational* taste management of this kind is carried out through the formulation of organizational goals (and perhaps also values, see p. 265), as well as by the taste performances articulated and practiced by people in power positions. With reference to the discussion on structure / action à la Bourdieu (p. 109), I will nevertheless refrain from making a statement as to who is managing the taste of the organizational members. To me, such a distinction is futile. As Bourdieu (1977) contends, people *act* on structural conditions and *understand* reality through their practical subjective knowledge, habitus being the juncture between objective and subjective reality. In other words, it is impossible to separate between organizational taste management and taste management on the part of the individual organizational member.

However, Hochschild leans towards a structural explanation. Then again, Hochschild's emotional workers are subject to "deep acting" fostered by management on an institutional level and aimed at producing real, subjective feelings (Hochschild 1983). To the extent that organizational taste management exists in the organization of my study, the organizational members are only doing what Hochschild (ibid.) labels "surface acting", i.e., fostering an *impression* of a certain taste or of a blank taste. In my study, organizational members are allowed to see and think as they wish, but in order to appear competent and *interested* (cf. Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992) they are required to perform taste in institutionally approved ways, i.e., according to the principle of legitimacy guiding them.

Maybe organizational taste management is at its strongest when organizational members are asked or expected to perform "professional enthusiasm" for a taste that is not theirs. As stated by one of my interviewees, such enthusiasm may not be "faked" (see p. 360). I interpret this statement as an emphasis on the authority of the performer; he or she must be accepted by the other interactants in order to be credible in his or her enthusiasm. Thus, it may be hard to perform "professional enthusiasm" for organizational members with the "wrong" capital composition for the title in question.

To conclude this section, taste management is less a matter of singling out who is managing whom, than of understanding the forces behind it and its consequences on the organization and the organizational members.

DRIFTING TOWARDS THE ECONOMIC POLE

Instrumental rationality and its consequences

Repeatedly, from chapter 11 onwards, I have stressed the repositioning of the organization towards the economic pole. Without doubt, the mounting influence of the economic pole in the organization affects, or even constitutes, taste management in the same arena. As we saw above, under the heading of "taste management by the economic pole", the shift in the direction of the economic pole is coupled with an increasing weight given to instrumental rationality, a central element of the economic pole, of Gesellschaft. In consulting Weber's (1930) writings on the connection between modernity and instrumental rationality, we are however given a word of caution. Instrumental rationality[74], which dominates value rationality (i.e., an action based on a conscious

belief in the value for its own sake, e.g., based on religion, politics or aesthetics), infuses a belief that efficiency in and of itself improves our lives, and, for that matter, our organizations. In other words, means become ends in themselves (for example, economic growth, wealth, efficiency, and productivity). Only the private spheres permit value rationality, and there is a progressively larger division between the public and private sphere. Weber argues that the proliferation of instrumental rationality augments the degree of value irrationality. A version of this problem of value irrationality can be found today when societies increase productivity at the cost of environmental problems and health problems such as obesity and burnout.

An interpretation of taste management in the organization in general, and by the economic pole in particular, is thus contained in Webers's suggestion that modernity subordinates values, such as taste, to instrumental rationality. In the organization at the center of this study, instrumental rationality pervades the constructions of meaningfulness among the executives at the economic pole (see p. 304), exemplified through the stressing of "money", "results", and "relation to work team". Although relationships, at first glance, may appear to reverberate Gemeinschaft rather than Gesellschaft, I interpret it as a Gesellschaft-marked notion of relation to work team. The anonymity, and, hence, replaceability of the team itself, bears the sign of Gesellschaft. I understand these constructions of meaningfulness as part of the idealized performance of a business leader. Only faint traces of these constructions of meaningfulness can be found among organizational members further down in the organizational hierarchy (see p. 302). In fact, some of the negative aspects of organizational life that were identified in the photographic study (p. 329) regarding, for

example, reporting, stress and lack of control, may be considered as manifestations (reporting) and consequences (stress, lack of control) of the organization's efficiency-orientation. Possibly, then, revenues, efficiency and market share sometimes serve as goals at the expense of work place satisfaction (see photographic study, p. 308), meaningfulness (p. 302) and, perhaps, also profits (see p. 251).

Compounding the problem of focusing on means as ends in the organization is, for one thing, the growing distinction between the public and private sphere (which, in turn, rests on audience segregation), where the organizational arena itself calls for a specific behavior, i.e., "neutral", "efficient", "professional" and "impersonal", on the part of the organizational members. This may give rise to *role distance*, something I will discuss under that heading below. For another, the dichotomous construction of the economic and cultural pole leaves everyone who does not comply with the economic capital-based goals as *disinterested* in the organizational objectives. Whereas the effects of this dichotomy will be the topic of the latter half of this chapter, I want to linger a little on how instrumental rationality affects taste management.

Bureaucracy and taste management

Although the strengthening of Gesellschaft evidently influences taste management at both poles, I want to belabor an aspect of Gesellschaft that affects taste management by the economic pole specifically: bureaucracy. In a study of the ethics of modern businesses in the economic field, Robert Jackall (1988) discusses virtue as a social construct and identifies the fact that bureaucracy separates "men and women from the consequences of

their actions" (p. 127) as an encumbrance to the fostering of ethical behavior in organizations. Describing bureaucracies as networks of patronage, Jackall stresses the constant need for adaptation to what one's managers want or seem to want. Accordingly, morality hinges on the situation; it consists in whatever it takes "to get things done", which often implies doing what the boss wants. Absolute principles are not welcome. In fact, they are perilous to career advancement.

Consequently, "whistleblowers" (i.e., managerial dissenters, who often take moral stands against their organization) are out of favor in the organization. Their presence in the organization interferes with the everyday sensemaking processes.

Without clear authoritative sanctions, moral viewpoints threaten others within an organization by making claims on them that might impede their ability to read the drift of social situations. As a result, independent morally evaluative judgments get subordinated to the social intricacies of the bureaucratic workplace... Managers know that in the organization right and wrong get decided by those with enough clout to make their views stick. (ibid., p. 105)

Managers in Jackall's study underline that a whistleblower often violates fundamental rules of a bureaucracy. Included in these rules are:

1) You never go around your boss. 2) You tell your boss what he wants to hear, even when your boss claims that he wants dissenting views. 3) If your boss wants something dropped, you drop it. 4) You are sensitive to your boss's wishes so that you anticipate what he wants; you don't force him, in other words, to act as boss. 5) Your job is not to report something that your boss does not want reported, but rather to cover it up. You do what your job requires, and you keep your mouth shut. (ibid., p. 109f.)

I interpret Jackall's rendering of morality in bureaucracies as an example of the subordination of value rationality. I suggest that the influence of bureaucracy on

taste management may follow a similar pattern. Bureaucracy being a central element of Gesellschaft, it will inevitably affect *the professional approach to taste* performance. Manifested in the demands that the organizational members by the economic pole "step outside of their personal taste" and maintain an "objective" or "neutral" taste, Gesellschaft and instrumental rationality emphasize the primacy of the impersonal over the personal. Jackall's writings on the relation between morality and bureaucracy may contribute to a better understanding of the ambiguity inherent in the two constructions of the professional approach to taste (which I identified as "stepping outside of one's taste" and espousing an exceptionally broad taste).

If we replace "morality" with "taste" in the above account of Jackall's study, an interesting pattern emerges. To say that this pattern reflects the organization Sandrew Metronome, even by the economic pole, would be overstated. Nevertheless, it bears some resemblance to Gesellschaft post-merger culture and its accompanying taste performances at the economic pole. Taste, like morality in Jackall's study, may be said to hinge on the situation. Possibly depending on what one's boss says or wants, a specific version of *the professional approach to taste* is adopted. Consequently, this taste performance is a strategy to advance in the organization. It rests on the total dismissal of the cultural pole, which in this context equals "absolute principles". I noted that some organizational members adopt the two constructions of *the professional approach* simultaneously (on p. 356). This parallel use can be interpreted in light of the bureaucratic rules that endorse compromises and submission to the will of one's superiors while distancing oneself from any type of personal taste or standpoint. Maybe, consistency in the rejection of the "personal" and "subjective" is

most essential, the very definition of "professionalism" (see footnote 73). Further, organizational members with more cultural capital would have a harder time managing their taste from the economic pole as they lack authorization to perform *the professional approach to taste*, and, therefore, also to switch between the two constructions of this taste performance.

In chapter 12, I stated that *the professional approach to taste* is primarily supported by and legitimized by men (see p. 392). Homosociality, where men orient themselves towards other male managers (see also p. 401), may also be said to pervade Jackall's description of bureaucratic rules. The way managers are urged to show concern for their superiors may be described as *homosocial care* (Holgersson 2003). Women and peripheral men (in this case, men from the cultural pole) may be regarded as whistleblowers if they do not conform to the bureaucratic rules. The references to "yes-men" around one of the senior managers and the experience of insecure male managers (p. 259) may hint at bureaucratic rules similar to those in Jackall's study. Thus, taste management at the economic pole also includes homosocial behavior on the part of men and heterosocial behavior on the part of women (although the latter may still be constructed as deficient to the male norm).

The impact of instrumental rationality and bureaucracy on an organization in the field of cultural production thus fosters a culture where managers and organizational members will dine come what may. Taste management at the economic pole consists, to a large extent, in maintaining a "neutral" and "objective" relation to taste. This can be made by adopting somewhat different, and sometimes parallel, constructions of *the professional approach to taste*, the selection of which may often be

guided by what male managers say. Objectivity nevertheless is gendered, and *the professional approach to taste* hinges on men's interpretive prerogative, a topic I will turn to next.

GENDERED "OBJECTIVITY" AND "SUBJECTIVITY"

This discussion of gendered "objectivity" and "subjectivity" continues the analysis of gendered taste performances and male normativity from chapter 12 (see p. 391f.) and draws heavily on Hochschild's (1983) study of emotional management. In the prevailing gender order, women have traditionally traded emotion management for economic support. Hochschild argues that women are constructed as "emotional", but their feelings are not seen as "a response to real events but as reflections of themselves as 'emotional women'" (ibid., p. 172). She claims that when a man is angry his anger is constructed as "rational" or understandable due to a strong conviction, yet the same degree of anger expressed by a woman will most often be constructed as personal instability. Along the lines of the dichotomous construction of men as more "objective" and women as more "subjective" that materialized in my study of taste performances by the economic pole, Hochschild outlines a "corollary of the 'doctrine of feelings'":

[…] the lower our status, the more our manner of seeing and feeling is subject to being discredited, and the less believable it becomes. An 'irrational' feeling is the twin of an invalidated perception. A person of lower status has a weaker claim to the right to define what is going on; less trust is placed in her judgments; and less respect is accorded to what she feels. Relatively speaking, it more often becomes the burden of women, as with other lower-status persons, to uphold a minority viewpoint, a discredited opinion. (ibid., p. 173)

Translated to taste performances, "the weaker claim to the right to define what is going on" implies that a female organizational member's taste performances will be placed in doubt no matter what pole is triggered. For the most part, it is harder for her to claim "neutrality" or "objectivity". A female organizational member's efforts to manage taste may be greater at the economic pole than at the cultural pole since the gendering of "objectivity" as male implies that her position is disadvantaged from the outset.

Not surprisingly, given the espousal of subjectivity by the cultural pole, more women than men adhere to *the balancing taste and market potential* performance. Still, a version of the gendered construction of "objectivity" and "subjectivity" is applicable here as well. Since "objectivity" is gendered male, men are constructed as referring to more "objective" criteria for what constitutes "good taste". In line with Hochschild's argument above, it *may* even be that at the cultural pole, where subjectivity is cherished, women with strong views are conceived as just "very opinionated" and insufficiently "rational" in their opinions. By the same reasoning, men's opinions may, to a greater extent, be constructed as resting on long experience, a central characteristic of Gemeinschaft.

Having been primarily concerned with the forces behind taste management, I will now turn to some of its consequences. One is the possibility of role distance.

ROLE DISTANCE

Drawing on Goffman's notion of "role distance" (see p. 86), I would like to argue that if taste management fosters a "virtual self" that the organizational member does

not identify with, the latter may try to disidentify him or herself from the implied virtual role by, for example, expressing role distance or declining to enter into the sanctioned role (Goffman 1961). Although role distance may be expressed by organizational members all over the organization, the most severe cases would naturally occur were organizational members rich in cultural capital to perform *the professional approach to taste*. Given that taste, an operationalization of cultural capital, is central to the habitus of these people, it is unlikely they can manage taste so "completely" as to deny its existence if only because they would lack the authority for a performance based on the economic pole. However, the influence of the economic pole is still not pervasive. At present, organizational members at the cultural pole are not required to "step out of their personal taste"; they can adopt the *balancing taste and market potential performance*. Yet, there is a chance that if the organization continues its repositioning towards the economic pole, the growing influence of *the professional approach to taste* might preempt any attempt to highlight taste, even based on experience. That would necessitate role distance. The fact that the economic pole generally has a negative connotation (see the photographic study, p. 308), which would probably become even more negative were Gesellschaft reinforced, augments the expression of role distance.

In addition to the possible role distance expressed through the unyielding abandonment of one's capital composition, women who manage taste by adopting *the professional approach to taste* may experience yet another kind of role distance. With the economic pole and the accompanying taste performances being gendered male, women at the economic pole may feel that their gender identity is not confirmed through their taste

performances. In other words, women may experience role distance in terms of gender as well. Similarly, research in the field of gender and leadership has highlighted the need for women in top positions to balance competing conceptions of femininity and competence. Studies have shown that women who adopt the behavior of their male colleagues are perceived as competent but rather unfeminine and manly. On the other hand, if female leaders act differently than the male executives in the organization, their gender identity is not questioned, but they are constructed as deviant and somewhat less competent than their male counterparts (Sheppard 1989; Wahl, Holgersson and Höök 1998; Höök 2001b; Holgersson 2003).

Effects of taste management may also be found on an organizational level. This is the concern of the next sections.

THE DICHOTOMOUS CONSTRUCTION OF THE FIELD

As we have seen, taste management at both poles is highly influenced, or I dare even say constituted, by the greater weight placed on the economic pole. However, the shift towards the economic pole, which follows upon the expansion of the film field to a media field, is only partial. The move is most evident among the executives who not only formulate the economic capital-oriented goals, but who, at the economic pole, also construct meaningfulness in terms of economic capital. To some degree, management's influence seems to wane further down in the organization where, despite the widespread taste management, meaningfulness is constructed in terms more entrenched in cultural capital. The dichotomous construction of the field, along with the gradual move towards the economic pole, manifested through

taste management, may have major consequences both on the organizational members' work situation and on the organization's abilities to reach its objectives. This is true not only for Sandrew Metronome but for many organizations in the cultural production field subject to the same kind of repositioning.

First of all, it seems as if the organization could take more advantage of the cultural pole's predominantly positive connotations (see photographic study on p. 308), of its function as a source of pride for many organizational members (including those by the economic pole, see for example p. 289) and of the fact that many organizational members still construct their job as meaningful because they work in entertainment or film (depending on capital composition). Instead, in light of the dichotomous construction of the two poles, management that espouses economic capital-oriented objectives will construct these inclinations towards the cultural pole on the part of the organizational members as signs of *disinterestedness* or "unprofessionalism".

Secondly, where the economic pole dominates, the dichotomous construction of the economic and the cultural principles of legitimacy tends to bring about a situation where some potential organizational resources are being overlooked. The dichotomous construction of the two poles may imply that the economic camp dismisses the idea of reaching an art house audience (at least with methods associated with the cultural pole). The cultural pole, with its accompanying constructions and practices of taste, is regarded as problematic and unprofessional, something in need of management (see p. 356, p. 415). This is particularly interesting in light of the two constructions of the market that I identified. At the economic pole, a reified construction of the market prevails.

The organizational members can aspire to reflect the market and meet its demands, by being "professional" and "neutral", but they have no ambition to affect the market. This construction of the market permeates *the professional approach to taste* and *taste as a resource for market knowledge*. At the other end of the spectrum, *the balancing taste and market potential* performance and the *taste as a resource for market influence* performance support an interactive notion of the market, where organizational members (especially those with "objectively" good taste) can, and should, strive to shape the market.

Thus, at the powerful economic pole one may not realize that organizational members by the cultural pole can contribute to the legitimizing of art house films. For example, by acquiring films rich in cultural capital, by programming and producing films associated with the cultural pole and by distributing films with a cultural profile, and thereby endowing the name Sandrew Metronome with cultural capital, the organization stands a good chance of affecting how films are received by the art house film audience and by people who play a part in legitimizing art house films to a larger audience, people such as reviewers and cinephiles. Hence, cultural capital and its accompanying definition of "good taste" could be used as an organizational resource to increase the organization's chances of choosing the "right" art house titles, given that titles of this type are constructed as review-driven. After all, there are indications that the profit margins of art house films are high when the films attract an audience (see p. 251). Organizational members at the economic pole often construct art house films as high-risk projects, alleging that they are impossible to market (see p. 289). I interpret their perception of the high risk associated with art house films and their perception of people at the cultural pole as unreliable, as hinging on the lack of

433

understanding of the cultural rules of legitimacy.[75]

A phenomenon that may mediate the polarization between the economic and cultural pole as well as curtail the growing influence of the former is something that can be described as organizational hypocrisy.

ORGANIZATIONAL HYPOCRISY

Drawing on Brunsson (1989), it could be argued that a scenario of mixed principles of legitimacy will inevitably give rise to "organizational hypocrisy". In modern societies, there are powerful norms regarding "the inner life" of organizations, according to Brunsson. Organizations often have to prove that they endorse and realize general modern values, such as rationality, progress and equality. One way of dealing with norms that are inconsistent with efficient organizational action is to create two sets of processes, where one creates action and one is more focused on expressing norms (cf. Goffman's (1959) division between *action* and *expression*, and Argyris and Schön's (1974) distinction between *theory-in-use* and *espoused theory*). As Gouldner (1959) points out, organizational members, and organizational actions in general, are often not guided by the goals espoused by the organization. Along these lines, management in an organization in the field of cultural production subject to a repositioning towards the economic pole may espouse goals derived from the economic pole, but it may also informally communicate competing goal definitions and work rationales to organizational members. In Sandrew Metronome, it seems that norms regarding goals are very coercive; almost all managers define goals in terms of the economic pole (although from time to time with an additional, equally important "culturally

434

defined" goal). However, when discussing meaningfulness, another picture emerges, where managers at the cultural pole and, to a large extent, organizational members in general, draw on the cultural pole to legitimize their answers. In contrast to questions regarding goals, my question concerning meaningfulness may have been one that managers were not accustomed to responding to. The lack of a "thin party line" regarding meaningfulness may have prompted the greater variety of answers among managers as well as among organizational members in general.

The "decoupling" of norms and actions is also evident in the separation between taste performances and organizational culture. An illustrative example is the distribution woman who, on one hand, calls attention to "the cinephile problem" associated with *the distinctive taste performance* (see p. 366), a problem that consists in what she considers an occasional *disinterest* in the company objectives among some of the organizational members by the cultural pole. On the other hand, she emphasizes that the pride of the organizational members rests on the quality products of Sandrew Metronome. As the organizational culture is clearly defined in terms of cultural capital, I assume that she mainly refers to cultural capital-oriented products. Thus, the interpretive prerogative enjoyed by people at the cultural pole regarding descriptions of the organizational culture may further underscore the separation between norms and actions. The organizational culture may be very strong and function as a way to control the influence of the espoused goals on everyday practice (cf. Castañer 1997).

Inconsistent norms, which follow naturally from being located in the field of cultural production with two principles of legitimacy, are not only difficult to reflect con-

435

currently, but also difficult to incorporate into action. By underscoring that organizations that face competing demands often recruit people who claim not to share the values, norms and beliefs of other organizational members, Brunsson offers an interpretation of the many rejections of "the old Sandrews" values among recent recruits with non-film backgrounds. In order to create efficient action, organizations with inconsistent and competing norms may distinguish between talk, decisions and actions. Brunsson argues that it is very easy to present conflicting talk and decisions (as long as the latter are not executed) and act according to yet another set of norms.

Although it can be productive to separate between talk, decisions and action from the organization's perspective, such organizational hypocrisy may be complicated for individual organizational members who sometimes need to act as a team.

TEAMS

In the above discussion, I mentioned that the lack of a "thin party line" (see p. 94) might explain the more varied answers to my question about meaningfulness as compared with questions about company objectives. A "thin party line" may be both beneficial and detrimental to an organization in the field of cultural production. As long as there is no "thin party line", e.g., a number of espoused values or objectives for the entire organization, it is rather easy to combine the two poles of legitimacy. Organizational members and the organization at large can benefit from letting the situation, the involved parties and departments trigger a key principle of legitimacy. This permits them to assume a richer definition of the situation and, perhaps, to foster organizational hypocrisy.

On the other hand, this lack of a "thin party line" may also result in a pervasive uncertainty among organizational members because they cannot conduct proper team performances; they do not know how to present the organization, its goals and their role in it. Organizational members outside of the management group often refrain from making comments about goals and values (see p. 335) since they do not know what "talk" to espouse in their team performances (even if this in turn deviates not only from decisions but also from actions).

This book was based on an organization, Sandrew Metronome, at a certain time in history. However, I have sought to point out general features common to most organizations in the field of cultural production. Thus, I hope that my study will encourage more reflection on the consequences of adopting the instrumental rationality and Gesellschaft models promoted throughout the business world in this kind of organizations.

CONTRIBUTIONS

In an attempt to summarize the contributions of this dissertation, I would like to emphasize that they are first and foremost of a theoretical character. Focusing on organizations in the field of cultural production and the two dichotomously constructed principles of legitimacy that distinguish these organizations, I make my contributions to organization studies. Since I direct attention to organizations in the field of cultural production specifically, it may appear as if I restrict myself to contributions in arts management and cultural production, research streams which are occupied with the same empirical field as I am (see p. 169). However, because I emphasize the competing principles of legitimacy that

characterize this type of organizations, I hold that the contributions of my study go beyond the field of arts management and cultural production to also include the stream of organization research that deals with questions of legitimacy; my particular approach to issues of legitimacy in organizations being the combination of the theories of Bourdieu and Goffman.

This being a largely theoretically driven study, I regard my analytical model (see chapter 4 – 7) as a contribution in itself, as it charts a model for probing organizational members' relation to taste in organizations in the field of cultural production. Closely tied to the analytical model is the concept of *taste performance*, which I developed by drawing on theories of Bourdieu and Goffman, and applying them to an organization (see p. 135 for a definition). A number of different taste performances characteristic of an organization in the field of cultural production are then identified in the empirical / analytical part of the dissertation. These are *talk of taste as an interaction medium*, *distinctive taste performances*, *balancing taste and market potential*, *a professional approach to taste*, and *taste as a resource for market knowledge or influence*. In addition, I want to emphasize the gendering of these taste performances. Drawing on theories in the field of gender and organization, I add the significance of gender to the interpretations of the taste performances. Still, I make no claim to contribute theoretically to the field of gender and organization. Another contribution is the concept of *taste management* (see p. 415 for a definition), which is a vital part of my concluding analysis. Furthermore, I regard the analysis of the causes and consequences of taste management by organizational members and by the organization as a contribution. Although not as central as the concepts mentioned so far, I want to highlight as a contribution to the understanding of organizations in the field of cultural

production, and especially those organizations subject to a repositioning, the notion of a film Gemeinschaft and a video Gesellschaft, introduced in the beginning of the empirical Part II (see p. 243). Furthermore, I consider the use of collaborative photography as a methodological contribution to organization studies. Although I primarily contribute to organization studies, I want to add that the combination of Bourdieu's and Goffman's theories, and its application to organizations, epitomized in the concept of taste performances, may be considered as a contribution to the sociology of culture as well.

SOME FINAL WORDS

Writing this dissertation, I avoided a structure true to the research process in favor of one that addresses theoretically and empirically interesting questions in a comprehensible way (see p. 199). Yet, I would like to end this book by briefly returning to the research process and casting light on my position as author and my interpretive prerogative when writing this book, as well as on the range of possible interpretations of texts. In fact, I will close with three photographs that correspond with the assignment of the participants of the photographic study. I have photographed something I liked about writing a dissertation, something I disliked about writing a dissertation, and something that symbolizes writing a dissertation, the only difference from the photographic study (besides this version not being particularly collaborative) is that I refrain from pointing out which picture falls into which category. Although congruence between my intended meaning and your interpretation of it was always elusive, I think, now, at the very end, it is not even desirable. In other words, I will take advantage of being the author of this book and leave it somewhat open-ended.

71. Organizational members of a government subsidized museum or a philharmonic orchestra, in close proximity to the cultural pole, would probably shy away from *the professional approach to taste* and *taste as a resource for market knowledge*. Thus, I make no claim for applicability to organizations clinging on to the cultural pole. However, since a defining characteristic of organizations in the field of cultural production is the significance of the cultural pole (the field being conceptualized as "the economic world reversed", cf. Bourdieu 1993), a corresponding reservation with regards to organizations immediately by the economic pole seems unnecessary.

72. *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary* (2003) defines "manage" (as a transitive verb) in the following terms: 1. to handle or direct with a degree of skill: as a) to make and keep submissive, b) to treat with care, c) to exercise executive, administrative, and supervisory direction of ; 2. to work upon or try to alter for a purpose; 3. to succeed in accomplishing; 4. to direct the professional career of.

73. Please note that this notion of "professionalism", closely tied to Gesellschaft, parts with the theoretical notion of professionalism in sociological literature. Conceptualizing professionalism as "occupational control of work" (see Freidson 1994), a recurring theme of the research on professionalism is the institutionalization of professional careers and norms (see Leicht and Fennell 1997). Professionalism in this context is sometimes seen as an alternative to free market or bureaucratic ways of work organization (see Freidson 1994). Moreover, this research area is primarily concerned with comparatively cultural capital-oriented professions (cf. Bourdieu 1984).

74. Obviously, Weber was aware of the co-existence of various types of rationality. However, what Weber called "instrumental rationality" has many times been equated with "rationality". For example, as Sjöstrand (1997) notes, there is a strong tendency among management theorists to replicate the notion of rationality used by economists. The latter view rationality as a calculative logic and regard it as something that is easily distinguished from irrationality. In other words, this construction of rationality is rampant among management theorists and practitioners.

75. Similarly, a deficient understanding of the cultural principles of legitimacy may give rise to the property demand is uncertain/"nobody knows" identified by Caves (2000) (see p. 178).

Appendices

- - - -

Visual methods

In interpreting photographs taken by organizational members one needs to pay some attention to photographic practices in general; i.e., the development of relationships between individuals, visual technologies, practices and images, society and culture. There are, however, conflicting views in this matter. On one hand, there is Pierre Bourdieu (1990b) who claims that objective limitations preside over individuals' photographic practice. In other words, what is "photographable" differs from person to person depending on his or her *habitus*. Photographic practice and amateur photographs are uniquely regulated and conventional. On the other hand, there are those who assign more agency to the individual, maintaining that individuals produce images intentionally and without the limits of objective factors, by drawing from a pool of personal and cultural resources of visuals.

Advocates of this second position (e.g., Cohen 1994, Pink 2001) claim that although individuals produce images that somehow perpetuate existent visual languages, this does not necessarily imply that these individuals are subject to objective limitations. Finding that Bourdieu's view reduces agency, subjectivity and creativity, these researchers claim that when "reproducing" conventional compositions, individuals are in fact just drawing from personal and cultural visual resources.

Since I gave the organizational members specific photographic assignments in the organizational environment, these photos naturally deviate from the norms of photo-

graphic practice. However, the inclusion of the writings on photographic practices could still be useful when interpreting the pictures, as they indicate to what extent the photographer has deviated from normal practice for this assignment. For the most part, vacations, family gatherings, celebrations, famed buildings and ancient monuments, provide automatic and socially sanctioned photo opportunities. How awkward does it then feel to take photos at work?

A REFLEXIVE APPROACH TO VISUAL METHODS

Films, photographs, drawings, cartoons, grafitti, maps, diagrams, signs and symbols were introduced by qualitative researchers in the sixties with the aim of enhancing our understanding of the human condition. Over the years (and across different disciplines), the degree of acceptance and continuity has varied. These visual research methods have also shown a theoretical diversity both between and within disciplines. Although the use of video as a visual research device has recently proliferated (primarily in anthropology), this study is only concerned with still photography.

What distinguishes pictures used in the social sciences from those claimed to be documentary photography or photojournalism is nothing but the particular way people involved with them use them, understand them and attribute meaning to them (Becker 1998). In an attempt to unpack the distinctive features of photographs used for social science purposes, I will give a brief outline of how pictures are employed and what theoretical standpoints inform their use. Most of this section will, however, be devoted to the reflexive approach to photography that I have used in my study.

In the forties, when anthropology was mainly a science of classification, anthropological studies used photographs to categorize human races (Harper 1998). Bateson and Mead (1942), for example, took more than 25 000 photographs during a two-year field study on the Balinese character. Common to the visual methods traditions in both anthropology and sociology is the conventions of "the realist tale" (van Maanen 1988). According to these conventions, the author is a scientific expert and, thus, all personal reporting and personal reflections should be discarded. The scientist observes "objectively" and, in line with this tradition, photography is seen as a "reflection" rather than an "interpretation" of what is photographed. In this very selective manner the anthropologist confirms his or her theories. The corresponding visual tradition in sociology drew on documentary photography, where many social problems that had been excluded from the sociological agenda were being exposed. Sociologists found that the documentary photographers had consummate involvement with their subjects, something that many sociologists were looking for. However, this documentary movement did not address issues of representation, ideology or how the photographer's relationship with the subject influenced the end result (Harper 1998). Becker (1974) draws attention to a widening gap between sociology and photography when the former was gradually constructed as a science and the latter as an art.

However, a few decades later, a more reflexive approach to visual methods had seen the light.

A reflexive approach to visual methods

In *Writing Culture*, James Clifford stated that all ethnographies are fictions (Clifford 1986, p. 6 – 7):

To call ethnographies fictions may raise empiricist hackles. But the word as commonly used in recent textual theory has lost its connotation of falsehood, of something merely opposed to truth. It suggests the partiality of cultural and historical truths, the ways they are systematic and exclusive.[...] Ethnographic truths are [...] inherently partial – committed and incomplete.

The ideas put forth by Clifford and Marcus (1986) were very serviceable to the visual representation of ethnography, since *Written Culture* had highlighted the similarities between the constructedness of film and written text. A redefinition of ethnography came along:

Rather than being a method for the collection of 'data', ethnography is a process of creating and representing knowledge (about society, culture and individuals) that is based on ethnographers' own experiences. It does not claim to produce an objective or 'truthful' account of reality, but should aim to offer versions of ethnographers' experiences of reality that are as loyal as possible to the context, negotiations and intersubjectivities through which the knowledge was produced. (Pink 2001, p. 18)

Casting light on the importance of the researcher's subjectivity to the production and reproduction of ethnographies, advocates for a reflexive approach to ethnography argue that subjectivity should be at the core of ethnographic knowledge, interpretation and representation. Ethnographers now suggest that research should focus on the production of ethnographic knowledge about how people experience reality, by directing attention to the intersubjectivity between researchers and their research contexts. The relationship between the subjectivities (the researcher's and the informants') generates a negotiated reality (Pink 2001). Thus, adherents

448

to the reflexive approach reject "the observational approach" which assumes that reality is visible, observable and recordable (in video or photography). An observational approach implies that one does research *on* people, not *with* them.

A visual method based on the realist tale most often implies that "reality" refers to the visible, to the material. A reflexive approach to the visual entails a perspective on "reality" that goes beyond objects that have a visual presence. Human imaginations and conversations are also visual (see for example Lakoff and Johnson 1980). In Pink's (2001) words: "material objects are unavoidably visual, but visual images are not, by definition, material. Nevertheless, the intangibility of an image that exists as verbal description or is imagined makes it no less 'real'" (p. 23). A reflexive visual ethnography then seeks to represent visible aspects of experience which different people interpret differently based on their own subjective knowledge. However, through intersubjectivity we have come to perceive photographs in general as realistic. For example, it is a very natural thing to show a picture of one's family and say "this is my family" (see Wright 1999). This brings me to the topic of participatory and collaborative photography, as these methods assign great importance to the subjectivity of the research subject.

PARTICIPATORY AND COLLABORATIVE PHOTOGRAPHY

Combining the intentions of both the researcher and the informant, collaborative photography is the result of their negotiation. This can, however, be done in a variety of ways. There are researchers working alone with one

informant (see Collier and Collier 1986) and researchers working with groups of informants (see Larson 1988), to name just two. There are several reasons for engaging in collaborative photography. Many cases attest to the researcher's interest in participating in the photographic culture of the informants. I have only come across two studies that resembles my use of participatory photography (i.e., the distribution of cameras to a number of people in a social arena, along with a specific assignment). One study used photography in order to give young pupils a chance to communicate what they liked and disliked about their school. Referring to their method as "photo evaluation", the authors argue for an alternative to feedback forms (Schratz and Steiner-Löffler 1998). Moreover, I later found out that running parallel to my study was a collaborative photographic study where organizational members depicted how it felt to work at their workplace (Warren 2002). Common to both studies are the subsequent interviews with the photographers centered on the developed pictures, "photographic interviewing". The practice of photographic interviewing has been used previously in ethnographic research, but then without the subjects themselves as photographers. Under such circumstances, the purpose has merely been to "elicit responses from informants" (see Pink 2001, p. 68). All in all, I conclude that the design of my photographic study is fairly unique.

Sample interview guide

PROJECT BACKGROUND
My background
About the project

YOUR ROLE IN THE ORGANIZATION
When did you first enter the organization?
Where did you work previously?
What are your responsibilities?
What is your most important responsibility / task?
What is the biggest challenge in your work?
What would you like to do in the organization?
Are there any other jobs you aspire to?

THE ORGANIZATION SANDREW METRONOME
Business / operations
Company goals / objectives
Organization in terms of departments and people.
Conflicts?
People (background, gender, age, etc)
What characterize the employees at S M?
Describe the organizational culture.
National differences?
Reorganizations. When? How?
Where is the power located?
What "external" actors / relations are most important
to the organization? (reviews?)
What is the most critical issue for the organization?
Is the organization subject to a lot of uncertainty?
How?
Describe the role of gender in the organization. Gender
equality? On top positions as well? Why?

INTERACTION

Who in the organization do you cooperate with?
In what projects? How?
What meetings do you take part in on a regular basis?
What topics are dealt with?
Describe the communication within the group and at
your local office.
Are social activities among employees common?
Describe these events.
Where do you have coffee/eat lunch? What do you
talk about? With whom?

TASTE

I am interested in the concept of taste. What are your
associations to "taste" in your work?
In general, when is the taste of the organizational mem-
bers important to the organization?
Is taste important in your job?
Can you recall any specific situation when taste has
been important in your work? How?
Do you often talk about film, television, literature,
music, sports, food, etc? How?
Is there any snobbism associated with taste in the
organization?
How would you characterize your taste? In film?
How do you evaluate films/projects?
Whose taste is most important? (if at all important)
How does a person acquire taste?

MEANINGFULNESS

I assume that you find your job meaningful. What
makes your job meaningful?

APPENDIX 3
Taste questionnaire sample

TASTE QUESTIONNAIRE

Sandrew Metronome Stockholm May 2002
Jenny Lantz, Ph.D. student, Stockholm School of Economics

My name is Jenny Lantz and I am a Ph.D. student at the Department of Management and Organization at the Stockholm School of Economics. This questionnaire is part of my research project concerning organizational culture and sensemaking in organizations; a dissertation project that serves to improve our understanding of how organizations work. The theme of the questionnaire is taste in organizations.

The questionnaire consists of a number of titles and names of musicians, films, television shows, authors, and restaurants. Your task is to grade them on a scale 1-5 (where 1 is the lowest and 5 the highest). I am interested in finding out what you *like* and *dislike*. Even though the survey covers a large number of titles/names, I hope you will somehow find it enjoyable to reflect on your taste while filling out the questionnaire. It probably takes about 15-20 minutes to fill it out. The questionnaire will only be used for academic purposes. I would be grateful if you filled it out as soon as possible. Your participation is highly appreciated, and a great help in my continuing dissertation work. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Jenny Lantz
Management and Organization
Stockholm School of Economics
Box 6501
113 83 Stockholm
Tel: 08-7369485
Email: Jenny.Lantz@hhs.se

How to fill out the questionnaire
Please circle the figure that best corresponds with your opinion of the artist, film, author, etc., on a scale where 1 represents 'strongly dislike' and 5 represents 'really like'. Please circle 'do not know' if you are not at all familiar with the piece or person in question.

Example:

MUSIC	dislike		<>		really like	
Snoop Dogg	1	②	3	4	5	don't know
Backstreet Boys	1	2	③	4	5	don't know
Emmylou Harris	1	2	3	4	⑤	don't know
Moby	1	2	③	4	5	don't know
Evert Taube	1	2	3	4	5	⬭don't know

Brief facts about you:

1. Name: _____
2. Gender: ☐ Man ☐ Woman
3. Age: _____ years
4. Education: Please mark the highest completed education.
   - ☐ Primary school
   - ☐ College of continuing education ("folkhögskola")
   - ☐ Upper secondary school
   - ☐ Undergraduate studies at university
   - ☐ Graduate studies at university
5. For how long have you been employed by the company?_____
6. Position:_____
7. Rank your interest in the following categories of culture (1=biggest, 5=least)
   ___Music ___Film ___Television ___Literature ___Restaurants

MUSIC

		dislike		<>		really like	
1.	Snoop Dogg	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
2.	Backstreet Boys	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
3.	Emmylou Harris	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
4.	Moby	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
5.	Evert Taube	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
6.	B.B. King	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
7.	Sheryl Crow	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
8.	Mary J. Blige	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
9.	Hedningarna	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
10.	Public Enemy	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
11.	Miles Davis	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
12.	Andrea Bocelli	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
13.	Britney Spears	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
14.	Metallica	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
15.	Joni Mitchell	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
16.	Petter	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
17.	The Pogues	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
18.	Willie Nelson	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
19.	The Beatles	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
20.	Aphex Twin	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
21.	Eric Clapton	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
22.	Elvis	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
23.	Barbados	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
24.	Chuck Berry	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
25.	Bob Marley	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
26.	Philip Glass	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
27.	Nick Cave	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
28.	Stevie Ray Vaughan	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
29.	Yes	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
30.	Herbie Hancock	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
31.	A Camp	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
32.	Marvin Gaye	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
33.	Pantera	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
34.	Madonna	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
35.	Bounty Killer	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
36.	Tortoise	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
37.	Dwight Yoakam	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
38.	David Bowie	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
39.	John Coltrane	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
40.	Nirvana	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
41.	Carola	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
42.	Ludwig van Beethoven	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
43.	Prince	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
44.	Frank Zappa	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
45.	Black Sabbath	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
46.	Arja Saijonmaa	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
47.	John Lee Hooker	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
48.	Aqua	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
49.	Claude Debussy	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
50.	Radiohead	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
51.	Beenie Man	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
52.	Clash	1	2	3	4	5	don't know

		dislike		<>		really like	
53.	Vikingarna	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
54.	Buddy Holly	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
55.	Rebecka Törnqvist	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
56.	Destiny's Child	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
57.	Igor Stravinskij	1	2	3	4	5	don't know

Musician/performing artist that I miss: _____

Grade:_____

FILM

		dislike		<>		really like	
1.	Bridget Jones dagbok	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
2.	Jacob's Ladder	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
3.	Trolösa	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
4.	O' Brother Where Art Thou?	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
5.	Gladiator	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
6.	Face Off	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
7.	Allt eller inget	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
8.	Bringing Out the Dead	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
9.	En idealisk äkta man	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
10.	Hana-bi	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
11.	Everyone Says I Love You	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
12.	Den gode, den onde, den fule	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
13.	Natural Born Killers	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
14.	Idioterna	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
15.	Köttets lustar	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
16.	Jalla! Jalla!	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
17.	The English Patient	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
18.	Den tunna röda linjen	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
19.	The Blair Witch Project	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
20.	Crouching Tiger Hidden Dragon	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
21.	Sleepless in Seattle	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
22.	Berk - sista vittnet	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
23.	Moulin Rouge	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
24.	Copycat	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
25.	Livet är en schlager	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
26.	Dagfjärilen	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
27.	Sleepy Hollow	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
28.	Terminator	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
29.	Hans och hennes	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
30.	The Ice Storm	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
31.	Spring Lola	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
32.	Jönssonligan spelar högt	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
33.	Fönstret mot gården	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
34.	American Beauty	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
35.	In the Mood for Love	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
36.	Elling	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
37.	The Shining	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
38.	Löjets skimmer	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
39.	Leva livet	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
40.	I huvudet på John Malkovich	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
41.	Seven	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
42.	East is East	1	2	3	4	5	don't know

	don't like		<>		really like	don't know
43. Golden Eye	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
44. Citizen Kane	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
45. Scream	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
46. Blade Runner	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
47. Fjärilens tunga	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
48. Den där Mary	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
49. The Limey	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
50. Till sista andetaget	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
51. Donnie Brasco	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
52. Tillsammans	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
53. The Matrix	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
54. Ceremonin	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
55. Magnolia	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
56. Amelie från Montmartre	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
57. Gudfadern	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
58. The Talented Mr Ripley	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
59. Requiem for a Dream	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
60. Happiness	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
61. Memento	1	2	3	4	5	don't know

Film that I miss: _____
Grade:_____

TV

	don't like		<>		really like	don't know
1. Uppdrag granskning	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
2. Vita Lögner	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
3. Dharma & Greg	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
4. Grammisgalan	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
5. Trafikmagasinet	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
6. Sportnytt/Sportspegeln	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
7. Kulturnyheterna	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
8. Late Show David Letterman	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
9. Efterlyst	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
10. Till jordens medelpunkt	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
11. Kalla fakta	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
12. Mitt i naturen	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
13. Fotbolls-VM	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
14. Svart eller vitt	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
15. Debatt	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
16. Så ska det låta	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
17. Spin City	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
18. Bildjournalen	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
19. Videokioboken	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
20. Nyhetsmorgon	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
21. Filmkronikan	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
22. Söndagsöppet	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
23. Sex and the City	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
24. Plus	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
25. Äntligen hemma	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
26. CNN-nyheter	1	2	3	4	5	don't know

---

	don't like		<>		really like	don't know
27. Rederiet	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
28. Mat	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
29. Silikon	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
30. Big Brother	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
31. Antikrundan	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
32. Dokumentären (SVT)	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
33. Nova	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
34. A-ekonomi	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
35. Parlamentet	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
36. Ricki Lake	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
37. Nyheterna	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
38. På Spåret	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
39. Cityakuten	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
40. När & fjärran	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
41. Musikbyrån	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
42. Expedition Robinson	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
43. Gladiatorerna	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
44. Felicity	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
45. TV3 Direkt	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
46. Mosaik	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
47. Sabrina för gammal för ung	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
48. Familjen	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
49. Bingolotto	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
50. OS i Salt Lake City	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
51. Seinfeld	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
52. Filmgalan	1	2	3	4	5	don't know

	don't like		<>		really like	don't know
53. Pyjamas	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
54. Röda rummet	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
55. Rapport	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
56. Vem vill bli miljonär?	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
57. En man kan från Texas	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
58. Sen kväll med Luuk	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
59. Baren	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
60. Heja Björn	1	2	3	4	5	don't know

Television show that I miss: _____
Grade:_____

LITERATURE

	don't like		<>		really like	don't know
1. Sidney Sheldon	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
2. Katarina Frostenson	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
3. Inger Edelfeldt	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
4. Ernst Brunner	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
5. Claes Holmström	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
6. Elsie Johansson	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
7. John Grisham	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
8. Kristian Petri	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
9. Lennart Sjögren	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
10. Eyvind Johnson	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
11. Zadie Smith	1	2	3	4	5	don't know

	dislike				really like	don't know
12. Margit Sandemo	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
13. Anna-Karin Granberg	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
14. Nick Hornby	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
15. Russell Banks	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
16. Hanif Kureishi	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
17. Karin Bellman	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
18. Göran Sonnevi	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
19. J.R.R. Tolkien	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
20. Maeve Binchy	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
21. Henning Mankell	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
22. Ulf Lundell	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
23. Kerstin Ekman	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
24. Malin Lindroth	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
25. Tom Clancy	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
26. Cecilia Davidsson	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
27. Björn Ranelid	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
28. Per Hagman	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
29. Marianne Fredriksson	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
30. Per Olov Enquist	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
31. Anna-Karin Palm	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
32. Louise Boije af Gennäs	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
33. Karin Fossum	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
34. Jonas Gardell	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
35. Martin Amis	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
36. Maria Hede	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
37. Lars Jakobson	1	2	3	4	5	don't know

	dislike				really like	don't know
38. James Ellroy	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
39. Harry Martinson	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
40. Monica Fagerholm	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
41. Linda Norrman Skugge	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
42. Geoff Ryman	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
43. Magnus Dahlström	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
44. Joanna Trollope	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
45. Carina Rydberg	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
46. Jan Guillou	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
47. Margaret Atwood	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
48. Salman Rushdie	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
49. Sara Lidman	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
50. Helen Fielding	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
51. Liza Marklund	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
52. Mikael Niemi	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
53. Peter Törnqvist	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
54. Harlequinböcker	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
55. Rosamunde Pilcher	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
56. J.K. Rowling	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
57. Paul Auster	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
58. Catharina Ingelman-Sundberg	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
59. Jackie Collins	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
60. Steve Sem-Sandberg	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
61. Marian Keyes	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
62. Lena Andersson	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
63. Ivar Lo-Johansson	1	2	3	4	5	don't know

	dislike				really like	don't know
64. Patricia Cornwell	1	2	3	4	5	don't know

Author that I miss: _____
Grade: ____

RESTAURANTS

	dislike				really like	don't know
1. Beirut Café	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
2. Babs Bar & Kök	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
3. Ocean	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
4. The Londoner	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
5. Atrium	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
6. Bon Lloc	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
7. Storstad	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
8. Burger King	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
9. WC	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
10. Franska matsalen	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
11. Café Opera	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
12. East	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
13. Grill Ruby	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
14. Food	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
15. Happy India	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
16. Pelikan/Kristallen	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
17. Fredsgatan 12	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
18. Den Gyldene Freden	1	2	3	4	5	don't know

	dislike				really like	don't know
19. Wedholms Fisk	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
20. Ko-Mama	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
21. Wasahof	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
22. Kungshallen	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
23. Halv trappa plus gård	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
24. KB	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
25. Koh Phangan	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
26. Nuovo	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
27. Vassa Eggen	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
28. Pizza Hut	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
29. Martini	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
30. Spisa hos Göken	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
31. McDonald's	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
32. Paus Bar & Kök	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
33. Il Tempo	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
34. Operakällaren/Bakfickan	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
35. Prinsen	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
36. Markattan	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
37. Anders Lampbar	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
38. Mäster Anders	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
39. Grodan Grev Ture	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
40. Narknot Bar & Restaurang	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
41. Kvarnen	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
42. Hannas	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
43. PA & Co	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
44. Alex Vinbar & Kök	1	2	3	4	5	don't know

	dislike		<>		really like	
45. Divino	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
46. Zum Franziskaner	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
47. Ho's	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
48. Riche/Teatergrillen	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
49. Kryp In	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
50. Sjögräs	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
51. Lydmar	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
52. Sophie's Bar	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
53. Snaps/Rangus Tangus	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
54. Lilla Pakistan	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
55. Sturehof	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
56. Guldapan	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
57. Roppongi	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
58. Zesty	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
59. Hermitage	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
60. Villa Källhagen	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
61. Elverket	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
62. Mooncake	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
63. Jerusalem Kebab	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
64. O'Learys	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
65. G'otchå	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
66. Folkhemmet	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
67. Stockholms Matvarufabrik	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
68. Järntorgspumpen	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
69. Eriks bakficka	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
70. Primo Ciao Ciao	1	2	3	4	5	don't know

	dislike		<>		really like	
71. Mandus	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
72. Lao Wai	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
73. Lounge Bar 51	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
74. Tranan	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
75. Gröne Jägaren	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
76. Pontus in the Greenhouse	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
77. Cheers	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
78. Lo Scudetto	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
79. Mårten Trotzig	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
80. Rolfs Kök	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
81. Chutney	1	2	3	4	5	don't know

Restaurant that I miss: _____
Grade: _____

Comments on the questionnaire:

_____

_____

_____

_____

Thank you for your participation!

Extract from the charter of the Anders Sandrew Foundation [76]

§ 2

OBJECTIVE

The objective of the Foundation is to, without restriction to any particular family or families or certain persons,

partly   to support the care and upbringing of children who lack the necessary means,

partly   to support, for example in the form of grants, education, primarily for young adults who seem to be endowed with good character and are hard-working and talented to make an achievement or do a work of significance in a profession, and who lack the necessary means to complete his or her education,

partly   to support academic research of significance to our country,

partly   to support the care of actors and actresses who are elderly or in poor health, but who have pursued respectable careers in theater or film.

76. This text was roughly translated from (oldfashioned) Swedish.

References

ABRAHAMSSON, L. (2000). *Att återställa ordningen.* Umeå, Boréa.

ABRAHAMSSON, L. (2002). "Just när det blev viktigt blev det manligt." *Kvinnovetenskaplig Tidskrift* (1): 37−52.

ACKER, J. (1988). "Class, Gender and the Relations of Distribution." *Signs* 13(3): 473−497.

ACKER, J. (1990). "Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations." *Gender & Society* 4(2): 139−158.

ACKER, J. (1992). Gendering Organizational Theory. *Gendering Organizational Analysis.* A. Mills and P. Tancred. Newbury Park, SAGE: 248−260.

ACKER, J. & D. R. VAN HOUTEN (1974). "Differential Recruitment and Control: The Sex Structuring of Organizations." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 19: 152−163.

ACKROYD, S. & P. THOMPSON (1999). *Organizational Misbehavior.* London, SAGE.

ADKINS, L. (1995). *Gendered Work: Sexuality, Family and the Labor Market.* Buckingham, Open University Press.

ADLER, N. & D. IZRAELI, Eds. (1988). *Women in Management Worldwide.* Armonk, NY, M.E. Sharpe.

ADORNO, T. (1978). "Culture and Administration." *Telos* (Fall): 93−111.

AKSOY, A. & K. ROBINS (1992). "Hollywood for the 21st Century: Global Competition for the Critical Mass in Image Markets." *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 16(1): 1−22.

ASLAKSEN, E. (1998). "Unge kunstnere og kunstverdenens kulturelle aspekter." *Nordisk Kulturpolitisk Tidskrift* (2): 6−32.

ALEXANDER, J. (2000). *La Réduction. Critique de Bourdieu.* Paris, Cerf.

ALVESSON, M. & A.-S. KÖPING (1993). *Med känslan som ledstjärna*. Lund, Studentlitteratur.

ALVESSON, M. & K. SKÖLDBERG (2000). *Reflexive Methodology: New Vistas for Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA, SAGE.

ALVESSON, M. & H. WILLMOT (1996). *Making Sense of Management. A Critical Introduction*. London, SAGE.

ARCHER, M. S. (1988). *Culture and Agency: The Place of Culture in Social Theory*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

ARCHER, M. S. (2000). *Being Human: The Problem of Agency*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

ARGYRIS, C. & D. A. SCHÖN (1974). *Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness*. San Francisco, Jossey Bass.

ASPLUND, J. (1991). *Essä om Gemeinschaft och Gesellschaft*. Göteborg, Bokförlaget Korpen.

BECKER, H. S. (1974). "Photography and Sociology." *Studies in the Anthropology of Visual Communication* 1(1): 3 – 26.

BECKER, H. S. (1982). *Art Worlds*. Los Angeles, University of California Press.

BECKER, H. S. (1998). Visual Sociology, Documentary Photography, and Photojournalism: It's (Almost) All a Matter of Context. *Image-Based Research: A Sourcebook for Qualitative Researchers*. J. Prosser. London, Falmer Press: 84 – 96.

BELL, D. (1976). *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism*. New York, Basic.

BÉNATOUÏL, T. (1999). "A Tale of Two Sociologies: The Critical and the Pragmatic Stance in Contemporary French Sociology." *European Journal of Social Theory* 2(3): 379 – 396.

BENNETT, T. (1998). *Culture: A Reformer's Science*. London, SAGE.

BERGER, P. & T. LUCKMANN (1966). *The Social Construction of Reality. A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge.* New York, Doubleday.

BETTIG, R. V. & J. L. HALL (2003). *Big Media, Big Money: Cultural Texts and Political Economics.* Lanham, Rowman & Littlefield.

BIRGERSON, M. (2005). *Filmbranschen och jämställd-heten.* Teaterförbundet.

BJÖRKEGREN, D. (1994). *Filmens företag.* Stockholm, Nerenius & Santérus.

BJÖRKEGREN, D. (1996). *The Culture Business: Management Strategies for the Arts-Related Business.* London, Routledge.

BLOMGREN, R. (1998). *Staten och filmen: svensk film-politik 1909 – 1993.* Stockholm, Gidlund.

BLUMER, H. (1969). *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall.

BOLTANSKI, L. & L. THÉVENOT (1991). *De la justifica-tion: Les économies de la grandeur.* Paris, Gallimard.

BONET, L., X. CUBELES & J. ROSELLO (1997). Management Control and Evaluation of Public Cultural Centres. *From Maestro to Manager: Critical Issues in Arts and Culture Management.* M. Fitzgibbon and A. Kelly. Dublin, Oak Tree Press: 85 – 96.

BORDWELL, D. & K. THOMPSON (1994). *Film History: An Introduction.* Boston, McGraw-Hill.

BOUDON, R. (1987). The Individualistic Tradition in Sociology. *The Micro-Macro Link.* J. Alexander. Berkeley, University of California Press.

BOURDIEU, P. (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice.* London, Cambridge University Press.

BOURDIEU, P. (1984). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste.* Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

BOURDIEU, P. (1986). The Forms of Capital. *Handbook of Theory and Research in the Sociology of Education.* J. G. Richardson. New York, Greenwood: 241–258.

BOURDIEU, P. (1990a). *The Logic of Practice.* Stanford, Stanford University Press.

BOURDIEU, P. (1990b). *Photography: A Middle-Brow Art.* Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press.

BOURDIEU, P. (1993). *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature.* New York, Columbia University Press.

BOURDIEU, P. (1996). *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field.* Cambridge, Polity Press.

BOURDIEU, P. (2001). *Masculine Domination.* Cambridge, Polity Press.

BOURDIEU, P. & L. J. D. WACQUANT (1992). *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology.* Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

BRETTELL GRIP & PORTNOFF (2004), "Accounting under Multiple Rationalities: A Study of the Royal Stockholm Philharmonic Orchestra." Paper presented at the EIASM 2nd Workshop on Managing Cultural Organizations. Bologna, Italy, December 13–14, 2004.

BROWN, C. & J. A. PECHMAN, Eds. (1987). *Gender in the Workplace.* Washington, DC, Brookings Institution.

BRUNSSON, N. (1989). *The Organization of Hypocrisy: Talk, Decisions and Actions in Organizations.* Chicester, John Wiley & Sons.

BRYSON, B. (1996). "'Anything But Heavy Metal': Symbolic Exclusion and Musical Dislikes." *American Sociological Review* 61: 884–899.

BRYSON, V. (1992). *Feminist Political Theory. An Introduction.* Basingstoke, Macmillan.

BUTLER, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity.* New York, Routledge.

CAILLÉ, A. (1988). "Esquisse d'une critique de l'économie générale de la pratique". *Lectures de Pierre Bourdieu*, Cahiers du LASA (Université de Caen)(8 – 9).

CALÁS, M. & L. SMIRCICH (1996). From the Woman's Point of View: Feminist Approaches to Organization Studies. *Handbook of Organization Studies*. S. Clegg, C. Hardy and W. Nord. London, SAGE: 218 – 257.

CAMAUËR, L. (2002). *Cultural Work and Cultural Production: An Attempt to Survey a Seemingly Unending Field*. Stockholm, Arbetslivsinstitutet.

CARP, O. (2005) "Filmbranschen dåligt jämställd". *Svenska Dagbladet*, 22 June.

CARRIGAN, T., R. CONNELL & J. LEE. (1985). "Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity." *Theory and Society* 14(5): 551 – 604.

CASTAÑER, X. (1997). The Tension between Artistic Leaders and Management in Arts Organizations: The Case of the Barcelona Symphony Orchestra. *From Maestro to Manager. Critical Issues in Arts and Culture Management*. Fitzgibbon, M. and Kelly, A. Dublin, Oak Tree Press.

CAVES, R. E. (2000). *Creative Industries: Contracts between Art and Commerce*. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.

CHONG, D. (2002). *Arts Management*. London, Routledge.

CICOUREL, A. V. (1974). *Cognitive Sociology: Language and Meaning in Social Interaction*. New York, Free Press.

CLEGG, S. R., C. HARDY & W. NORD, Eds. (1996). *Handbook of Organization Studies*. London, SAGE.

CLIFFORD, J. & G. E. MARCUS, Eds. (1986). *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley, University of California Press.

COCKBURN, C. (1991). *In The Way of Women*. London, Macmillan.

COHEN, A. (1994). *Self Consciousness: An Alternative Anthropology of Identity*. London, Routledge.

COLBERT, F., S. BILODEAU, J. NANTEL & W. POOLE (1994). *Marketing Culture and the Arts*. Montreal, Morin.

COLLIER, J. & M. COLLIER (1986). *Visual Anthropology: Photography as a Research Method*. Albuquerque, University of New Mexico Press.

COLLINS, J. (1992). Television and Postmodernism. *Channels of Discourse, Reassembled: Television and Contemporary Criticism*. R. C. Allen. London, Routledge: 327–353.

COLLINS, R. (1981). "On the Microfoundations of Macrosociology." *American Journal of Sociology* 86(5): 984–1014.

COLLINSON, D. L. & J. HEARN (1994). "Naming men as men: implications for work, organization and management." *Gender, Work and Organization* 1(1): 2-22.

COLLINSON, D. L. & J. HEARN (1996). Breaking the Silence: On Men, Masculinities and Managements. *Men as Managers, Managers as Men: Critical Perspectives on Men, Masculinities and Managements*. D. L. Collinson and J. Hearn. London, SAGE: 1–24.

CONNELL, R. (1987). *Gender and Power. Society, the Person and the Sexual Politics*. Stanford, Stanford University Press.

CONNELL, R. (1995). *Masculinities*. Berkeley, University of California Press.

CROZIER, M. & E. FRIEDBERG (1980). *Actors and Systems. The Politics of Collective Action*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

CZARNIAWSKA, B., Ed. (1998). *Organisationsteori på svenska*. Malmö, Liber ekonomi.

DE BEAUVOIR, S. (1989 [1952]). *The Second Sex*. New York, Vintage Books.

DARGIS, M. (2004). "Crouching Tiger, Hidden Truths in the Court of a King Who Would Be Emperor". *New York Times*, 27 August.

DELPHY, C. (1984). *Close to Home: A Materialist Analysis of Women's Oppression.* London, Hutchinson.

DELPHY, C. & D. LEONARD (1992). *Familiar Exploitation: A New Analysis of Marriage in Contemporary Western Societies.* Cambridge, Polity Press.

DENSCOMBE, M. (1998). *The Good Research Guide: For Small-Scale Social Research Projects.* Buckingham, Open University Press.

DIGGLES, K. (1986). *Guide to Arts Marketing: The Principles and Practice of Marketing as They Apply to the Arts.* London, Rhinegold.

DIMAGGIO, P. (1977). "Market Structures, the Creative Process, and Popular Culture." *Journal of Popular Culture* 11: 436–452.

DIMAGGIO, P. (1987). "Classification in Art." *American Sociological Review* 52: 440–455.

DIMAGGIO, P. J. & W. W. POWELL (1983). "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields." *American Sociological Review* 48: 147–160.

DIRKS, T. (2005). *Cinematic Terms: A Film-Making Glossary.* http://www.filmsite.org/filmterms2.html, (accessed June 12, 2005).

DIXON, W. W. (2001). Twenty-Five Reasons Why It's All Over. *The End of Cinema As We Know It: American Film in the Nineties.* J. Lewis. New York, New York University Press: 356–366.

DOBBIN, F (1994). Cultural Models of Organization: The Social Construction of Rational Organizing Principles. *The Sociology of Culture: Emerging Theoretical Perspectives.* D. Crane. Cambridge, Blackwell.

473

DOUGLAS, M. & B. ISHERWOOD (1979). *The World of Goods: Towards an Anthropology of Consumption.* New York, W.W. Norton.

DURKHEIM, E. (1992 [1900]). *Professional Ethics and Civic Morals.* London, Routledge.

EDUARDS, M. (1998). "Män – finns de?" *Kvinnovetenskaplig Tidskrift* (3-4): 77 – 84.

ELIAS, N. (1939 [1994]). *The Civilizing Process, vol 1: The History of Manners.* Oxford, Blackwell.

ELIAS, N. (1939 [1991]). *The Society of Individuals.* Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

ELSTAD, J. I. (1997). "Collective Reproduction Through Individual Artists: The Location of Norwegian Artists in the income Hierarchy." *Cultural Policy* 3(2): 267 – 288.

ELVIN-NOWAK, Y. (1998). *Flexibilitetens baksida. Om balans, kontroll och skuld i yrkesarbetande mödrars vardagsliv.* Stockholm, Psykologiska Institutionen, Stockholms Universitet.

ERICKSON, B. H. (1996). "Culture, Class, and Connections." *American Journal of Sociology* 102(1): 217 – 251.

ERICSSON, D. (2001). *Kreativitetsmysteriet: Ledtrådar till arbetslivets kreativisering och skrivandets metafysik.* Stockholm, EFI.

ETZIONI, A. (1964). *Modern Organizations.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall.

FAUSTO-STERLING (1985). *Myths of Gender. Biological Theories about Women and Men.* New York, Basic Books.

FERGUSON, K. (1984). *The Feminist Case against Bureaucracy.* Philadelphia, Temple University Press.

FITZGIBBON, M. & A. KELLY (1997). *From Maestro to Manager: Critical Issues in Arts and Culture Management.* Dublin, Oak Tree Press.

FLAX, J. (1990). Postmodernism and Gender Relations in Feminist Theory. *Feminism / Postmodernism*. L. Nicholson. New York, Routledge.

FORBES, D. P. (1998). "Measuring the Unmeasurable: Empirical Studies of Nonprofit Organization Effectiveness From 1977–1997." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 27(2): 183–202.

FREIDSON, E. (1994). *Professionalism Reborn: Theory, Prophecy and Policy*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

FREUND, K., B. HASLUM & G. LINDGREN (1988). *Sandrews: De första femtio åren*. Stockholm, Norstedts.

FREY, B. S. & W. W. POMMEREHNE (1989). *Muses and Markets: Explorations in the Economics of the Arts*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

FUCHS EPSTEIN, C. (1981). Women and Elites: A Cross-National Perspective. *Access to Power: Cross-National Studies of Women and Elites*. C. Fuchs Epstein and R. Laub Coser. London, Unwin.

GAME, A. & R. PRINGLE (1984). *Gender at Work*. London, Pluto.

GARFINKEL, H. (1984 [1967]). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge, UK, Polity Press.

GEERTZ, C. (1988). *Works and Lives: The Anthropologist as Author*. Stanford, Stanford University Press.

GEMZÖE, L. (2002). *Feminism*. Stockholm, Bilda.

GERGEN, K. J. AND K. E. DAVIS (1985). *The Social Construction of the Person*. New York, Springer-Verlag.

GIDDENS, A. (1976). *New Rules of Sociological Method*. London, Hutchinson.

GIDDENS, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society: Outline of a Theory of Structuration*. Berkeley, University of California Press.

GILJE, N. & H. GRIMEN (1992). *Samhälls-vetenskapernas förutsättningar.* Göteborg, Daidalos.

GLASER, B. G. & A. L. STRAUSS (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research.* New York, Aldine de Gruyter.

GOFFMAN, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life.* New York, Doubleday.

GOFFMAN, E. (1961). *Encounters: Two Studies in the Sociology of Interaction.* Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill.

GOFFMAN, E. (1963). *Behavior in Public Places: Notes on the Social Organization of Gatherings.* New York, Free Press.

GOFFMAN, E. (1967). *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face to Face Behavior.* New York, Pantheon.

GOFFMAN, E. (1977). "The Arrangement between the Sexes." Theory and Society 4(3): 301–331.

GOFFMAN, E. (1979). *Gender Advertisements.* London, Macmillan.

GOFFMAN, E. (1974). *Frame Analysis. An Essay on the Organization of Experience.* Boston, Northeastern University Press.

GOFFMAN, E. (1983). "The Interaction Order." *American Sociological Review* 48: 1–17.

GOMART, E. & A. HENNION (1999). A Sociology of Attachment: Music Amateurs, Drug Users. *Actor Network Theory and After.* J. Law and J. Hassard. Oxford, Blackwell.

GOMERY, D. (1986). *The Hollywood Studio System.* London, MacMillan.

GOTTDIENER, M. (1985). "Hegemony and Mass Culture: A Semiotic Approach." *American Journal of Sociology* 90(5): 979–1001.

GOULDNER, A. W. (1959). Organizational Analysis. *Sociology Today.* R. K. Merton, L. Broom and L. S. Cottrell. New York, Basic Books: 400–28.

GOULDNER, A. W. (1970). *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology*. New York, Avon.

GREENBERG, C. (1963). *Art and Culture*. Boston, Beacon Press.

GRISWOLD, W. (1987). "A Methodological Framework for the Sociology of Culture." *Sociological Methodology* 14: 1–35.

GRONOW, J. (1997). *The Sociology of Taste*. New York, Routledge.

GUILLET DE MONTHOUX, P. (1993). *Det sublimas konstnärliga ledning: estetik, konst och företag*. Stockholm, Nerenius & Santérus.

GUILLET DE MONTHOUX, P. (2004). *The Art Firm: Aesthetic Management and Metaphysical Marketing*. Stanford, Stanford University Press.

GUILLET DE MONTHOUX, P., C. GUSTAFSSON & S.-E. SJÖSTRAND (2006, in press). *Aesthetic Leadership: Managing Fields of Flow in Art and Business*.

HAAVIND, H. (1984). Love and Power in Marriage. *Patriarchy in a Welfare Society*. H. Holter. Oslo, Universitetsförlaget.

HALFORD, S. & P. LEONARD (2000). *Gender, Power and Organizations*. London, Palgrave.

HALL, J. R. & M. J. NEITZ (1993). *Culture: Sociological Perspectives*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall.

HANNERZ, U. (1996). *Transnational Connections: Culture, People, Places*. London, Routledge.

HARDING, S. (1986). *The Science Question in Feminism*. Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

HARPER, D. (1998). An Argument for Visual Sociology. *Image-Based Research: A Sourcebook for Qualitative Researchers*. J. Prosser. London, Falmer Press: 24–41.

HARTMANN, H. (1981). The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism. *Women and Revolution*. L. Sargent. Boston, South End Press: 1–41.

477

HARVEY, D. (1989). *The Condition of Postmodernity.* Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

HEARN, J. (1987). *The Gender of Oppression: Men, Masculinity and the Critique of Marxism.* Brighton, Wheatsheaf.

HEARN, J. & W. PARKIN (1983). "Gender and Organisation. A Review and a Critique of a Neglected Area." *Organization Studies* 4(3): 219–253.

HEBDIGE, D. (1988). *Hiding in the Light: On Images and Things.* New York, Routledge.

HELENIUS, R. (1990). *Förstå och bättre veta: om hermeneutiken i samhällsvetenskaperna.* Stockholm, Carlsson.

HELLE, H. J. (1991). *Verstehen and Pragmatism: Essays in Interpretative Sociology.* Frankfurt am Main, Lang.

HERMELE, V., Ed. (2002). *Män, män, män och en och annan kvinna.* Stockholm, Svenska Filminstitutet.

HIRDMAN, Y. (1988). "Genussystemet. Reflexioner över kvinnors sociala underordning." *Kvinnovetenskaplig Tidskrift* (3): 49–63.

HIRDMAN, Y. (1990). Genussystemet. *Demokrati och Makt i Sverige. SOU 1990:44.* Stockholm, Fritzes Förlag: 75–107.

HIRSCH, P. (1972). "Processing Fads and Fashions: An Organization-Set Analysis of Cultural Industry Systems." *American Journal of Sociology* 77: 639–659.

HOCHSCHILD, A. R. (1983). *The Managed Heart. Commercialization of Human Feeling.* Berkeley, University of California Press.

HOLGERSSON, C. (2003). *Rekrytering av företagsledare: en studie i homosocialitet.* Stockholm, EFI.

HOLSTEIN, J. & J. A. GUBRIUM (1997). Active Interviewing. *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice.* D. Silverman. London, SAGE: 113–129.

HOLT, D. B. (1997). "Distinction in America? Recovering Bourdieu's Theory of Tastes from its Critics." *Poetics* 25: 93 – 120.

HOSKING, D. M. (1988). "Organizing, Leadership and Skilful Process." *Journal of Management Studies* 2(25): 147 – 166.

HSFRs etikkommitté: Etik HSFR (1996). Uppsala, Ord och Form.

HULTBOM, C. (1997). Makt och ledarskap i börsbolagen. *SOU 1997:135 Ledare, makt och kön.* A. Nyberg and E. Sundin. Stockholm, Fritzes.

HÖÖK, P. (2001a). Management as Uncontrollable Sexuality. *Invisible Management.* S.-E. Sjöstrand, J. Sandberg & M. Tyrstrup. London, Thomson Learning.

HÖÖK, P. (2001b). *Stridspiloter i vida kjolar.* Stockholm, EFI.

HUME, D. (1854 [1757]). *Philosophical Works.* Vol 3. Boston, Little.

HUTCHEON, L. (1988). *A Poetics of Postmodernism: History, Theory, Fiction.* New York, Routledge.

HUYSSEN, A. (1986). *After the Great Divide: Modernism, Mass Culture, Postmodernism.* Bloomington, IN, Indiana University Press.

JACKSON, P. (1991). Performance Indicators: Promises and Pitfalls. *Museum Economics and Community.* S. Pearce. London, Athlone: 41 – 64.

JACKSON, C., S. HONEY, J. HILLAGE & J. STOCK. (1994). *Careers and Training in Dance and Drama. A report of research for the Arts Council of England. Report No. 268.* Brighton, UK, Institute of Manpower Studies at the University of Sussex.

JACKSON, S. (1998). Feminist Social Theory. *Contemporary Feminist Theories.* S. Jackson & J. Jones. New York, New York University Press: 12 – 33.

JACKSON, S. (1999). "Feminist Sociology and Sociological Feminism: Recovering the Social in

Feminist Thought." *Sociological Research Online* 4(3): http://www.socresonline.org.uk/socresonline/4/3/jackson.html.

JAMESON, F. (1991). *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham, NC, Duke University Press.

KALMTEG, L. (2003). "Männen har makten i svenska kulturlivet". *Svenska Dagbladet*, 5 June.

KANTER, R. M. (1977). *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York, Basic Books.

KESSLER, S., J & W. MCKENNA (1978). *Gender. An Ethnomethodological Approach*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

KHAKEE, A. & R. TOWSE, Eds. (1992). *Cultural Economics*. Berlin, Springer.

KIMMEL, M. S. (1996). *Manhood in America: A Cultural History*. New York, Free Press.

KOLB, B. M. (2000). *Marketing Cultural Organisations: New Strategies for Attracting Audiences to Classical Music, Dance, Museums, Theatre and Opera*. Dublin, Oak Tree.

KYLÉN, J.-A. & N. VESTLUND (1978). *Intervju*. Stockholm, J.-A. Kylén-Utbildningskonsulter.

KÖPING, A.-S. (2003). *Den bundna friheten: om kreativitet och relationer i ett konserthus*. Stockholm, Stockholm University, School of Business, Arvinius förlag.

KOTLER, P. & J. SCHEFF (1997). *Standing Room Only: Strategies for Marketing the Performing Arts*. Boston, MA, Harvard Business School Press.

KVALE, S. (1997). *Den kvalitativa forskningsintervjun*. Lund, Studentlitteratur.

LAKOFF, G. & M. JOHNSON (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

LAMONT, M. (1992). *Money, Morals & Manners. The Culture of the French and the American Upper-Middle Class*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

LAMONT, M. & A. LAREAU (1988). "Cultural Capital: Allusions, Gaps and Glissandos in Recent Theoretical Developments." *Sociological Theory* 6: 153 – 168.

LAMONT, M. & L. THÉVENOT (2000). *Rethinking Comparative Cultural Sociology: Repertoires of Evaluation in France and the United States*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

LAMONT, M. & M. FOURNIER (1992). Introduction. *Cultivating Differences: Symbolic Boundaries and the Making of Inequality*. M. Lamont and M. Fournier. Chicago, University of Chicago Press: 1 – 17.

LANTZ, J. (2006a, in press). Gendered Textbook Filmmakers. *Aesthetic Leadership: Managing Fields of Flow in Art and Business*. Guillet de Monthoux, P., C. Gustafsson, and S.-E. Sjöstrand.

LANTZ, J. (2006b, in press). "The Making of 'Men at Kastrup'", *Journal of Men and Masculinities*, SAGE.

LARSON, H. J. (1988). "Photography That Listens." *Visual Anthropology* 1: 415 – 32.

LAUZEN, M. (2003). *The Celluloid Ceiling: Behind-the-Scenes and On-Screen Employment of Women in the Top 250 Films of 2002*. School of Communication, San Diego State University, available from http://www.5050summit.com/stats2003.html (accessed in Febrary 2004).

LEICHT, K. T. & M. L. FENNEL (1997). "The Changing Organizational Context of Professional Work." A*nnual Review of Sociology* 23: 215 – 231.

LINDGREN, G. (1983). Könssegregeringen i arbetslivet och kvinnlig heterosocialitet. *Sociologi i brytningstid*. G. Cigehn, A. Lindblad and R. Åberg. Umeå, Department of Sociology, University of Umeå.

LINDGREN, G. (1985). *Kamrater, kollegor och kvinnor: en studie av könssegregeringsprocessen i två mans-dominerade organisationer*. Umeå, Department of Sociology, University of Umeå.

LINDGREN, G. (1992). *Doktorer, systrar och flickor.* Stockholm, Carlsson.

LINDGREN, G. (1996). "Broderskapets logik." *Kvinnovetenskaplig Tidskrift* (1): 4 – 14.

LINDGREN, G. (1999). *Klass, kön och kirurgi. Relationer bland vårdpersonal i organisationsförändringarnas spår.* Malmö, Liber.

LINDSTEDT, K. (2003). "17 gubbar mot två tjejer." *Aftonbladet,* 15 Dec.

LIPMAN-BLUMEN, J. (1976). "Toward a Homosocial Theory of Sex Roles: An Explanation of the Sex Segregation of Social Institutions." *Signs* 1(3): 15 – 31.

LISKA, A. E. (1981). *Perspectives on Deviance.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall.

LOFLAND, J. (1980). Early Goffman: Style, Structure, Soul. *The View from Goffman.* J. Ditton. New York, St. Martin's Press: 24 – 51.

LOFLAND, J. & L. LOFLAND (1995). *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis.* Belmont, Wadsworth.

LOVELL, T. (2000). "Thinking Feminism With and Against Bourdieu." *Feminist Theory* 1(1): 11 – 32.

LURY, C. (1996). *Consumer Culture.* Cambridge, Polity Press.

MANGSET, P. (1999). Innledning. *Studier av kulturpolitikk og kulturliv.* E. Aslaksen, G. Arnestad and P. Mangset. Kristiansand and Bergen, Høyskoleforlaget and Senter for kulturstudier.

MARCH, J. G. & H. SIMON (1958). *Organizations.* New York, Wiley.

MARTIN, J. (1994). "The Organization of Exclusion: Institutionalization of Sex Inequality, Gendered Faculty Jobs and Gendered Knowledge in Organizational Theory and Research." *Organization* 1: 401 – 31.

MASON, J. (1996). *Qualitative Researching.* London, SAGE.

MAYNARD, M. (1995). *Feminist Social Research: Pragmatics, Politics and Power.* London, UCL Press.

MEAD, G. H. (1934). *Mind, Self and Society from the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist.* Chicago, Chicago University Press.

Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (2003) 11th edition, Springfield, MA, Merriam-Webster.

MEYER, J. W. & N. ROWAN (1977). "Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony." *American Journal of Sociology* 83: 340–363.

MILLS, A. J. & P. TANCRED, Eds. (1992). *Gendering Organizational Analysis.* Newbury Park, SAGE.

MINTZBERG, H. (1979). *The Structure of Organizations.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall.

MISCHE, A. & H. WHITE (1998). "Between Conversation and Situation: Public Switching Dynamics Across Network Domains." *Social Research* 65(3): 695–724.

MOKWA, M. P., W. M. DAWSON & E. A. PRIEVE. (1980). *Marketing the Arts.* New York, Praeger.

MORAN, A., Ed. (1996). *Film Policy: International, National and Regional Perspectives.* London, Routledge.

MORGAN, D. H. J. (1992). *Discovering Men.* London, Routledge.

NICHOLSON, L. J., Ed. (1990). *Feminism / Postmodernism.* New York, Routledge.

NORÉN, L. (1995). *Tolkande företagsekonomisk forskning: en metodbok: social konstruktionism, metaforsynsätt, aktörssynsätt.* Lund, Studentlitteratur.

OAKLEY, A. (1972). *Sex, Gender and Society.* London, Temple Smith.

O'CONNELL, A. (1997). Strategic Planning and the Arts Organisation. *From Maestro to Manager: Critical Issues in Arts and Culture Management.* M. Fitzgibbon and A. Kelly. Dublin, Oak Tree Press: 69–84.

PATEMAN, C. (1988). *The Sexual Contract.* Cambridge, Polity Press.

PEACOCK, A. & I. RIZZO, Eds. (1994). *Cultural Economics and Cultural Policies.* Dordrecht, Kluwer.

PEIRCE, C. S. (1998 [1905]). *The Essential Writings.* E. C. Moore. Amherst, NY, Prometheus Books.

PERROW, C. (1986). *Complex Organizations: A Critical Essay.* New York, Random House.

PETERSON, R. A. & D. BERGER (1975). "Cycles in Symbol Production: The Case of Popular Music." *American Sociological Review* 40: 158–173.

PETERSON, R. A. & R. M. KERN (1996). "Changing Highbrow Taste: From Snob to Omnivore." *American Sociological Review* 61: 900–907.

PFEFFER, J. & G. SALANCIK (1978). *The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective.* New York, Harper & Row.

PINK, S. (2001). *Doing Visual Ethnography: Images, Media and Representation in Research.* London, SAGE.

PRINGLE, R. (1989). *Secretaries Talk: Sexuality, Power and Work.* London, Verso.

PROSSER, J. (1998). Introduction. *Image-Based Research: A Sourcebook for Qualitative Researchers.* J. Prosser. London, Falmer Press: 1–5.

PSATHAS, G. (1980). "Approaches to the Study of the World of Everyday Life." *Human Studies* 3:3–17.

RABIGER, M. (1997). *Directing. Film: Techniques and Aesthetics.* Boston, Focal Press.

RAEBURN, S. D. (1999). "Psychological Issues and Treatment Strategies in Popular Musicians: A Review, Part 1." *Medical Problems of Performing Artists* 14(4): 171–179.

REGNÖ, K. (2003). Kartläggning av kvinnor och män på ledande positioner. *Mansdominans i förändring: Om ledningsgrupper och styrelser. SOU 2003:16.* Stockholm, Fritzes.

RIDGEWAY, C. (1997). "Interaction and the Conservation of Gender Inequality: Considering Employment." *American Sociological Review* 62(2): 218 – 235.

ROPER, M. (1994). *Masculinity and the British Organisation Man since 1945*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

ROPER, M. (1996). 'Seduction and Succession': Circuits of Homosocial Desire in Management. *Men as Managers, Managers as Men: Critical Perspectives on Men, Masculinities and Managements*. D. L. Collinson and J. Hearn. London, SAGE: 210 – 226.

ROSENBERG, A. (1995). *Philosophy of Social Science*. Boulder, CO, Westview Press.

ROUDOMETOF, V. & M.-F. G. EPITROPOULOS (1998). *American Culture in Europe: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Westport, CT, Praeger.

RUBIN, G. (1975). The Traffic in Women: Notes on the "Political Economy" of Sex. *Toward an Anthropology of Women*. R. Reiter. New York, Monthly Review Press.

SANDBERG, J. (2001a). Constructions of Social Constructionism. *Invisible Management*. S.-E. Sjöstrand, J. Sandberg and M. Tyrstrup. London, Thomson Learning: 28 – 48.

SANDBERG, J. (2001b). Educational Rhetoric or Leadership Practice? *Invisible Management*. S.-E. Sjöstrand, J. Sandberg and M. Tyrstrup. London, Thomson Learning: 167 – 187.

SCHEGLOFF E (1988). Goffman and the Analysis of Conversation. *Erving Goffman: Perspectives on the Interaction Order*. P. Drew and T. Wooton. Cambridge, Polity Press: 89 – 135.

SCHIBSTED ASA (2001). *Schibsted Annual Report to Shareholders, 2001*. Available from www.schibsted.no/img/pdg/annualreport2001.pdf (accessed February 2004).

SCHRATZ, M. & U. STEINER-LÖFFLER (1998). Pupils Using Photographs in School Self-Evaluation. *Image-Based Research: A Sourcebook for Qualitative Researchers*. J. Prosser. London, Falmer Press: 235–251.

SCHUDSON, M. (1997). Cultural Studies and the Social Construction of 'Social Construction': Notes on 'Teddy Bear Patriarchy'. *From Sociology to Cultural Studies: New Perspectives*. E. Long. Oxford, Blackwell: 379–398.

SCHUTZ, A. (1999 [1970]). *Alfred Schutz: On Phenomenology and Social Relations*. H. R. Wagner. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

SCOTT, J. (1986). "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis." *The American Historical Review* 91(5): 1053–1075.

SCOTT, W. R. (1995). *Institutions and Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA, SAGE.

SCOTT, W. R. (1998). *Organizations: Rational, Natural and Open Systems*. Upper Saddle River, NJ, Prentice Hall.

SEARLE, J. (1995). *The Construction of Social Reality*. New York, Free Press.

SEWELL, W. H. (1992). "A Theory of Structure: Duality, Agency, and Transformation." *American Journal of Sociology* 98: 1–29.

SHEPPARD, D. (1989). Organizations, Power and Sexuality: The Image and Self-Image of Women Managers. *The Sexuality of Organization*. J. Hearn, D. Sheppard, P. Tancred-Sheriff and G. Burrell. London, SAGE.

SILBER, I. F. (2003). "Pragmatic Sociology as Cultural Sociology: Beyond Repertoire Theory?" *European Journal of Social Theory* 6(4): 427–449.

SILVERMAN, D. (1970). *The Theory of Organisations: A Sociological Framework*. London, Heinemann.

SILVERMAN, D. (2001). *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analyzing Talk, Text and Interaction.* London, SAGE.

SIMMEL, G. (1949 [1911]). "The Sociology of Sociability." *American Journal of Sociology* 55: 254–261.

SIMMEL, G. (1950). *The Sociology of George Simmel.* New York, Free Press.

SIMON, H. (1957). *Administrative Behavior.* New York, Free Press.

SINCLAIR, A. (1998). *Doing Leadership Differently: Gender, Power and Sexuality in a Changing Business Culture.* Melbourne, Melbourne University Press.

SJÖSTRAND, S.-E. (1985). *Samhällsorganisation.* Stockholm, Doxa Ekonomi.

SJÖSTRAND, S.-E. (1995). Towards a Theory of Institutional Change. *On Economic Institutions: Theory and Applications.* J. Groenewegen, C. Pitelis and S.-E. Sjöstrand. Aldershot, Edward Elgar: 19–44.

SJÖSTRAND, S.-E. (1997). *The Two Faces of Management. The Janus Factor.* London, Thomson.

SJÖSTRAND, S.-E., J. SANDBERG & M. TYRSTRUP, Eds. (2001). *Invisible Management.* London, Thomson Learning.

SMITH, D. (1987). *The Everyday World as Problematic: A Feminist Sociology.* Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

SMITH, D. (1990). *The Ideological Practice of Sociology, The Conceptual Practices of Power: A Feminist Sociology of Knowledge.* Toronto, University of Toronto Press.

SOILA-WADMAN, M. (2003). *Kapitulationens estetik: Organisering och ledarskap i filmprojekt.* Stockholm, Stockholm University, School of Business, Arvinius Förlag.

SOU 1994:3. Mäns föreställningar om kvinnor och chefskap. Stockholm, Fritzes.

SOU 1997:138. Familj, makt och jämställdhet.
Stockholm, Fritzes.

STAM, R., R. NURGOYNE & S. FLITTERMAN-LEWIS
(1992). *New Vocabularies in Film Semiotics:
Structuralism, Post-Structuralism and Beyond.* London,
Routledge.

STANLEY, L. (1984). Should 'Sex' Really Be 'Gender' or
'Gender' Really Be 'Sex'? *Applied Sociology.* R.
Anderson and W. Sharrock. London, Allen & Unwin.

STENSTRÖM, E. (2000). *Konstiga företag.* Stockholm,
EFI.

STRATI, A. (1999). *Organization and Aesthetics.*
London, SAGE.

SUCHMAN, M. (1995). "Managing Legitimacy: Strategic
and Institutional Approaches." *The Academy of
Management Review* 20(3): 571–610.

SUNDIN, E. (1998). Män passar alltid? Nivå- och
organisationsspecifika processer med exempel från han-
deln. *SOU 1998: 4.* Stockholm, Fritzes.

THURÉN, B.-M. & K. SUNDMAN, Eds. (1997). *Kvinnor,
män och andra sorter: genusantropologiska frågor.*
Stockholm, Carlsson.

TIENARI, J., C. HOLGERSSON, A.-M. SØDERBERG & E.
VAARA (2003). An Uneasy Coupling. *Merging Across
Borders: People, Cultures and Politics.* A.-M.
Søderberg and E. Vaara. Copenhagen, Copenhagen
Business School Press.

TURNER, J. H. (1988). *A Theory of Social Interaction.*
Cambridge, Polity Press.

TÖNNIES, F. (1979 [1887]). *Gemeinschaft und
Gesellschaft: Grundbegriffe der reinen Soziologie.*
Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

VAN MAANEN, J. (1988). *Tales of the Field.* Chicago,
University of Chicago Press.

VOGT, W. P. (1999). *Dictionary of Statistics &
Methodology.* London, SAGE.

WAHL, A. (1992). *Könsstrukturer i organisationer: Kvinnliga civilekonomers och civilingenjörers karriärutveckling.* Stockholm, EFI.

WAHL, A. (1996). "Företagsledning som konstruktion av manlighet." *Kvinnovetenskaplig Tidskrift* (1): 15–29.

WAHL, A. & C. HOLGERSSON (2003). Male Managers' Reactions to Gender Diversity Activities in Organizations. *Individual Diversity in Organizations.* M. Davidson and S. Fielden. London, John Wiley.

WAHL, A., C. HOLGERSSON & P. HÖÖK (1998). *Ironi och sexualitet: om ledarskap och kön.* Stockholm, Carlsson.

WAHL, A., C. HOLGERSSON, P. HÖÖK & S. LINGHAG (2001). *Det ordnar sig. Teorier om organisation och kön.* Lund, Studentlitteratur.

WALBY, S. (1986). *Patriarchy at Work. Patriarchal and Capitalist Employment.* Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.

WALBY, S. (1992). Post-Post-Modernism? Theorizing Social Complexity. *Destabilizing Theory: Contemporary Feminist Debates.* M. Barrett and A. Phillips. Oxford, Polity.

WARREN, C. A. B. (2002). Qualitative Interviewing. *Handbook of Interview Research. Context & Method.* J. A. Gubrium. Thousand Oaks, CA, SAGE.

WARREN, S. (2002). "'Show Me How It Feels to Work Here': Using Photography to Research Organizational Aesthetics." *ephemera: critical dialogues on organizations* 2(3): 224–245.

WASSER, F. (2001). *Veni, Vidi, Video: The Hollywood Empire and the VCR.* Austin, University of Texas Press.

WEBER, M. (1930). *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism.* London, Routledge.

WEBER, M. (1946). Class, Status, Party. *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology.* H. H. Gerth and C. W. Mills. New York, Oxford University Press: 180–195.

WEEDON, C. (1987). *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory.* Oxford, Blackwell.

WEICK, K. E. (1979). *The Social Psychology of Organizing.* Reading, MA, Addison-Wesley.

WEICK, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in Organizations.* Thousand Oaks, CA, SAGE.

WEST, C. & D. ZIMMERMAN (1987). "Doing gender." *Gender & Society* 1(2): 125-152.

WETTERSTRÖM, J. (2001). *Stor opera – små pengar: ett operativt företag och dess ledningshistoria.* Stockholm, Stockholm University, School of Business, Carlsson.

WETTERSTRÖM (2006, in press). Aesthetic Institutions: Three Centuries of Judgment and Management in the Royal Swedish Opera. *Aesthetic Leadership: Managing Fields of Flow in Art and Business.* Guillet de Monthoux, P., C. Gustafsson, and S.-E. Sjöstrand.

WIDERBERG, K. (1998). "Translating Gender." *NORA* 6(2): 133-138.

WIDERBERG, K. (2002). *Kvalitativ forskning i praktiken.* Lund, Studentlitteratur.

WILLIAMS, R. (1983 [1976]). *Keywords.* London, Fontana.

WILLIAMSON, O. E. (1981). "The Economics of Organization: The Transaction Cost Approach." *American Journal of Sociology* 87: 548 – 577.

WRIGHT, T. (1999). *The Photography Handbook.* London, Routledge.

ZETTERLUND, C. (2002). *Design i informationsåldern: om strategisk design, historia och praktik.* Stockholm, Raster.

ZUCKER, L. G. (1987). "Institutional Theories of Organizations." *Annual Review of Sociology* 13: 443 – 644.

FILMS

3000 Miles to Graceland (2001) by Demian Lichtenstein

Alfred (1995) by Vilgot Sjöman

All About My Mother (1999) by Pedro Almodóvar

Amélie (2001) by Jean-Pierre Jeunet

American Pie (1999) by Paul Weitz

Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon (2000) by Ang Lee

Fucking Åmål (1998) by Lukas Moodysson

The Godfather (1972) by Francis Ford Coppola

Harry Potter and the Sorcerer's Stone (2001) by Chris Columbus

Hero (2002) by Yimou Zhang

Italian for Beginners (2000) by Lone Scherfig

Jalla! Jalla! (2000) by Josef Fares

Jaws (1975) by Steven Spielberg

Livvakterna (2001) by Anders Nilsson

The Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring (2001) by Peter Jackson

Moulin Rouge (2001) by Baz Luhrmann

Riding in Cars with Boys (2001) by Penny Marshall

Sånger från andra våningen (2000) by Roy Andersson

Star Wars (1977) by George Lucas

Swordfish (2001) by Dominic Sena

Sällskapsresan (1980) by Lasse Åberg and Peter Hald

Terminator (1984) by James Cameron

Titanic (1997) by James Cameron

Witchblade (2001) by Ralph Hemecker

Art & Business
Aesthetics, Technology & Management

The Fields of Flow research program is a unique joint scholarly undertaking by three academic institutions. The program is being carried out in close cooperation with prominent institutions and organizations in the arts. The *fields* in focus are art and business. The notion of *flow* presented in the title of the program draws attention to movement across disciplines and changes, thereby referring to different points of contact and interaction between the fields of art and business.

Art and business are basic building blocks in any social or social welfare development. The two elements presuppose, constitute, and help bring about change in one another. The understanding of art requires an undestanding of management – and vice versa. This rationality of simultaneity and coexistence has for some time been controversial – the logic of distinctiveness have instead characterized most of the actions. In recent years, however, there has occurred a reuniting of these fields. We see such cross-fertilization – flows of experience and knowledge – as an essential area of study in gaining new insight into many changes going on in society.

Fields of Flow is being carried out by a core group of about fifteen researchers at three universities, under the leadership of Professor Sven-Erik Sjöstrand (Stockholm School of Economics) together with Professor Pierre Guillet de Mounthoux (Stockholm University) and Professor Claes Gustafsson (Royal Institute of Technology). In addition to the core group, the program involves many others – researches as well as practition-

ers – foremost from the field of art. Extensive collaboration has been established with national and international research teams, businesses and art institutions. An Advisory Board comprising about fifteen prominent leaders in the fields of business and the arts is also associated to the program.

The Fields of Flow program builds on three main themes: (1) Artistic and Cultural Production, (2) The Aesthetic Dimensions of Management, Technology and Organization, and (3) Art Meets Business. Business Meets Art. The program includes close to twenty semi-autonomous research projects. They are all described at the homepages of the three core institutions, i.e., for Stockholm School of Economics www.hhs.se (press "Research & Publications" button and then the text "Management and Organization"), for Stockholm University www.su.se (look for Business administration and then "Research"), and for Royal Institute of Technology www.kth.se (press "Research").