

---

# Routledge International Handbook of the Sociology of Art and Culture

*Edited by Laurie Hanquinet and Mike Savage*

 **Routledge**  
Taylor & Francis Group  
LONDON AND NEW YORK

# A post-Bourdieuian sociology of valuation and evaluation for the field of cultural production<sup>1</sup>

*Stefan Beljean, Phillipa Chong and Michèle Lamont<sup>2</sup>*

---

## Introduction

In recent years, social scientists have seen an upsurge of interest in the sociology of valuation and evaluation (SVE). In Europe, leading sociologists have increasingly focused their attention on the topic. For instance, shortly after having been elected at the Collège de France in 2013, the sociologist Pierre-Michel Menger gave his first year of seminars on 'Evaluation in the sciences, the arts and organizations', while a very different type of sociologist, Luc Boltanski, has turned his attention to organizational forms used to present and classify cultural objects.<sup>3</sup> At the same time, American sociologists focus on the study of central cultural processes tied up in evaluation such as quantification (Espeland and Stevens 2008), commensuration (Espeland and Stevens 1998), standardization (Epstein 2007; Timmermans and Epstein 2010), or classification (Fourcade and Healy 2013). Sociological subfields such as cultural sociology and economic sociology, where evaluation figures prominently, are bustling with activity and energy and have experienced considerable growth over the past decades. Collective volumes on evaluation are multiplying (e.g. Beckert and Musselin 2013; Berthoin Antal, Hutter and Stark 2015) while sessions on the sociology of evaluation attract large and enthusiastic crowds at European and American professional sociological meetings alike.<sup>4</sup> And a newly launched international journal concerned with (e)valuation, *Valuation Studies* (<http://valuationstudies.liu.se>), has generated considerable interest across research communities. Such synchronized movements suggest that clearly, something is in the air.

These various developments are in part linked to a number of empirical macro-social changes concerning the ways in which values are defined and assessed in contemporary society (see e.g. Kjellberg and Mallard 2013).<sup>5</sup> Intellectually, they owe much to Bourdieu and the profound influence he has had on sociology through his inquiries into cultural production and consumption in symbolic and cultural fields (art, science, culture, knowledge, fashion and more; see e.g. Bourdieu 1993). Bourdieu's work has put questions of evaluation and valuation at the centre of sociologists' attention and introduced an analytical framework for studying markets for symbolic goods from which many scholars have taken inspiration. Thus, in the last twenty years, we have seen a proliferation of Bourdieu-inspired research on (e)valuation and fields of cultural production (Lamont 2012a; Coulangeon 2016).

2

# n sociology valuation for production<sup>1</sup>

and Michèle Lamont<sup>2</sup>

in the sociology of valuation increasingly focused their attention at the Collège de France in the form of seminars on 'Evaluation and the Sociology of Cultural Production' in 2009. A different type of sociologist, Luc Boltanski and Michèle Lamont, used to present and classify the field of cultural production. The focus on the study of central constraints (Espeland and Stevens 2008), and the role of evaluators (Epstein 2007; Timmermans 2003). Sociological subfields such as the sociology of valuation figures prominently, are experiencing considerable growth over the past decade (e.g. Beckert and Musselin 2013; Espeland and Stevens 2008). The sociology of evaluation attract attention at professional sociological meetings and conferences. The field with (e)valuation, *Valuation and the Sociology of Cultural Production* has attracted considerable interest across research disciplines. Early on, something is in the air. A number of empirical macro-social studies have been assessed in contemporary sociology. We owe much to Bourdieu and his followers for their inquiries into cultural production, science, culture, knowledge, and evaluation. We have put questions of evaluation at the center of an analytical framework that sociologists have taken inspiration from. Bourdieu-inspired research on evaluation (Coulangeon 2016).

But while many scholars have embraced Bourdieu's approach to (e)valuation, others have positioned themselves more critically toward his work. Instead of seeing in Bourdieu's writing a comprehensive and definitive analytical framework, these scholars have been working on the blind spots of his contribution, digging in new directions that became salient because of the distinctive angles that Bourdieu adopted to approach evaluation (see e.g. Hennion 2001; Hesmondhalgh 2006; Lamont 2009; Born 2010; Prior 2011; Silva and Warde 2010). The work of these scholars – as well as the various new developments cited above – indicate that we are already well on our way in developing a 'post-Bourdieuian' sociology of valuation and evaluation.

Up until recently, however, this post-Bourdieuian sociology of valuation and evaluation has developed without much theoretical integration. Scholars have worked on different aspects and sub-processes involved in (e)valuation, but only little effort has been made to bring different lines of work in dialogue with each other. As a result, much of this new line of research has remained confined to a succession of case studies, in which the added value from one project to the next was either unclear or not made explicit.

To remedy this situation, Lamont (2012a) recently made a call for more *comparative* research of valuation and evaluation with the goal of moving the field toward more cumulative theory building. Building on Karin Knorr-Cetina's (1999) notion of machinery of knowledge and on her collaborative work with sociologists of knowledge Charles Camic and Neil Gross (2011), Lamont outlined an agenda for such a research program that centres around the study of various types of *constraints* that shape the form and outcome of (e)valuation processes. The idea is to use the analytical focus on these constraints to compare evaluation processes in various types of contexts and evaluations of different types of cultural objects.

In this short essay, we build on this idea. We do so by focusing on three *constraints* that have tended to receive little attention in the work of Bourdieu and followers, but which we regard to be particularly important analytical dimensions for a comparative sociology of evaluation and valuation. These dimensions are: 1) the standards of evaluation in fields of cultural production; 2) the self-concepts of evaluators; as well as 3) the agency of objects in evaluation.

The body of this paper discusses recent empirical work on each of these three constraints and offers directions for future scholarship. We centre our attention on recent developments in the sociology of *cultural production*, as other chapters in this volume deal with cultural consumption.<sup>6</sup> In addition, we also offer a discussion of research at the intersection of economic sociology and organizational research that has made important contributions to the sociology of valuation and evaluation, but which has developed largely independently from the influence from Bourdieu. We argue that establishing more bridges between this literature and the sociology of art and culture is a necessary precondition for the development of a more integrated research agenda for the sociology of valuation and evaluation. Before we delve into our analysis, however, we start with a short discussion of Bourdieu's legacy to the sociology of arts and culture.

## The 'classical' model

One of Bourdieu's major contributions to the sociology of art and culture was what we dub his "classical model" of the field of cultural production (Bourdieu 1993, 1996). According to this model, the field of cultural production is divided into opposite poles which are each governed by two distinct sets of standards of evaluation: On the one hand, there is the (sub-)field

of large-scale production which revolves around economic standards of evaluation, while on the other hand, there is the (sub-)field of restricted production which is oriented toward aesthetic standards of evaluation.

A key goal that Bourdieu pursued in his work on the field of art in France was to convey the historical contingency of this particular structuration of the field of cultural production. More specifically, he aimed to show how the idea of artistic autonomy – which lies at the fundament of the sub-field of restricted production – is far from transcendent and universal, but only emerged at a particular point in time and under particular historical circumstances.

However, this important point has largely been overlooked in survey-based Bourdieu-inspired research on cultural production. Indeed, as scholars applied his framework to various national cases, the historical character of his argument often got lost. Instead, many approached Bourdieu's model as a ready-made theoretical framework to be transposed to an ever-larger set of empirical settings. This has led to a gradual reification of Bourdieu's classical two-pole model of the structure of symbolic and cultural fields (but note the proliferation of excellent Bourdieu-inspired French historical studies of cultural fields: e.g. Sapiro 2003; 2010 in particular). Further, such highly standardized and predictable applications have focused scholarly attention away from a number of important dimensions of evaluation processes, such as the role of self-concepts of evaluators or the substantive content of criteria of evaluation. In the following section, we point to three new lines of work by a new generation of scholars who have started to bring these dimensions of evaluation back into focus.

## Recent criticisms and revisions

### *New research on standards of evaluation in fields of cultural production*

First, new work in cultural sociology is focusing attention on standards of evaluation in fields of cultural production, a topic that Bourdieu approached through a simple model: He posited a clear opposition between economic and aesthetic criteria of evaluation which for him were the product of the dualistic structure of the field of cultural production, that is, the fundamental opposition between pure art and commercial mass production. Again, this view has become part and parcel of much empirical research in the sociology of art and culture.

New work, however, is challenging this classical view of the relation between criteria of evaluation and the structure of fields of cultural production. Evidence from recent case studies indicates that even genres that are clearly geared toward either mass-production (such as stand-up comedy) or restricted production for peers or experts (such as poetry) exhibit a great deal of internal diversity, such that they encompass a broad range of possible positions that are *more* or *less* market (or art) oriented – with the result that cultural products are often evaluated against economic and aesthetic criteria of evaluation at the same time (see e.g. Craig and Dubois 2010; Kersten and Verboord 2013; Beljean 2014). These findings suggest that Bourdieu's model may have overstated the contrast between restricted production and large-scale cultural production, and that there is a need for a more refined understanding of these two modes of cultural production.

Further, empirical findings suggest that there is no fundamental opposition between the logic of 'art for money' and the logic of 'l'art pour l'art', and that these two logics are often intertwined. Michael Hutter (2013), for example, considers how the meeting of artistic and commercial logics can be productive and a source of innovation. An exemplar of this

generative potential is the translation of Japanese artist Takashi Murakami's graphic otaku motif onto Louis Vuitton luxury-brand handbags.

A second literature invites us to go beyond Bourdieu's classical model, and its emphasis on the opposition between profit-orientation and autonomy, and to consider other structuring principles that shape how cultural products are evaluated. One example comes from research on evaluation processes in a cultural industry. In a study of intermediaries in the industry for stand-up comedy in the United States, Beljean (2014) finds that there are systematic differences in how market intermediaries evaluate comedians across different vertically stratified tiers of the comedy industry. For example, intermediaries who cater to the top tier of the industry tend to be primarily concerned with the renown of comedians and their ability to sell tickets, while intermediaries in the mid-tier of the market are more concerned about comedians' ability to adapt their material to different types of crowds.<sup>7</sup> However, these differences cannot be simply explained by the degree of autonomy of different market tiers, as a standard Bourdieusian account would have it. Rather, these differences need to be understood in the light of the 'superstar' structure (Rosen 1981) of the comedy industry, which creates different dynamics of supply and demand across different market tiers.

These new lines of work point to promising directions for future research such as the value of studying standards of evaluation in fields of cultural production *inductively*, rather than through the preconceived lens of field analysis or another theoretical framework. Such an approach can help us to identify unanticipated empirical patterns and to eschew reifying theoretical assumptions such as Bourdieu's distinction between economic and aesthetic criteria of evaluation. It can also shed light on how various criteria of evaluation are intertwined, thus generating a more accurate and comprehensive understanding of how cultural products are evaluated. Another promising topic is considering the relation between evaluation and the structure of cultural fields beyond the opposition between profit-orientation and autonomy, so as to identify other principles of structuration that shape the criteria of evaluation against which cultural products are evaluated, such as disciplinary boundaries (Guetzkow, Lamont and Mallard 2004; Mallard, Lamont and Guetzkow 2009) or market forces (Beljean 2014).

### *Neo-phenomenological studies of valuation and tasting practices*

Second, in response to criticisms of Bourdieu's work for his lack of attention to actual evaluative practices and deliberations 'on the ground', new studies of evaluation engage in close-up empirical (ethnographic and interview-based) analysis of evaluative practices and judgment.<sup>8</sup> This interactional focus has manifested itself in studies that emphasize (i) how self-concepts shape evaluative practice and (ii) the agency of objects in evaluation (i.e. the role of non-human supports).

### *Self-concepts in evaluation*

Work on self-concepts considers both the formation of the evaluator's subjectivity and how individuals' self-understandings shape their evaluative behaviour. Self-concepts refer to the narratives that individuals tell to themselves and the world about the types of people they are (Epstein 1973; Leschziner 2015). Research shows that people not only construct and 'tell' these narratives, but also that these self-understandings can shape action to the extent that people may be drawn to activities that resonate with their self-concepts (Gross 2002), and the content of self-concepts reflect constraints people face (Leschziner 2015). People's narratives,



thus, matter insofar as they contribute to actors' intersubjective construction of reality and shape their evaluative practices. This literature also considers the intellectual and organizational conditions that make specific types of evaluative selves possible (e.g. Lamont 2009 on peer review in the US).

In his theory of symbolic fields, Bourdieu (1993; 1996) focuses on how people behave in ways to maximize their strategic self-interests based on their field position. But new work on evaluation suggests that self-interest is not all that matters. Lamont (2009) argues that we need to move beyond considerations of self-interest to examine neglected aspects of evaluation, including how evaluators understand their role and the emotional consequences of their work. Using the world of scientific peer review as her case study, she finds that peer review represents more than just an opportunity for panellists to advance their research agendas or reproduce their positions in the academic field. Panellists are driven by the desire to contribute to collective problem solving, and they derive feelings of pleasure and validation from the process of serving as experts whose opinions matter.

Chong (2013) offers a phenomenology of fiction reviewing as a study of evaluative identity and practice. She traces the concrete steps that reviewers take to guarantee the legitimacy of their professional evaluations by moving beyond their idiosyncrasies as readers to offer a general assessment, which both enables and sustains reviewers' self-concept as fair judges. In a related study, Chong (2015) studies the various factors critics weigh when considering whether or not to write a negative review. Her interviews with critics reveal how a complex mix of pleasure and anxiety, competition and stewardship, empathy and self-preservation all come to bear on critics' evaluative practices.

Empirical analyses in this vein demonstrate the value of considering actors' subjective experiences for a fuller portrait of evaluative practice (also Gross 2008; Heinich 2005). This line of work emphasizes the value of empirical studies of evaluation as an identity and practice, one that reveals multidimensionality and variability in the orientation of evaluators. This strongly contrasts with the Bourdieusian approach to identity which has remained largely underdeveloped (Alexander 1995).<sup>9</sup>

The place of subjectivity in evaluation has been understudied because of its historical understanding as a foil obscuring 'objective' ways of knowing. This has resulted in what Shapin (2012) calls a 'dustbin' conception of subjectivity as a heterogeneous bucket of meaning about which nothing coherent can be said.<sup>10</sup> But by taking evaluators' experience of evaluation and their self-concepts as analytical points of departure, work considering the phenomenology of tasting and evaluation can shed new light on the practical, cultural and emotional dimensions of evaluation – dimensions too often obscured within the final judgments themselves.

### Bringing objects back in

Rich ethnographic and phenomenological studies have produced insights on the subject-object relation: that is, how subjects learn to appreciate and evaluate cultural objects and how cultural objects exert influence on evaluating subjects. This approach is in keeping with the new sociology of art (cf. Becker *et al.* 2006), which grapples with how to meaningfully incorporate art objects into social analysis rather than just reducing them to mere proxies for other 'social variables.' The goal is to recognize not only how art objects are shaped by society, but also what forms of agentic power and distinctive properties they wield (while still eschewing 'charismatic' ideologies about art or artists). This work also aligns with an actor-network-theory inspired view of evaluation as a socio-material process wherein the

properties of the object being evaluated and the evaluating agent are coproduced (also see Boltanski and Esquerre 2014).

Hennion's (2004) theory of attachment, developed based on his empirical work on amateurs, is exemplary here. He rejects the idea that taste and judgment simply reflect other social factors. Rather than emphasize that taste is a product of broader societal classification systems, Hennion argues for a performative approach to taste that considers how people, their bodies and the objects they evaluate coproduce one another. Much in line with French contemporary pragmatist thinking (Barthe *et al.* 2013), he takes taste and judgment seriously as techniques that people learn, and with which they actively engage. In his study of amateur wine-tastings, for example, he emphasizes how people in such group settings physically and socially coproduce the objects they are tasting: the physico-chemical properties of a wine act on the taster and the taster's status is defined by the way she attends to the act of drinking the wine (i.e. taking a moment to sniff and pucker while sipping).

Similarly, in the United States, Benzecry (2011) looks at how individuals fashion themselves into members of a community of cultural appreciators. Specifically, he studies opera fans and examines how they learn, in quite practical ways, to deepen their passion for and attachment to opera. This includes learning the acceptable practices for appreciating and valuing opera through informal talk, attending conferences and experiencing opera house performances. Benzecry traces how opera fans move from their initial, visceral reactions to opera to consciously learning how to deepen their engagement with the art form. This contrasts with Bourdieu's approach in that it foregrounds the beguiling properties of opera itself as a cultural object and how it attracts people to learn more about it, rather than suggesting that people are only attracted to opera as part of the corpus of 'legitimate' culture. Furthermore, this approach allows Benzecry to acknowledge opera fans' experience at times of being stigmatized for enjoying this particular form of cultural participation – something that is hard to reconcile with a straightforward cultural capital argument.

In summary, then, recent research demonstrates the value of looking at taste and cultural discernment not only as mechanisms for reproducing inequality, but also as nuanced interactional processes. Specifically, new work seeks to balance Bourdieu's insights by bringing cultural objects themselves and their evaluators 'back in,' so to speak. The point is not to return to a view of art as having inherent or charismatic value, but to relocate within the frame of analysis the agency, identity and emotions of evaluative actors and their practices. Such research also promises to be relevant for other fields where professional evaluations routinely carry influence.

### **New perspectives from organizational research and economic sociology**

In this last section of our paper, we broaden our focus and examine developments beyond the sociology of art and culture. This is essential because the study of (e)valuation processes in cultural domains is no longer the sole purview of sociologists of art and culture. Rather, over the last ten to twenty years, we have seen a growing body of literature on cultural production and (e)valuation emerging in economic and organizational sociology.

This literature has developed largely independently from the influence of Bourdieu's work. Rather than building on Bourdieu's theory of the field of cultural production, economic sociologists and organizational scholars have turned to the study of cultural markets primarily to answer theoretical questions germane to their own subfields.

Economic sociologists have aimed to identify mechanisms through which value is 'socially constructed' and to challenge standard theories of valuation in economics (see e.g. Velthuis 2005; Karpik 2010; Beckert and Aspers 2011). Organizational scholars, in turn, have

developed an interest in cultural markets to better understand processes and dynamics that are central to organizational theories of legitimacy, diffusion and reputation (see e.g. Bielby and Bielby 1994; Zuckerman *et al.* 2003; Rao *et al.* 2005; Phillips 2013).

The result is a number of significant contributions to the development of a post-Bourdiesian sociology of evaluation and valuation. Most importantly, these scholars have introduced new theoretical and analytical perspectives to the study of fields of cultural production – perspectives that have their origin outside the sociology of art and cultural production. For instance, one strand of work in organizational research is drawing from general theories of categorization and identity (see Negro *et al.* 2010 or Vergne and Wry 2014, for a review of this research paradigm). Scholars have built on these theories to examine how membership in certain cultural categories (such a genres), as well as their clarity or ambiguity, affects the evaluation of cultural products (see e.g. Zuckerman *et al.* 2003; Hsu 2006). In doing so, these scholars have moved away from an orthodox Bourdieusian interpretation of categories in markets for symbolic goods as ‘weapons’ in positional struggles for power to an understanding of categories as ‘coordination devices’ between market participants.<sup>11</sup>

Another line of research at the intersection of economic sociology and organizational research has borrowed from sociological theories of status to explain differences in how cultural products are evaluated in markets for symbolic goods (e.g. Benjamin and Podolny 1999; Yogevev 2010), while still other scholars have built on sociological theories of social influence to develop a better understanding of how consumers and intermediaries in cultural markets manage to reach agreement in their evaluations despite an absence of reliable markers of quality (see e.g. Mark 2003; Salganik *et al.* 2006; Godart and Mears 2009).

Last, but not least, organizational scholars and economic sociologists also need to be credited for correcting a bias in favour of high culture that critics have identified in Bourdieu’s work: While Bourdieu – as well as his followers – have paid only little attention to the sub-field of large-scale cultural production (see e.g. Hesmondhalgh 2006), these social scientists have extended empirical sociological research on valuation processes to a broad range of *cultural industries*.

We draw attention to these developments here because we believe that the work by economic sociologists and organizational researchers can guide and enrich future research on (e)valuation processes in cultural fields in at least two important ways. First, the work of these scholars provides a model for how to theorize processes of valuation and evaluation in cultural fields most productively. Bourdieu famously conceptualized the field of cultural production as ‘the economic world reversed’ – in which disinterestedness is valued over the pursuit of short-term material gains (Bourdieu 1983). But by doing so, he may have put more emphasis on the particularities of cultural fields than needed. For there is no reason to assume that valuation processes in fields of cultural production are a priori distinct from valuation processes in any other domains of society. In contrast to Bourdieu, newer work emerging from these fields does not treat fields of cultural production as fundamentally distinct from other domains of research. Rather, it draws on theoretical tools and frameworks derived from general sociological theories such as organizational theory, labour market theory or status theory to consider valuation processes in cultural fields together with valuation processes in other domains of society, such as education, business or politics. Thus, it opens up the possibility for general theory-building across substantive areas of research as a complement to domain-specific theories of valuation in fields of cultural production.<sup>12</sup>

Second, the work of economic sociologists and organizational scholars also underscores the importance of acknowledging and theorizing the role of *formal organizations* in cultural markets. This is important because in many cultural markets, it is *members of formal*



*organizations* who produce, classify and evaluate cultural products, not atomized individual producers or critics. This matters because the status of formal organizations, their relation to other organizations, as well as their internal politics and practices are all likely to affect how cultural products are evaluated. Hence, the adoption of organizational perspectives is absolutely essential for developing a proper understanding of (e)valuation processes in cultural markets. Many of the empirical studies cited above provide excellent illustrations for this (see e.g. Zuckerman *et al.* 2003). Yet, to date, such organizational perspectives have been primarily deployed in research on *cultural industries*. A key task for future research therefore will be to adopt similar perspectives for the study of cultural fields that fall on the opposite pole of the field of cultural production: high culture art fields and fields of restricted production.

Such a focus is particularly timely given important structural changes in the organization of many art worlds. In the last decade, we witnessed a growth of professional and organizational structures in countless cultural fields, with the result that more and more fields that used to be structured by an ideology of disinterestedness now look increasingly like market-oriented cultural industries (e.g. for the case of the literary field, see Thompson 2010; Verboord 2011). Common markers of this transformation are the emergence of third-party market mediators such as agents or managers, a growing involvement of large media corporations or the widespread use of marketing practices. In the light of these developments, we consider it highly important that scholars build more bridges between traditional Bourdieu-inspired research on cultural production and research in economic sociology and organizational research.

## Conclusion

With the brief 'tour d'horizon' offered in this paper, we aim to generate enthusiasm and further discussion around a future agenda for the sociology of valuation and evaluation. Building on Lamont's recent call for a comparative sociology of valuation and evaluation (2012b), we have highlighted three important types of *constraints* that are exercised on (e)valuation – 1) *the criteria of evaluation*; 2) *the self-concepts of evaluators*; and 3) *the roles of object and non-human supports* – and discussed how these three constraints could serve as points of comparison for future scholarship. These analytical levels are among the most important to consider across different contexts and different types of cultural objects. Thus, we urge our colleagues to work toward theory building while focusing on these promising topics.

But even though we share a firm conviction in the value of comparative lenses for gaining new theoretical insights in the study of cultural processes (Lamont *et al.* 2014), the multifarious development of the field is likely to follow its own logic. Hence, we want to encourage scholars to think about the blind-spots of, not only the Bourdieusian theoretical framework, but also of the lenses currently used in sociological research on evaluation and valuation. For path dependency is not easily avoided when it comes to the formulation of theoretical problems, as Thomas Kuhn (1970) powerfully argued almost fifty years ago.

## Notes

- 1 We gratefully acknowledge Heather Haveman and Mike Savage for providing comments on this paper.
- 2 Harvard University.
- 3 [www.college-de-france.fr/site/pierre-michel-menger/#seminar](http://www.college-de-france.fr/site/pierre-michel-menger/#seminar); Luc Boltanski et Arnaud Esquerre. "La "Collection", une forme neuve du capitalisme. La mise en valeur economique du passé et ses effets." *Les Temps Modernes*, 679(3), p. 5.

- 4 Most recently, the sessions organized by the Science, Knowledge and Technology section at the meetings of the American Sociological Association in San Francisco in August 2014 and the meetings of the German Sociological Association held in Trier in October 2014.
- 5 These macro-social changes include, among other things, the rise of new public management, the impact of neoliberalism or new developments in information technology (Kjellberg and Mallard 2013).
- 6 Note, however, that much of our argument also applies to cultural consumption, as there is a "homology" between Bourdieu's sociology of cultural production and his sociology of cultural consumption (Hesmondhalgh 2006: 216)
- 7 Note, however, that this strong focus on "economic" criteria of evaluation in the professional evaluations of market intermediaries stands in contrast to consumers' evaluation of comedy. Existing research on comedy consumers in the UK suggests that taste-based "symbolic boundaries" are particularly strong among consumers of comedy because of the personal and subjective nature of humor (Friedman 2014).
- 8 Interestingly, this shift toward more inductive and close-up empirical analysis can also be observed in the work of scholars who continue to study (e)valuation processes in fields of cultural production through the lens of an orthodox Bourdieusian framework of analysis, see e.g. Nylander (2013) or Friedman (2014).
- 9 But see Steinmetz's (2006) argument of a more Freudian take on Bourdieu's concept of *libido sciendi*.
- 10 Shapin (2012) argues for a phenomenology of taste, but he is more interested in the inter-subjectivity of taste in terms of classification systems and chemical properties of food: that taste has both a cultural and a natural basis.
- 11 This difference points to an important underlying difference in the treatment of question of power and domination in the work of Bourdieu and organizational scholars. While Bourdieu has been criticized for putting *too much* emphasis on antagonistic dynamics in cultural fields, organizational scholars might be criticized for paying *too little* attention to the question of power and domination.
- 12 For an example of such a domain-crossing approach to theory-building, see Lamont, Chong and Bourgoin (2014) who compare customary rules of evaluation across three settings: fiction reviews, peer review and management consulting. Lamont, Chong and Bourgoin argue that what is understood to be a legitimate evaluation in these three settings is shaped by three main factors: 1) the agent conducting the evaluation (who can do it, how are they certified, how to do gain their competence? etc.); 2) the object being evaluated (how clearly bounded is it, how are the comparans defined? etc.); and 3) the audiences (is it single or plural? a client or a peer? etc.).

## References

- Alexander, J. (1995) *Fin de Siècle Social Theory: Relativism, Reduction, and the Problem of Reason*, London: Verso.
- Barthe, Y., D. de Blic, J. Heurtin, É. Lagneau, C. Lemieux, D. Linhardt, C. Moreau de Bellaing, C. Rémy and D. Trom (2013) 'Sociologie Pragmatique : Mode d'Emploi', *Politix*, 103(3): 175.
- Becker, H. (1982) *Art Worlds*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Becker, H., R. Faulkner and B. Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (2006) *Art from Start to Finish*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Beckert, J. and P. Aspers (2011) *The Worth of Goods*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Beckert, J. and C. Musselin (2013) *Constructing Quality*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Beljean, S. (2014) 'You Gotta Make People Laugh. Stratification and Standards of Evaluation in the Stand-up Comedy Industry', paper presented at Conference of Eastern Sociological Association, February, Baltimore, USA.
- Benjamin, B. and J. Podolny (1999) 'Status, Quality, and Social Order in the California Wine Industry', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(3): 563.
- Benzecry, C. (2011) *The Opera Fanatic*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Berthoin Antal, A., Hutter, M. and D. Stark (2015) *Moments of Evaluation*, New York: Oxford.
- Bielby, W. and D. Bielby (1994) "All Hits Are Flukes": Institutionalized Decision Making and the Rhetoric of Network Prime-Time Program Development', *American Journal of Sociology*, 99(5): 1287-1313.
- Boltanski, L. and A. Esquerre (2014) 'La "Collection", Une Forme Neuve du Capitalisme. La Mise en Valeur Économique du Passé et Ses Effets', *Les Temps Modernes*, 3(679): 5-72.
- Born, G. (2010) 'The Social and the Aesthetic: For a Post-Bourdieuian Theory of Cultural Production', *Cultural Sociology*, 4(2): 171-208.

- Bourdieu, P. (1983) 'The Field of Cultural Production, or: The Economic World Reversed', *Poetics*, 12(4): 311–356.
- (1993) *The Field of Cultural Production*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- (1996) *The Rules of Art*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Camic, C., N. Gross and M. Lamont (2011) *Social Knowledge in the Making*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Chong, P. (2013) 'Legitimate Judgment in Art, the Scientific World Reversed?: Critical Distance in Evaluation', *Social Studies of Science*, 43(2): 265–281.
- (2015) 'Playing Nice, Being Mean, and the Space in Between: Book Critics and the Difficulties of Writing Bad Reviews', in B. Antal, M. Hutter and D. Stark (eds.) *Moments of Valuation: Exploring Sites of Dissonance*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Coulangéon, P. (2016) 'The Sociology of Cultural Participation in France Thirty Years after Distinction', in L. Hanquinet and M. Savage (eds.) *Routledge International Handbook of the Sociology of Art and Culture*, London: Routledge.
- Coulangéon, P. and J. Duval (2013) *Trente ans Après La Distinction de Pierre Bourdieu*, Paris: Editions la Découverte.
- Craig, A. and S. Dubois (2010) 'Between Art and Money: The Social Space of Public Readings in Contemporary Poetry Economies and Careers', *Poetics*, 38(5):441–460.
- Epstein, S. (1973) 'The Self-Concept Revisited: Or a Theory of a Theory', *American Psychologist*, 28(5): 404–416.
- (2007) *Inclusion*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Espeland, W. and M. Stevens (1998) 'Commensuration as a Social Process', *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24(1):313–343.
- (2008) 'A Sociology of Quantification', *European Journal of Sociology*, 49(03): 401–436.
- Fourcade, M. and K. Healy (2013) 'Classification Situations: Life Chances in the Neo-Liberal Era', *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 38: 559–572.
- Friedman, S. (2014) *Comedy and Distinction*, New York: Routledge.
- (2014) 'The Hidden Tastemakers: Comedy Scouts as Cultural Brokers at the Edinburgh Festival Fringe', *Poetics*, 44(3): 22–41.
- Godart, F. and A. Mears (2009) 'How Do Cultural Producers Make Creative Decisions? Lessons from the Catwalk', *Social Forces*, 88(2): 671–692.
- Gross, N. (2002) 'Becoming a Pragmatist Philosopher: Status, Self-Concept, and Intellectual Choice', *American Sociological Review*, 67(1):52–76.
- (2008) *Richard Rorty: The Making of an American Philosopher*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Guetzkow, J., M. Lamont and G. Mallard (2004) 'What Is Originality in the Humanities and the Social Sciences?', *American Sociological Review*, 69(2): 190–212.
- Heinich, N. (2005) *L'élite artiste: Excellence et singularité en régime démocratique*, Paris: Gallimard.
- Hennion, A. (2001) 'Music Lovers: Taste as Performance', *Theory, Culture and Society*, 18(5):1–22.
- (2004) 'Une Sociologie Des Attachements', *Sociétés*, 85(3):9–24.
- Hesmondhalgh, D. (2006) 'Bourdieu, the Media and Cultural Production', *Media, Culture and Society*, 28(2): 211–231.
- Hsu, G. (2006) 'Jacks of All Trades and Masters of None: Audiences' Reactions to Spanning Genres in Feature Film Production', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51(3): 420–450.
- Hutter, M. (2013) 'Translation and Dissonance. Complementary Modes of Innovation in the Creative Economy', paper presented at conference for *Valorizing Dissonance: Cultural Perspectives on Newness*, Social Science Research Center Berlin (WZB) June, Berlin, Germany.
- Karpik, L. (2010) *Valuing the Unique*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kersten, A. and M. Verboord (2013) 'Dimensions of Conventionality and Innovation in Film: The Cultural Classification of Blockbusters, Award Winners, and Critics' Favourites', *Cultural Sociology*, 8(1):3–24.
- Kjellberg, H. and A. Mallard (2013) 'Valuation Studies? Our Collective Two Cents', *Valuation Studies*, 1:11–30.
- Knorr-Cetina, K. (1999) *Epistemic Cultures*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kuhn, T. (1970) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lamont, M. (2009) *How Professors Think*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- (2012a) 'How Has Bourdieu Been Good to Think With? The Case of the United States', *Sociological Forum*, 27(1):228–237.

- (2012b) 'Toward a Comparative Sociology of Valuation and Evaluation', *Annual Review of Sociology*, 38(1):201–221.
- Lamont, M., S. Beljean and M. Clair (2014) 'What Is Missing? Cultural Processes and Causal Pathways to Inequality', *Socio-Economic Review*, 12(3): 573–608.
- Lamont, M., P. Chong and A. Bourgoin (2014) 'Capturing Worlds of Worth: Fiction Reviewing, Management Consulting and Scholarly Evaluation Compared', paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Sociological Association, August, San Francisco, CA.
- Leschziner, V. (2015) *At the Chef's Table: Culinary Creativity in Elite Restaurants*, Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Mallard, G., M. Lamont and J. Guetzkow (2009) 'Fairness as Appropriateness', *Science, Technology and Human Values*, 34(5): 573–606.
- Mark, N. (2003) 'Culture and Competition: Homophily and Distancing Explanations for Cultural Niches', *American Sociological Review*, 68: 319–345.
- Negro, G., Ö. Koçak and G. Hsu (2010) 'Research on Categories in the Sociology of Organizations', *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 31: 3–35.
- Nylander, E. (2013) 'Mastering the Jazz Standard: Sayings and Doings of Artistic Valuation', *American Journal of Cultural Sociology*, 2(1): 66–96.
- Phillips, D.J. (2013) *Shaping Jazz: Cities, Labels, and the Global Emergence of an Art Form*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Prior, N. (2011) 'Critique and Renewal in the Sociology of Music: Bourdieu and Beyond', *Cultural Sociology*, 5(1): 121–138.
- Rao, H., P. Monin and R. Durand (2005) 'Border Crossing: Bricolage and the Erosion of Categorical Boundaries in French Gastronomy', *American Sociological Review*, 70(6): 968–991.
- Rosen, S. (1981) 'The Economics of Superstars', *The American Economic Review*, 71(5): 845–858.
- Salganik, M., P. Sheridan Dodds and D.J. Watts (2006) 'Experimental Study of Inequality and Unpredictability in an Artificial Cultural Market', *Science*, 311(5762):854–56.
- Sapiro, G. (2003) 'The Literary Field Between the State and the Market', *Poetics*, 31(5): 441–464.
- (2010) 'Globalization and Cultural Diversity in the Book Market: The Case of Literary Translations in the US and in France', *Poetics*, 38(4): 419–439.
- Shapin, S. (2012) 'The Sciences of Subjectivity', *Social Studies of Science*, 42(2): 170–184.
- Silva, E. and A. Warde (eds.) (2010) *Cultural Analysis and Bourdieu's Legacy*, London: Routledge.
- Steinmetz, G. (2006) 'Bourdieu's Disavowal of Lacan: Psychoanalytic Theory and the Concepts of "Habitus" and "Symbolic Capital"', *Constellations*, 13(4): 445–464.
- Thompson, J. (2010) *Merchants of Culture*, Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Timmermans, S. and S. Epstein (2010) 'A World of Standards but Not a Standard World: Toward a Sociology of Standards and Standardization', *Annual Review of Sociology*, 36(1): 69–89.
- Velthuis, O. (2005) *Talking Prices*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Verboord, M. (2011) 'Market Logic and Cultural Consecration in French, German and American Bestseller Lists, 1970–2007', *Poetics*, 39(4): 290–315.
- Vergne, J.-P. and T. Wry (2014) 'Categorizing Categorization Research: Review, Integration, and Future Directions', *Journal of Management Studies*, 51(1): 56–94.
- Yogev, T. (2010) 'The Social Construction of Quality: Status Dynamics in the Market for Contemporary Art', *Socio-Economic Review*, 8(3): 511–536.
- Zuckerman, E.W., T.-Y. Kim, K. Ukanwa and J. von Rittmann (2003) 'Robust Identities or Nonentities? Typecasting in the Feature-Film Labor Market', *American Journal of Sociology*, 108(5): 1018–1074.

Introduc

Notwithsta  
dominant s  
2011; Silva  
has almost  
sively adva  
and Smith  
Carballo a  
Bourdieu's  
engine of  
claim of a  
standing b  
Given  
like a 'cult  
Mohr 200  
was the ta  
criticism f  
tant contr  
(Alexand  
personal r  
in scholar  
'weak' an  
able guid  
Howe  
could ser  
refocusin  
meaning  
a 'sociol  
and an a