CONTENT AND COVERAGE OF ‘CULTURE’ IN INTRODUCTORY TEXTBOOKS

by

Lorien T. Lake-Coral

Copyright © Lorien T. Lake-Coral 2012

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

In the Graduate College

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

2012
As members of the Dissertation Committee, we certify that we have read the dissertation prepared by Lorien Lake-Corral entitled ‘Content and Coverage of Culture in Introductory Textbooks’ and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Date: November 21, 2012
Celestino Fernandez

Date: November 21, 2012
Ronald Breiger

Date: November 21, 2012
Charles Ragin

Final approval and acceptance of this dissertation is contingent upon the candidate’s submission of the final copies of the dissertation to the Graduate College.

I hereby certify that I have read this dissertation prepared under my direction and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement.

Date: November 21, 2012
Dissertation Director: Celestino Fernandez
STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This dissertation has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at the University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this dissertation are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the copyright holder.

SIGNED: Lorien T. Lake-Corral
DEDICATION

Dedicated to Steve
TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES .................................................................................................................. 6
LIST OF TABLES .................................................................................................................... 7
ABSTRACT ................................................................................................................................. 8
CHAPTER 1: PROJECT DESCRIPTION ..................................................................................... 9
CHAPTER 2: MAPPING THE SOCIOLOGY OF CULTURE ............................................................ 11
  Culture and Sociology ............................................................................................................ 11
  Mapping the Field .................................................................................................................. 13
  Data/Methodology ................................................................................................................ 17
    Anthologies of Culture ......................................................................................................... 18
    Reading Lists ....................................................................................................................... 19
    Culture Section Oral Histories ............................................................................................ 21
  Framing ‘Culture’ in Textbooks ............................................................................................ 26
CHAPTER 3: TOWARDS A SOCIOLOGY OF TEXTBOOKS .......................................................... 32
  A Brief History of the Textbook ............................................................................................ 32
  Textbooks as ‘Semiotic Commodities’ .................................................................................. 34
  Textbook Content ................................................................................................................ 36
CHAPTER 4: DATA & METHODOLOGY .................................................................................... 39
  The Present Study ................................................................................................................ 39
    Sampling .............................................................................................................................. 40
    Coding ................................................................................................................................. 41
    Analyses ............................................................................................................................. 44
CHAPTERS 5: RESULTS ............................................................................................................ 48
  Percent Coverage ................................................................................................................. 48
  Topic Coverage .................................................................................................................... 48
  Frames .................................................................................................................................. 53
  Change over Time ................................................................................................................ 60
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS ...................................................................................................... 63
  Discussion ............................................................................................................................. 63
  Future Directions ................................................................................................................ 66
    For Field Mapping .............................................................................................................. 66
    For Textbook Analysis and Pedagogy .................................................................................. 68
  Contribution ......................................................................................................................... 69
APPENDIX A: TOP TWENTY TEXTBOOKS, 2008 .................................................................. 72
APPENDIX B: CITATIONS FOR TEXTBOOKS USED IN ANALYSIS ....................................... 73
APPENDIX C: MCA PLOTS AND OUTPUTS ............................................................................. 76
REFERENCES ......................................................................................................................... 85
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 - MCA 1.................................................................................................................. 56
Figure 2 - MCA 2.................................................................................................................. 57
Figure 3 - MCA 3.................................................................................................................. 59
Figure 4 - Regression, Change Over Time........................................................................... 60
Figure 5 - Regression, Change Over Time, no Stark.............................................................. 61
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 - Coding Index........................................................................................................... 42
Table 2 - Frames.................................................................................................................... 43
Table 3 - QCA Results for Topics ....................................................................................... 49
Table 4 - QCA Results for Frames....................................................................................... 53
Table 5 - Eigenvalues for MCA for Frames and Years......................................................... 57
This dissertation reports the results of a content analysis of Introductory Sociology textbooks in order to assess their coverage of, and approach to, the teaching of “culture” in the hopes of ultimately creating a unified approach for the introduction of students to the sociology of culture. Looking at introductory sociology textbooks, the current study documents if and to what extent the topic of culture is included; and if so, analyzes which topics are included, how much space is dedicated to culture, and particularly which frames (in Goffman’s (1974 [1986]) sense) are used to present sociology of culture.

The results of this research highlight three important tendencies of introductory texts. Firstly, there is an apparent inconsistency between current academic work in the sociology of culture and inclusion of that work in introductory textbooks. This is particularly true of cultural production. Additionally, textbooks are extremely likely to treat culture as a concept in an anthropological sense (including a discussion of language, norms, and values) or in terms of diversity or multiculturalism. Finally, textbooks on the whole do not appear to change over time in significant ways. This is certainly not the case from edition to edition (usually a span of one to two years), but also among textbooks from different time periods (the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s, and 2000s).
CHAPTER 1: PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This dissertation reports the results of a content analysis of Introductory Sociology textbooks in order to assess their coverage of, and approach to, the teaching of “culture” in the hopes of ultimately creating a unified approach for the introduction of students to the sociology of culture. Looking at introductory sociology textbooks, the current study documents if and to what extent the topic of culture is included; and if so, analyzes which topics are included, how much space is dedicated to culture, and particularly which frames (in Goffman’s (1974 [1986]) sense) are used to present sociology of culture.

The research question guiding much of this dissertation is: How does knowledge about the sociology of culture get reproduced? More specifically, how is culture presented in introductory-level sociology textbooks? Which frames are used to represent culture?1 The focus of this study is a content analysis of several textbooks. Additionally, this research looks at the trajectory across several editions of the same textbook as well as at textbooks in general over time. Clearly, the emphasis of this dissertation is largely descriptive and qualitative. However, there are certain implications for pedagogy as well as the field of the sociology of culture itself that cannot be ignored.

In order to meaningfully analyze the contents of introductory textbooks, it is also necessary to chart the history of the sociology of culture (independent of its treatment in

---

1 These frames are identified in Chapter 2.
introductory textbooks), as well as to explore the history of textbook production in order to find out how textbooks get written in the first place; more specifically, how certain topics are selected for inclusion. Using several different types analytic methodologies (including simple linear regression, qualitative comparative analysis, and multiple correspondence analysis) allows for the detailed examination of textbook coverage on several dimensions. These dimensions include amount of coverage, topics covered, and overall frames utilized.

The results of this research highlight three important tendencies of introductory texts. Firstly, there is an apparent inconsistency between current academic work in the sociology of culture and inclusion of that work in introductory textbooks. This is particularly true of cultural production. Additionally, textbooks are extremely likely to treat culture as a concept in an anthropological sense (including a discussion of language, norms, and values) or in terms of diversity or multiculturalism. Finally, textbooks on the whole do not appear to change over time in significant ways. This is certainly not the case from edition to edition (usually a span of one to two years), but also among textbooks from different time periods (the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s, and 2000s). The implications of these (and other) trends will be explored in more depth in Chapter 6.
CHAPTER 2: MAPPING THE SOCIOLOGY OF CULTURE

“There is nothing more universal than the project of objectifying the mental structures associated with the particularity of a social structure” (Bourdieu 1984a: xiv).

Culture and Sociology

In this chapter, I examine patterns of linkage among past and present research in the sociology of culture. I sketch the overall pattern of relations among these sub-specialties, examine the structural position of particular sub-specialties, and consider their implications for understanding the discipline. “Following Bourdieu (1988), reflexively understanding sociology as a social field should reveal comprehensible, latent social structures underlying intellectual affinities, and these structures should have stories to tell” (Ennis 1992: 259).

As Raymond Williams famously stated, “culture is one of the two or three most complicated words in the English language” (Williams 1983: 87). It is with this in mind that cultural scholars and educators alike have struggled to define both the term and the field it encompasses. Alfred Weber, brother of noted sociologist Max Weber, is often credited with being the first to use the term Kultursoziologie (cultural sociology) in Weimar Germany (1935). Contemporary cultural sociology, however, is considered to be the result of the “cultural turn” of the 1960s, which led to the structuralist and postmodern approaches to social sciences, which tend to incorporate cultural analysis and critical theory (Walker 2001). The “cultural turn” describes a shift in emphasis towards meaning and on culture rather than politics or economics (Jeffrey 1988). Interestingly,
the Section on the Sociology of Culture of the American Sociological Association rejects the notion of the ‘cultural turn,’ as indicated by its members in interviews (see Chapter 2).

The sociology of culture grew from the intersection between sociology, as shaped by early theorists like Marx, Durkheim, and Weber, and the growing discipline of anthropology, where researchers pioneered ethnographic strategies for describing and analyzing a variety of cultures around the world. What sociologists bring to the field of cultural analysis is “a focus on institutions and social relations, as well as on the broader perspective of structured axes of social differentiation and their historical transformations–axes of class, status, gender, nationality, and ethnicity” (Wolff 1999: ¶4). According to Jameson (1998),

The very sphere of culture itself has expanded, becoming coterminous with market society in such a way that the cultural is no longer limited to its earlier, traditional or experimental forms, but it is consumed throughout daily life itself, in shopping, in professional activities, in the various often televisual forms of leisure, in production for the market and in the consumption of those market products, indeed in the most secret folds and corners of the quotidien. Social space is now completely saturated with the image of culture (Jameson 1998: 111).

The American Sociological Association has recognized ‘culture’ as one of its subject areas since 1988.

The purpose of the Section on Sociology of Culture is to encourage development of this perspective through the organized interchange of ideas and research. The section...considers material products, ideas, and symbolic means and their relation to social behavior. The [section] generates lively intellectual exchange about a range of issues, from the sociology of the arts, to political culture, to identity construction, to studies of religion and science (American Sociological Association 2008).
As the field of cultural sociology grew and changed as a result of the ‘cultural turn,’ dozens of sub-specialties were created. Indeed, the Section on the Sociology of Culture of the American Sociological Association’s research networks categories identify ten major areas of study (or sub-specialization): consumer studies, cognition, language, religion, rurality, material culture, political culture, space and place, symbolic boundaries, and visual sociology (American Sociological Association Section on the Sociology of Culture 2009). Other lists include aesthetics, cultural production/consumption, globalization, identity, inequality, meaning, and social movements. As such, this is a broad sub-field of sociology with many of its own unique traits.

Mapping the Field

In 1984, Bourdieu formulated his theory of the field, which brings directly to mind the imagery of a geographic field that can, quite literally, be ‘mapped.’ For Bourdieu, however, a field is the social setting in which agents and their social positions are located. The position of each particular agent in the field is a result of interaction between the specific rules of the field, an agent’s habitus and capital (Bourdieu, 1984a). This approach to mapping fields is best illustrated by Bourdieu’s (1984a; 1993) use of correspondence analysis to provide a visual conception of symbolic hierarchies within the literary and artistic field.
For years, scholars have ‘mapped’ their fields. Understanding the structure of a field gives the researcher an objective basis for the description of positions in the field. It also makes it possible to understand the way in which different strategies are produced inside the field and the ways in which different cultural scholars create specific symbolic products which depend on their positions in the field (Lebaron 2001). “It is a sort of matrix of different scientific and social practices, of life-styles, opinions and scientific conceptions” (Lebaron 2001: 103). To accurately capture and map a field (such as the field of cultural sociology), it is first necessary to review the relevant literature. In this case, field mapping stems from early discussions of the sociology of knowledge and the sociology of science.

“When it comes to a sociology of knowledge, the knowledge in question is both, and simultaneously, the effect and the cause” (Lemert 1997: 352). In other words, according to Lemert, there are two major ‘traditions’ in the sociology of knowledge: the “knowledge-as-effect” approach of Marx and Mannheim, and the “knowledge-as-cause” (social constructionist) tradition. The first approach “considers the sociology of knowledge the investigation of the social causes of whatever passes for knowledge in sociology” (Lemert 1997: 352). However, Lemert also describes

the trouble Marx got himself into by insisting that things are not only not what they appear to be but they are the very opposite of appearances—that knowledge, thus, is not knowledge at all but the mere, false, and inverted reflection of the mode of production. But, as Alvin Gouldner once put it, in reference to Marx's famous camera obscura metaphor, How then does Marx account for the cameraman? (Lemert 1997: 352).

---

2 see Ennis (1987), Garner (1997), or Cerulo (2002) for excellent examples of field mapping in sociology.
Karl Mannheim (1936) seemed to have better understood the risks of reducing knowledge to the irrelevancy of a mere effect of Marx’s economic base. Mannheim moved away from “the study of ideology as the inevitable distortion of knowledge to a more positive, and scientific, study of ‘the varying ways in which objects present themselves to the subject according to the differences in social settings’” (Lemert 1997: 352-3).

The other major tradition in the sociology of knowledge, made famous by Berger and Luckmann (1966), holds that knowledge (in the form of social consciousness) is the cause, not just of knowledge itself, but of the whole of social reality. This knowledge-as-cause tradition suggests that all of social reality, being the result of human consciousness, is real only in a figurative sense. Because of this idea, the data of researchers such as “economists and attitude surveyors are, at best, third order simulations of primary effects. Only the demographers and ethnographers come as close as second order empirical simulations of whatever is out there in, to use the word, ‘reality’” (Lemert 1997:353).

Surely one of the singular insights of the sociology of knowledge for social scientific inquiry is to be found in its claim that social life does not stop at the doors of our being, but passes into the chambers of our minds and our psyches, and insinuates itself even into the domain of spoken and unspoken thoughts and desires (McCarthy 1996: 107). Mapping these mental schemata in a generalized way is exactly what field mapping strives to do.

Generally speaking, the sociology of science involves the study of science as a social activity, especially dealing “with the social conditions and effects of science, and with the social structures and processes of scientific activity” (Ben-David and Sullivan
The sociology of science, as a discipline, has historically employed a number of methods for doing this. Robert Merton, generally considered one of the fathers of the sociology of science, used reference to bibliometric information and historical information to develop a thesis about the relationship between the Puritan religion and the scientific revolution in the 18th century. In later work, Merton used his experience with scientists and with the history of science to formulate a list of norms which governed conduct within the scientific community. Though both of these approaches have been criticized for various reasons since they were postulated in the late 1930s and early 1940s, they serve as somewhat canonical examples of the sociology of science (Ben-David and Sullivan 1975).

It is here that we encounter the ‘sociology of scientific knowledge,’ a slightly more European approach which is closely related to the sociology of science, and considers social influences on science. Indeed, the concept of field mapping can be traced back to Kuhn’s idea that science does not evolve gradually toward truth, but instead undergoes periodic revolutions which he calls paradigm shifts (Kuhn 1962). A paradigm is an approach that scientists use to understand the subject matter of their field (Kuhn 1962, Garner 1997). A paradigm includes concepts and theories, research methodologies, bodies of knowledge, and a sense of the major solved and unsolved problems in the field. Fields can have one single paradigm or can have multiple competing paradigms, and when the community of scientists in a given field changes its basic approach to the subject matter of the field, a paradigm shift occurs as a response to
internal and external pressures. (Kuhn 1962, Garner 1997). “When asked to provide a narrative of the history of [a] field, scholars often reconstruct such histories in terms of internal problems, puzzles, and paradigm shifts” (Garner 1997: 3).

Data/Methodology

Complementary methods exist for describing and analyzing the structure of a field. Ethnographic observations help researchers discover the different kinds of opposition and dichotomies that exist in the field. These ethnographic observations make it possible to build the appropriate variables which can be used, in turn, for structured data analysis (Lebaron 2001). “The structure of the field is approached through data analysis and ethnographic observations, but this apparently abstract construction is a way to generate new systematic observations” (Lebaron 2001: 98).

For the purposes of this analysis, an ethnographic approach was selected\(^3\). In order to chart the history of the field of culture ethnographically, it is important to determine where existing maps (or typologies, or frameworks, or structures) of culture can be found. One obvious location exists in anthologies of culture, published by various authors in the field. Other typologies or frameworks are often discussed in various journal articles that purport to be ‘surveys of the field’ in and of themselves.\(^4\)

\(^3\) The term ‘ethnography’ generally refers to some direct participation or contact of the researcher with the subjects being studied and within the natural environment or habitat of those people. However, alternative uses of the term include qualitative research which is reflexive, holistic, and where the intent is to provide a detailed, in-depth description of everyday life and practice. This may also be thought of as ‘thick description,’ álà Clifford Geertz (1973).

\(^4\) see Ortner 1984 for an anthropological version
major place to search is graduate departments’ comprehensive exam reading lists, which
often delineate substantive areas within the general field of study (in this case, sociology
of culture). In this vein, the reading lists of graduate-level survey courses in the
Sociology of Culture also provide additional formulations of the field. The Section on
the Sociology of Culture of the American Sociological Association (ASA) itself has much
to provide this analysis as well. For the purposes of this study, several sources of data
were used, including anthologies and handbooks of cultural sociology, top-ranked
graduate departments’ sociology of culture comprehensive exam reading lists as well as
the content of oral histories of the ‘Culture Section’ of the ASA.

Anthologies of Culture

One of the first places one would look to search out existing maps of the field of
culture would be anthologies and other edited volumes that claim themselves to be
collections that represent the field. These texts often separate their material into topic
areas (which, arguably, are a type of subfield). For the purposes of this analysis, seven
volumes were selected, including two books which claimed themselves to be an
“anthology” or “handbook” of culture, four edited volumes, and one special issue of a
journal. The volumes selected were chosen based on a convenience sample of popularity,
breadth, and usage.

Though not always written or phrased in exactly the same way, many overlapping
areas were apparent during the analysis. For example, five of the seven books had some
form of ‘science and technology’ or ‘cyberculture’ as a topic, and three used ‘sex’ or ‘sexuality.’ The areas most often included in the volumes include inequality, globalization, science and technology, and identities (which were each used at least five times across the seven books selected). Colonialism and globalization (together or separate) were used four times, as was the case with politics and/or the economy.

The organization of anthologies tends towards one of content rather than thematic areas. In other words, articles and chapters were organized by their content (such as sexuality or technology) instead of representing thematic areas (such as cultural practice or multiculturalism). In this way, anthologies and handbooks are so diverse in their coverage that it is difficult to make any generalizations about thematic selection and presentation. Indeed, an ethnographic analysis of texts is necessarily more focused on specific coverage and not on generalizability. For this reason, other existing frameworks of culture were also analyzed.

Reading Lists

Another source of data comes from comprehensive (or preliminary, or field) examination reading lists. Using *U.S. News & World Report*’s 2009 rankings of graduate programs in Sociology, the top twenty-five programs were identified. In the fall of 2008, *U.S. News & World Report* sent questionnaires to department heads and directors of graduate studies at institutions that had granted at least five doctorates in sociology between 2001 through 2005 (Morse 2011). The questionnaires asked respondents to rate
the academic quality of the program at each institution on a 5-point scale, with 5 being
the highest score (Morse 2011).

For each of the top twenty-five programs, departmental websites were searched
for online publication of comprehensive exam reading lists. Five comprehensive exam
reading lists in culture were obtained in this manner. When reading lists were not readily
accessible to the public via the web, the programs’ department heads, chairpersons, or
directors were contacted via email requesting a copy of the readings lists (if an
examination in “Culture” was offered). Only one university was unwilling to share the
reading list for their comprehensive exams. Of the ten top-ranked departments, only two
(University of Wisconsin-Madison and Stanford) did not offer comprehensive exams in
Culture. When expanded to include the programs in U.S. News & World Report’s top 25,
eight programs did not offer comprehensive examinations in Culture, six programs opted
for self-designed exams, and one program (Columbia University) did not administer
comprehensive exams at all.

After performing a content analysis on the reading lists for those top-25 programs
that did administer comprehensive examinations in Culture and for which reading lists
were obtained (n=8), several patterns emerged. For example, every list included readings
from Bourdieu and Marx. Such a common ‘core’ set of readings is not unexpected, as
many substantive areas in sociology as well as in other disciplines often agree on a set of
readings which are central to the canon (Coser 1992, Rambo 1997, Hays 2000). What is
more interesting in the current study is the organization of the field. Many reading lists
(though not all) broke readings into several categories and subcategories (such as “critical theory” or “culture and cognition”). Of these, a general theory category of some kind (classical, contemporary) was almost universal, as was a methodology category (though not as common). Nearly all of those lists who subcategorized the field included some category of cultural production (n=5), identity (n=5), politics (n=5), cognition (n=4), inequality (n=4), and globalization (n=4). Additionally, the major readings associated with these seven subcategories were also present in the readings lists that did not subcategorize. Other subcategories (such as meaning, boundaries, or cultural change) were also common but not as prevalent as the other seven (n=3 and below). Indeed, some very specific subject areas (such as religion, fashion, or careers in culture) were utilized across lists but too varied to be considered thematic.

Based on the survey of top-ranked graduate programs’ comprehensive examination reading lists, seven major thematic areas emerge in the subject of sociology of culture. These areas are theory, production, identity, politics, cognition, inequality, and globalization. Comparing this list of thematic areas with those identified by cultural scholars is necessarily the next step in the mapping process.

Culture Section Oral Histories

A third source of data on thematic areas in the sociology of culture should

---

5 It should be noted that hereafter, use of the term “theory” refers specifically to theories of culture, such as Marx’s materialism or Bourdieu’s Field Theory, and not of sociological theory in a general sense.
necessarily come from scholars of culture themselves. To that end, the Section on the Sociology of Culture of the American Sociological Association (ASA) has collected oral histories of the section by cultural scholars. Seven interviews were used in this analysis from Jeffrey Alexander, Karen Cerulo, Paul DiMaggio, Cynthia Epstein, Donna Gaines, Michael Schudson, and Vera Zolberg. The seven edited interviews range from ten to fifteen minutes each and include responses to questions posed by an interviewer. Most questions are aimed at uncovering the history of the Section itself and respondents discuss where they were, what they were doing, and how they first joined the section. However, the respondents also discuss many of the content areas within the sociology of culture.

For example, 2006 Section Chair Jeffrey Alexander reports being “furious” (2010: 2:07) that colleagues in the mid-1980s considered ‘cultural sociology’ to be an oxymoron and considers the beginning of the Culture Section to be a way to legitimize a subject area that was receiving more and more attention from scholars. In fact, the first major distinction that Alexander makes is between ‘sociologists of culture’ and ‘cultural sociologists.’ This distinction is one that is not addressed in the comprehensive reading lists by a majority of institutions and is sometimes confounded with anthropology. The historical connection of sociology to theorists such as Lemert or Parsons suggests, to Alexander, that at the time, sociologists considered their subject areas (culture, religion, politics) secondary to their empirical orientation as social scientists. To signify someone as a ‘cultural sociologist’ was to imply that he or she took a less-than-positivist approach
to research. Alexander also makes the distinction between studying “a phenomenon called culture” (2010: 3:43), using empirical models and statistical analysis, and looking at the cultural dimensions of other phenomena, which is more and more common today. For Alexander, culture is one of the four major specialties that a sociologist may engage with in his or her career, and “the subfields of empirical specialization” within culture include historical/comparative analysis, gender, politics, and “whatever” (meaning nearly all empirical areas can be studied with the orientation of a cultural sociologist).

Alexander himself considers studies of power to be critical to the field. When discussing the history of the sociology of culture, Alexander makes reference to the ‘cultural turn’ of the 1960s and the increased interest in linguistics, semiotics, and structuralist analysis. It is important to note that none of these subject areas were included in the comprehensive exam reading lists.

Karen Cerulo identifies early cultural scholars as those studying “social theory, politics and the arts” (2010: 0:38), cultural production, and religion. She believes that dealing with the diversity of subdisciplines (including areas such as social movements, politics, mental health, and narratives) within the field of culture is one of the major challenges for the Chair of the Section. Additionally, as Alexander noted, Cerulo agrees that “instead of the thing to be explained, [culture] is becoming one of the explanatory variables” (2010: 12:59). Vera Zolberg (Section Chair in 1989) reiterated this early confounding of cultural sociology and sociology of culture: Her thesis advisor indicated that “if I was going to [study culture], I should do it in a more sociological - American
sociological - way, which was to study cultural institutions and the institutions of

culture” (2010: 0:34).

Cynthia Epstein (President of the ASA in 2006 as well as Chair of the Culture
Section from 2001-2) describes her involvement in culture as coming from an interest in
dichotomies (black/white, man/woman) in society. She mentions historical analysis as
well as meaning as two major areas in culture which were popular during her tenure as
Section Chair, but does not discuss subfields in any greater detail. Donna Gaines, who is
credited by most of the other scholars as being the driving force behind the creation of the
Section on the Sociology of Culture, herself refers to popular culture on several occasions
as a major dimension of the sociological study of culture. She also mentions politics and
Marxist theory as areas from which cultural scholars emerged in the mid-1980s. Michael
Schudson, Section Chair in 1999, identifies several areas in which scholars were
interested or engaged before the Section emerged in 1985, including popular culture,
social movements/social change, structure/agency, and mass media. He also discusses
more current areas of focus in cultural sociology, including cultural production and
meaning-making. Vera Zolberg as well indicates that the study of art (“with a capital
‘A’” [2010: 1:35]) and cultural production (“creation”) were major substantive areas of
research of the early cultural sociologists. She also identifies collective memory, work,
theory, and deviance as other subject areas often engaged in the field of culture.
Paul DiMaggio discusses cultural sociology as being born out of three major empirical areas: cultural production, cognition, policy. Indeed, DiMaggio sees culture as a way to understand “the production of culture as being a comparative study of different cultural institutions, not just the arts, but also science, religion and law” as well as fashion and cuisine (2010: 1:55). Interestingly, DiMaggio is the first (and only) scholar to mention the term ‘multiculturalism’ in his discussion of the sociology of culture. This is not a major area covered by comprehensive reading lists, either, but is presented as a major factor in the textbook presentation of culture. DiMaggio discusses multiculturalism as being one of the three major sessions at the annual meeting of the ASA during his tenure as Chair of the Section in 1994, along with production and meaning/measurement (which was included on only one comprehensive reading list - the University of Arizona). As Section Chair, DiMaggio formed working groups (now called research networks) in the areas of comparative institutions, meaning/measurement, multiculturalism, and cultural policy. DiMaggio also indicated his own interest in cognition, inequality/social class, and comparative historical analysis.

After reviewing these interviews with seven cultural scholars, several patterns emerged. First and foremost, cultural scholars may not always agree on the specific subfields that make up the larger field of cultural sociology, but all of those interviewed referred multiple times to the ‘diversity’ of the field. In other words, some conceptions of the Culture Section see it as a ‘catch-all’ for those scholars who found themselves without a section in the 1980s but who had a unified approach to studying their varied content.
areas. But can the same be said for the field itself - that it is a hodgepodge of “whatever” (Alexander 2010: 4:27)? There was no singular subfield mentioned by all respondents, although five respondents out of seven mentioned the ‘arts’ or ‘popular culture’ as being important areas of study for cultural sociologists. Cultural production, meaning, and politics were discussed by four of the respondents. Areas mentioned by at least three respondents include cognition/memory, theory, and social change. It appears, at least to scholars of culture, that cultural sociology is more of an orientation to studying phenomena than a list of phenomena itself.

Framing ‘Culture’ in Textbooks

Erving Goffman's development of frame analysis is not exactly a theoretical paradigm, nor is it a complete methodological approach. Those familiar with Goffman’s work tend to see frame analysis as an examination of how reality is structured through ritualistic performances (Goffman 1974; Lynxwiler 1999). Goffman's work was influenced by such diverse theorists as John Dewey, Emile Durkheim, George Herbert Mead, and Ludwig Wittgenstein (Collins 1988). The major thread that connects his writings is an interest in how the elements of everyday encounters structure social order.

One of the unique features of framing is its appropriation by scholars from very different fields of study. Today's frame analysis spans a number of disparate approaches including organizational studies, social movement studies, and media studies (Benford &
Snow 2000, Fisher 1997, Hallahan 1999, or Scheufele 1999, e.g.). Each subject area has, of course, focused on different areas of framing theory and has approached the subject with different methods (König 2005). In the area of social movement research, David Snow and his associates contend that there are frames that “resonate with cultural narration, that is with stories, myths, and folk tales that are part and parcel of one's cultural heritage” (Snow & Benford 1988: 210). In the field of the sociology of culture, these stories and folk tales can be equated with the canon of theory and research available as tools to scholars and students alike. ‘Cultural heritage,’ then, can be found in cultural tools - and in academia, one of the most omnipresent cultural tools is the textbook.

The identification of frames is, of course, not a theoretical end in itself, but merely a contribution to the explanation of cultural dynamics (König 2005). Therefore, identifying the frames through which “Culture” may be explored in textbooks is relatively simple. For example, one frame included in nearly all areas of the field was that of cultural practice - of studying rituals, norms, and language. This might be termed an ‘anthropological’ framing of culture; seeing culture and cultural practices as the object of study.

For the purposes of this study, four cultural frames were developed based on the results of the ethnographic field mapping completed above: (1) Anthropological, (2) Diversity, (3) Popular Culture, and (4) Cultural Production. The Anthropological frame envelops a presentation of culture that is decidedly descriptive. Textbooks employing this frame usually define culture in terms of its parts (such as language, norms, or rituals),
with little or no analytical additions. Evidence for this frame can be seen in the ASA’s Section on the Sociology of Culture including ‘language’ and ‘material culture’ as two of its ten recognized sub-speciality areas, for example. Interestingly, none of the graduate program exam reading lists analyzed included areas that would be considered ‘anthropological’ in this more descriptive sense. However, the distinction between sociological and anthropological approaches to culture was raised by Jeffery Alexander in his discussion of ‘sociologists of culture’ and ‘cultural sociologists’ (Alexander 2010: 2:46-3:33).

Textbooks employing the Anthropological frame almost always included elements of culture (language, norms, or values) as part of their definitions of culture. For example, Henslin defines culture in all editions of his various textbooks as “the language, beliefs, values, norms, behaviors, and even material objects that are passed from one generation to the next” (Henslin 2008: 38). Similarly, Macionis defines culture as “the values, beliefs, behavior, and material objects that, together, form a people’s way of life” (Macionis 2001: 61). Both of these definitions highlight the role of culture as a series of elements rather than as an active or analytic process.

The Diversity frame refers to two closely related phenomena; globalization and multiculturalism. With the rise of globalization, more and more academic textbooks utilize special “boxes” or other tools to discuss, even briefly, the growing interest in non-Western or, at the very least, non-hegemonic views of various social phenomena. Current evidence of this phenomenon will be presented in Chapter 5. Textbooks using the
Diversity frame will necessarily tend to define culture as fluid, relative, and all-encompassing. More specifically, the Diversity frame carries with it a conception of the study of culture as the study of cultures (in plural). Texts and chapters using the diversity frame often discussed elements of culture through a global lens or defined culture in vague terms. For example, Stockard defines culture as “the complex pattern of living that we as humans have developed and that we pass on from generation to generation” (Stockard 1997: 51). The author’s next sentence refers to the idea that while people may share an American culture, most of these people live different lifestyles that could also be considered ‘culture’ (Stockard 1997). Even more frankly, the title of the textbook authored by Bryjak and Soroka (1994) is *Sociology: Cultural Diversity in a Changing World*. This text includes many boxes and other highlighted features such as “Ourselves and Others: Culture Conflict and Child Abuse” (Bryjak & Soroka 1994: 53) or “Focus on Mexico” (Bryjak & Soroka 1994: 63-4).

The **Popular Culture** frame, on the other hand, seems on its face to relate more to current research in the field and less to textbooks as they currently are produced. While “Arts & Entertainment” can certainly be considered part of popular culture, it encompasses almost any cultural form that is embraced by an informal majority of the population. This may include normative behaviors, stylistic endeavors, and dominant ideologies as well as folk culture, mass culture, fads and fashions (Storey 2006). Indeed, cultural scholars such as Jeffrey Alexander (2010) and Karen Cerulo (2010) (among others) included “arts” or “popular culture” specifically as part of their conception of
culture. Textbooks using this frame were few and far between, but often included highlighted boxes or breakout sections such as “Popular Culture, the Internet, and Cultural Imperialism” (Kendall 2007: 97) or introductions to the chapter such as the one found in Schaefer (2007):

The United States is the most consumer-oriented society in the world...Americans own more television sets than inhabitants of any other country - nearly one set per person. Observers blame TV for plummeting levels of civic engagement, the death of community, and the decline of everyday socializing. Heavy viewing has also resulted in historically unprecedented exposure to commercials. And ads have proliferated far beyond the television screen to virtually every social institution and type of public space, from museums and zoos, to college campuses and elementary school classrooms, restaurant bathrooms and menus, at the airport, even in the sky (Schaefer 2007: 51).


The fourth and final frame is the **Cultural Production** frame, which tends towards framing culture in terms of politics, hegemony, and field. This might also be called the “Bourdieuian” frame, if such a mention of Bourdieu existed in introductory textbooks (it doesn’t). The Production frame sees culture in terms of a power struggle engaged in by actors within various fields. For example, in the study of graduate comprehensive examinations, both “cultural production” and “politics” were some of the most common topics included in graduate-level reading lists. Indeed, readings by

---

6 For many sociologists of culture, "production" refers to the specific theory and studies of Paul DiMaggio and Richard Peterson. However, the use of this term within this dissertation more specifically refers to aspects of Pierre Bourdieu's reproduction theory.
Bourdieu himself were included on every single reading list reviewed. Moreover, more than half of the cultural scholars interviewed by the ASA Culture Section mentioned politics in some form, and all mentioned power. Kornblum (2005, 2007) was the only author to employ a production frame, evidenced by such subtopics as “Cultural Hegemony: Myth or Reality” (Kornblum 2007: 61).

These four frames, while not exhaustive of all theoretical and empirical knowledge in the field of culture, are certainly representative of some of the ways that actors within the field give meaning to it.
CHAPTER 3: TOWARDS A SOCIOLOGY OF TEXTBOOKS

“To be taken seriously, any critique of how textbooks are created must demonstrate a factual understanding of how they come into being” (Goode 1988: 386-7).

A Brief History of the Textbook

The first usage of the word ‘textbook’ did not occur until the 1830s, although the term ‘school book’ first appeared in the Oxford English Dictionary in the 1750s (Stray 1994). Since that time, scholars such as Ludwig Fleck ([1935] 1979) and Thomas Kuhn (1962) have offered typologies for the differences between ‘school books,’ ‘children’s books,’ text books,’ and ‘textbooks.’ For example, in the mid-1930s, Fleck (1979: 111ff) distinguished state-of-the-art “journal science” written for “specific” experts from handbook science (which translates journal science for “general” experts), popular science (for non-experts), to textbook science (which introduces initiates to the expert system). “Because textbooks cannot meaningfully engage state-of-the-art debates at the core of the field, they are inevitably, and perhaps irredeemably, misleading from the standpoint of journal science” (Manza et al 2010: 270).

By the end of the 19th Century, however, textbook publishing had become a ‘mainstay’ of the publishing industry in Britain (Stray 1994: 4). Around the mid-century, publishing companies such as Wadsworth were cropping up all over the United States. Higher education was booming and publishers faced high demand for all kinds of books for every level of course. However, when the economy stalled in the 1980s, a period of extensive educational reform meant changes to the world of textbook publication.
Publishers began focusing “more and more on introductory courses, especially as enrollments in advanced courses declined” (Fullerton 1988: 354). Over time, it became more important for publishers to develop books to compete with each other than to understand the needs of teachers and students and respond in new ways.

As higher education changed, so did textbooks and the relationships between publishers and academics...Whereas they once felt that book people understood their world and participated in it, now they tell me that they feel like troublesome objects in the process of getting books adopted. Publishers, they say, have shifted from listening to them and sharing ideas and information to perceiving them as a "market," an "other" whose only value is in buying a particular book (Fullerton 1988: 353).

The result of this gradual change in the relationship of publishers and academics is a generally adversarial relationship. And yet each year in the United States, approximately 800,000 sociology textbooks are sold to introductory sociology students (Hamilton and Form 2003, Manza et al 2010), and the vast majority of introductory sociology instructors utilize one of the available textbooks (McGee 1985: 176-77, Hamilton and Form 2003: 694).

“Philosophers of science have long noted the conservative role of the textbook in reproducing the dominant ideas of a disciplinary field” (Manza et al 2010: 269). Fleck ([1935] 1979) argued that each type of science (journal, handbook, and textbook) produces its own type of knowledge, or model, of the discipline. Kuhn (1962) agreed: the modes of textbook presentation produce ‘stable and formulaic presentations of the dominant paradigm within a field’ (Manza et al 2010: 270). In his 1994 proposal of a ‘sociology of textbooks,’ Stray concluded that one should approach the historical
sociology of the textbook “by seeing it as the interaction of several relationships involving teachers and pupils, producers and consumers, institutions and the state” (Stray 1994: 24).

The undergraduate sociology textbook is a social creation; its nature is governed partly by the publishing industry and partly by the realities of undergraduate teaching (Goode 1988). Textbooks must constantly toe the line between fitting into instructors’ specific courses and including enough of the material deemed ‘crucial’ to the discipline.7 Instructors believe that “there must be something of a ‘fit’ between the instructor's sense of how a course ought to be taught and the reading material that he or she adopts” (Goode 1988: 384). But every instructor cannot design a textbook that fits his or her course exactly (although this is becoming more feasible with technology and online data banks). Thus they must rely on a select number of textbook authors to meet their pedagogical needs. However, as most editors will admit, “the author is quite restricted in controlling what content can be introduced in each chapter” (Tischler 1988: 370).

Textbooks As ‘Semiotic Commodities’

Textbooks can also be considered from a materialist and semiotic perspective. During the 19th Century, meaning became commodified through capitalism. Books, and more specifically textbooks, were produced commodities that transmitted a message; an encoded ‘social hieroglyph’ which required access to a ‘code’ so that its meanings could

7 see Tischler (1988) for a brief discussion of these so-called ‘crucial’ topics or anecdotes.
be decoded (Thompson 1990, Stray 1994). Textbooks combine the coded meanings of a field of knowledge (for example, the field of culture) with pedagogy. Access to these ‘codes’ was often restricted to university-educated scholars and students. As such, textbooks became “situated objects which form[ed] part of the processes of education” (Stray 1994: 2). Not only this, but they also became commodities which (along with education) could be produced, distributed, and consumed without much thought. Textbooks can also be considered a major element in the process of cultural transmission. They are authoritative, low-status embodiments of received knowledge (Stray 1994). A text, then, is not an isolated object but instead a “product of the social and historical agency of its making: an agency that has to include both content and intention (Williams 1989: 172).

A number of authors have written on the effect of publishing practices and have suggested that this makes a significant independent contribution to the uniformity of the textbook literature (Platt 2008a). Lynch and Bogen (1997: 485) interviewed the publishers of leading texts in addition to examining their products, and found that they drew on market research to play an active role in shaping texts. “One of the very few factors that most textbook publishers consider in making their decisions is the potential sales of a manuscript. From time to time they send up a ‘trial balloon’ to determine how much interest a field has in a particular approach or subject” (Goode 1988: 384-5). Ritzer (1988) points out that some texts are ‘managed books’, where the owner of the big name

---

8 see also Bourdieu (1990)
that appears on the cover has made little contribution to the actual writing, while in less extreme cases the text provided by the author is still edited, illustrated and designed in-house by the publisher.

Textbook Content

Goode (1988) believes that although the full-length introductory textbook may not be the best way to convey how to think sociologically, it is the best way to convey the content of the field of sociology. For this reason, the content of textbooks, as well as their organization, has been the topic of heated debate. Which topics are included? Schaefer (1988) argues that introductory textbooks in sociology necessarily reflect recent developments in the field and that inclusion of a topic legitimates it. Additionally, because most undergraduates’ exposure to sociology [is] limited to an introductory level course taught with a textbook, it is crucial that the content accurately reflect the discipline (Suarez & Balaji 2007: 240).

However, it remains to be seen how long it takes textbooks to ‘catch up’ to current issues, research and theory in the field of culture.

Some scholars (Graham 1988, Goode 1988, & Tischler 1988, e.g.) have argued over whether textbooks are declining or are improving in clarity, creativity, and pedagogy over time. Some of this argument can be attributed to a desire by administrators in sociology departments to enroll as many students as possible. Therefore, although rigor in textbooks is important, “teaching must be part entertainment, part pedagogy” in order to attract and hold the interest of the large percentage of introductory sociology students
who are non-majors (Goode 1988: 385). Although sociologists would like introductory textbooks to be highly rigorous, getting students to take and learn in sociology courses is favored over a strict adherence to academic-level writing.

We may wish to impose high-level rigor on our courses and our texts, but unless we are willing to see a full-scale abandonment of our classes by students who do not have to be there, our materials will have to be watered down somewhat for current undergraduate demand (Goode 1988: 385).

This is not a dissertation on the pedagogical issues of using textbooks as opposed to original manuscripts or first-hand readings by theorists such as Marx or Durkheim. Indeed, the issue of usage, as far as textbooks are concerned, has been hashed out again and again⁹. Nor is this project meant to discuss the quality of textbooks. It is understood that “textbook writers are under great pressure to conform to the format of the biggest-selling texts in the field; success or failure may be at least partly a function of the publishers’ ability and willingness to kick back money to adopters and may not be wholly traceable to the nature and quality of the book” (Ritzer 1988:374). Many authors (Coser et al 1982, Manza et al 2010, e.g.) have discussed the publication and marketing aspects of textbook production as well. Instead, this dissertation aims to discuss the nature of these textbooks (adopted or not) and their inclusion of topics, specifically culture. As such, this dissertation does not discuss the issues of textbook uniformity or pedagogy from an educational perspective. Instead, it analyzes one specific sub-area’s presentation in textbooks and its implications for that sub-area: culture.

---

⁹ see Platt (2008a) for a thorough discussion
Scholars as far back as the turn of the last century have found that the content of textbooks necessarily changes with the times. For example, Meroney (1933) found an increasing emphasis on biological factors in sociological textbooks between 1894 and 1932. He attributed this change to controversies between religion and science at the time (Meroney 1933, Platt 2008a). Platt (2008b: 328) also acknowledges that “there has emerged a canonical set of authors, consisting of earlier European writers accompanied by a more recent set of key contributors from the US.” Harley’s (2008) comparative data show how this pattern has been replicated, with some modifications, for Australia and Britain. “Although precise orders fluctuate with date, reflecting both publication dates and shifts in fashion, all three countries have citations to Marx, Weber and Durkheim in the lead” (Platt 2008b). Thus we see the beginning of the emergence of a “frame” (in this case, a theoretical or canonical one) in textbooks.
CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY

“In spite of disciplinary research tools capable of turning our texts into objects of analysis, the distinctive content of the textbook remains almost completely unexamined” (Manza et al 2010: 277).

The Present Study

In the past, when sociology textbooks have been examined scientifically, it has been almost entirely without analyses of their content (Manza et al 2010). However, content analysis has been used to document textbook shortcomings (e.g. how a particular topic is [mis]treated in textbooks), or to use textbooks as a source of data to identify the “conventional wisdom” or “lowest common denominator” of the discipline (e.g. Ferree and Hall 1996, Lynch and Bogan 1997). For the purposes of the current study, analyses of textbooks, a content analysis was indeed undertaken. Analyses include both textbooks in their entirety as well as single chapters dedicated (or partially dedicated) to the Sociology of Culture. The intention was to uncover patterns or common ‘approaches’ to culture. Is culture presented in a unified way across textbooks? What material is presented? What material is neglected or left out? And, most importantly, what ‘frames’ of culture are used in different texts?

To look at the effect of time in the introduction of the sociology of culture, I attempted to code across several editions of the same textbook. The goal of this analysis was to see which topics get expanded, added in, combined, or dropped entirely. Finally, I used Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) to see whether there is a “recipe” for sociology of culture content in introductory textbooks.
Sampling

There are currently hundreds of introductory textbooks on the market. Every year, close to 900,000 university-level students enroll in introductory sociology courses, approximately 800,000 of them in courses with a required textbook (Hamilton & Form 2003). Large publishing houses, such as McGraw Hill, Pine Forge Press, and Pearson-Prentice Hall, regularly keep and share data on textbook sales and market shares based on surveys of bookstores. In fact, in 2003, the two largest publishing houses reported that together Henslin (1999), Kendall (2001), Kornblum (2000), Macionis (2001), and Schaefer (2001) covered just over half the market (Hamilton & Form 2003: 694).

In order to both keep findings relevant and current as well as trace textbooks’ inclusion rates over time, fifteen introductory textbooks published in or since the year 2000 were analyzed. For the purposes of choosing a sample, fifteen of the 20 most commonly-used textbooks in Introductory Sociology courses in the United States were selected\(^\text{10}\). This ‘top-twenty’ list was obtained through Monument Information Resource, a leading provider of textbook sales data for higher education (recently rebranded as ‘PubTrack Higher Education’). PubTrack Higher Education “gathers actual Point of Sales (POS) and Book-in-Use data about which titles are adopted and purchased at colleges and universities across the United States and Canada” (Bowker 2012: 1). I was able to obtain a list of the top twenty textbooks used by colleges and universities in 2008

\(^{10}\) The complete top-twenty list can be found in Appendix A.
and selected fifteen of the easiest to obtain for inclusion in the analysis. Following Suarez and Balaji (2007), I used publishers’ websites to determine the most current edition of each particular title and confirmed with colleagues (who currently or recently taught Introductory classes) that the textbooks chosen reflect the mainstream top-selling introductory textbooks. Wherever possible, I also obtained earlier editions of the texts included in this sample, as well as earlier editions of the other top-twenty books (if the current edition was unavailable to me). In order to study change over time in textbooks, I had intended to obtain a list of the top twenty textbooks in use in the 1980s or 1990s, but PubTrack Higher Education did not have that information available. As such, I opted for a convenience sample of older textbooks by simply asking colleagues for any textbooks they had from previous years (particularly prior to 2000). A total of 26 additional textbooks were collected and coded for additional analysis (for an overall total of 41 textbook chapters coded), including 18 previous editions of top-twenty textbook as well as 8 pre-2000 textbooks. Some of the previous edition texts were also pre-2000. A complete list of textbooks used in the analyses can be found in Appendix B.

Coding

Three types of coding took place in this study. First, textbooks were evaluated on the amount of coverage of the topic of ‘culture.’ This was coded as length of the relevant

---

11 The five top-twenty textbooks that were not used in the analysis were omitted for several reasons. One of the books was a custom edition of a textbook for Strayer University and was unobtainable, two were cost-prohibitive to obtain for a dissertation, and two were readers that were not comparable to the traditional textbook’s use of chapters.
chapter (in whole number of pages). Based on this and the total number of content pages in the textbook (excluding glossaries and indexes), the percent of coverage was calculated.

Secondly, the 41 textbooks were coded in terms of coverage. That is, several topics determined (by the information in Chapter 2) to be valuable and/or important to the topic of “culture” were identified and their inclusion, level of inclusion, or lack thereof was also coded. Level of inclusion ranged from an entire unit to a highlighted term within the text of the chapter to no mention at all. These topics were coded on a 10-point scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Level of Inclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Unit/Part title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Chapter title/partial chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Chapter subheading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Topic title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Subtopic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Highlighted (in box, special feature, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Italicized/bolded term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>In text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>In another chapter/section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Coding Index
The eight topics measured by this scale were **theory, language, norms/values, cognition/sociobiology, media/popular culture, production, multiculturalism/diversity, and globalization.**

Finally, the overall frame of the chapter (or sub-chapter) was also coded for all 41 textbook chapters. When it came to identifying the various frames used by textbooks, I utilized a key-term system. If, for example, the text’s definition of “culture” included any of the key terms, the case was coded as “1” for the corresponding frame. This allowed for cases to have multiple frames. Coding the textbooks in this manner did not allow for a frame to exist if it was not used in the definition of ‘culture.’ It is for this reason that I believed this coding process to be flawed; it did not account for the overall “feel” of a chapter in terms of its frame, only the definition of ‘culture’. Therefore, I also coded textbooks as having a particular frame if any of the major subheadings or topics (coding levels 1-4) included any of the key terms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Key terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropological</td>
<td>language, norms, rituals, values, customs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>diversity, difference, global perspective, ethnocentrism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular Culture</td>
<td>arts, entertainment, music, popular, consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Production</td>
<td>Bourdieu, hegemony, field, politics, power</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Frames
Analyses

In terms of analysis, several analytical methodologies were utilized, classifying this research as mixed-methods. To look at overall coverage of culture in textbooks, I used a simple regression to determine whether the percent of textbooks dedicated to culture is significantly different among textbooks and whether the percent of coverage has changed significantly over time (within different editions of the same textbook).

To look at the level of inclusion of various topics, several qualitative comparative analyses (QCA) were undertaken using the Quine-McCluskey algorithm of the fs/QCA program. Each topic of coverage (of the eight coded) was used as an outcome variable for one of the eight analyses. The remaining seven topics were used as causal conditions. This was done in order to assess which types of topic coverage were related in a significant way to other topics. In order to run the analyses using fs/QCA successfully as crisp-sets, the ‘levels of inclusion’ codes were transformed into dichotomous variables. The codes for each level of inclusion were converted to “1” if the level of inclusion was 3 or higher and “0” for 2 or lower. Level 3 was chosen as the cutoff mark because it indicates at least some amount of highlighting of the topic at hand by the textbook (rather than a simple passing mention within the text itself).
As is common in the empirical world, there is not always a case to exhibit each logically possible combination of relevant causal conditions. More literally, and for this data in particular, the truth table does not contain cases on each of the $2^k$ rows of the truth table (where $k$ is the number of causal conditions). “A truth table this complete is rare, [however,] especially when $k$ is greater than five, because naturally occurring social phenomena are almost always limited in their diversity” (Ragin 2003: 8). For this reason, QCA is the preferred method of analyzing the data because of its use of remainders and simplifying assumptions. Ragin explains:

…when the diversity of social phenomena is limited, researchers can use causal combinations lacking cases (called "remainders" in fs/QCA) to simplify the results of the analysis of the causal conditions linked to an outcome. This process is usually described as one of making "simplifying assumptions" because the researcher must assume that if the nonexistent combinations could be observed, they would have the outcome, as indicated in the equation derived from the truth table (Ragin 2003: 8-9).

Essentially, the QCA method allows researchers to define any number of possible independent variables and a dependent variable (coded in terms of presence or absence). Using Boolean algebra, QCA generates parsimonious equations explaining necessary and sufficient conditions for the presence and absence of the dependent variable (Ragin 1987; Earl 2000). Additionally, QCA “identifies the necessary and sufficient condition for an event to occur, and is especially suited to situations with complex patterns of interactions among specified conditions” (Cress & Snow 1996: 1096). Luckily, as Earl (2000) notes,
QCA turns the threat of spuriousness on its head by explicitly asking about combinations between causal variables. This means that researchers can use collinearity as a source of information as opposed to a methodologically troubling redundancy in data. [And], as the publishing record suggests, the definitional and operationalization requirements of QCA do not seem overly burdensome. In fact, many variables important to social movement outcomes may be more amenable to a presence/absence formulation than an evenly graded, interval variable formulation. This is not because the relevant variables lack quantitative changes but because those changes can be difficult to scale evenly into units (Earl 2000: 20).

Qualitative comparative analysis was also used to analyze the thematic focus of each of the textbooks in the sample. For this analysis, there was no outcome variable (as this was meant to be a descriptive endeavor), so a dummy “outcome” variable was created which consisted of all “1”s. This was done in order to see whether there was any sort of combination of themes among all textbooks.

Finally, when looking at the frames of each textbook, multiple correspondence analysis (MCA) was used. MCA is a technique for nominal categorical data\textsuperscript{12}, used to detect and represent underlying structures in a data set (Le Roux & Rouanet 2004). Multiple correspondence analysis was used instead of traditional correspondence analysis because of its ability to compare multiple categories (in this case, 4) to one another, rather than just two categories. Additionally, one can map out individual case identities using MCA. This analysis was run using the R program for statistical analysis’ “multiple joint correspondence analysis” algorithm (which is available through the “CA” package in R). This uses a slightly different algorithm (than what is generally used to produce MCA

\textsuperscript{12} MCA can also be applied to numerical data.
graphs) for calculating correspondence analysis coordinates and dimensions, but it does assist in disentangling categories that overlap or coordinate positions. To produce the MCA maps, I used the “FactoMineR” package for R.

This analysis was run several different ways. First, the factors in the analysis included the presence or absence of the four conceptual frames outlined in Chapter 2 (diversity, popular culture, production, and anthropological). This type of disjunctive coding allows for the absence of a frame to be analyzed (instead of simply coding the lack of a frame as a missing case). The second analysis included the year of publication, and the third analysis included individual textbooks. The results of all three multiple correspondence analyses (as well as the results of the analyses outlined above) are discussed in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 5: RESULTS

“Collectively, introductory textbooks can be seen as showing what is regarded as the basic knowledge that every student should have about sociology, what is taken for granted among ordinary sociologists at the time, and what the works and authors are that are treated as exemplary or otherwise significant” (Platt 2008a: 147).

Percent Coverage

Overall, Introduction to Sociology textbooks tend to dedicate between four and five percent of their total space to a chapter on ‘culture.’ The average coverage was 4.53%, with a range from 0.5% (Stark 2004) to 7.44% (Rose et al 1977). This large range, however, is due to Stark’s series of textbooks breaking of culture into two small sections of other chapters. If Stark’s texts are removed, the range of coverage for culture is 3.5% (Henslin 2008) - 7.44% (Rose et al 1977).

Because introductory textbooks by their nature must cover many topics in a short amount of space, the overall percent coverage of culture is not a useful measure in and of itself. A comparison of the coverage of culture to other topic areas (race, stratification, gender, etc.) would likely produce more interesting and useful data. Instead, the level of inclusion and topic coverage within the culture chapters was analyzed.

Topic Coverage

The coverage (and level of inclusion) of various topics in the sampled textbooks reveals some interesting patterns at first glance. All but two of the 41 sampled chapters included a discussion of language; 34 at the level of subtopic of higher. (The two
chapters that did not include language were chapters from Stark (2004, 2006), which was the only book in the sample that split a discussion of culture into two chapters; language was discussed in the first of the two chapters for each edition but not the second).

Similarly, norms and values were mentioned in 33 of the 41 texts at a level of subtopic or higher and the same two chapters of Stark (2004, 2006) were the only two chapters not to mention language at all. Diversity, too, was covered in all sampled chapters except for the two Stark chapters, but at more varying degrees of inclusion (ranging from a passing mention in the narrative to an entire chapter subheading). By contrast, cultural production was mentioned by only 10 of the 41 sampled chapters, and was only mentioned in passing references within the narrative of the text itself in all but three of these.

As stated in the previous chapter, eight separate QCA analyses were run on the topic data, with each topic acting as the outcome variable once. No simplifying assumptions were used. Some of the analyses were not helpful to a greater understanding of the data; for example, only three textbooks (out of 41) were coded as including “production” as a topic, so both the coverage and the consistency of the possible solutions was extremely low. However, there were some interesting results (see below, where the presence of a topic is indicated by uppercase and the absence by lowercase):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>LANGUAGE<em>NORMS</em>sociobiology<em>production</em>DIVERSITY</td>
<td>0.379310</td>
<td>0.846154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Norms/Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Solution</td>
<td>Coverage</td>
<td>Consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LANGUAGE<em>NORMS</em>POPCULTURE<em>production</em>DIVERSITY</td>
<td>0.551724</td>
<td>0.800000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LANGUAGE<em>NORMS</em>production<em>DIVERSITY</em>GLOBALIZATION</td>
<td>0.620690</td>
<td>0.900000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>THEORY<em>NORMS</em>production<em>DIVERSITY</em>GLOBALIZATION</td>
<td>0.545455</td>
<td>0.947368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THEORY<em>NORMS</em>sociobiology<em>POPCULTURE</em>production*DIVERSITY</td>
<td>0.212121</td>
<td>0.875000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>theory<em>NORMS</em>SOCIOBIOLOGY<em>POPCULTURE</em>production*DIVERSITY</td>
<td>0.121212</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>theory<em>NORMS</em>sociobiology<em>popculture</em>production<em>DIVERSITY</em>globalization</td>
<td>0.060606</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norms/Values</td>
<td>THEORY<em>LANGUAGE</em>production<em>DIVERSITY</em>GLOBALIZATION</td>
<td>0.514286</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THEORY<em>LANGUAGE</em>sociobiology<em>POPCULTURE</em>production*DIVERSITY</td>
<td>0.200000</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>theory<em>LANGUAGE</em>SOCIOBIOLOGY<em>POPCULTURE</em>production<em>DIVERSITY</em>globalization</td>
<td>0.114286</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>theory<em>LANGUAGE</em>sociobiology<em>popculture</em>production<em>DIVERSITY</em>globalization</td>
<td>0.057143</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociobiology</td>
<td>THEORY<em>LANGUAGE</em>NORMS<em>production</em>DIVERSITY</td>
<td>0.600000</td>
<td>0.521739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LANGUAGE<em>NORMS</em>POPCULTURE<em>production</em>DIVERSITY</td>
<td>0.650000</td>
<td>0.650000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>theory<em>LANGUAGE</em>NORMS<em>popculture</em>production<em>DIVERSITY</em>globalization</td>
<td>0.050000</td>
<td>0.250000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular Culture</td>
<td>LANGUAGE<em>NORMS</em>sociobiology<em>production</em>DIVERSITY*globalization</td>
<td>0.142857</td>
<td>0.500000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Solution</td>
<td>Coverage</td>
<td>Consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>theory<em>LANGUAGE</em>NORMS<em>production</em>DIVERSITY*globalization</td>
<td>0.095238</td>
<td>0.500000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THEORY<em>LANGUAGE</em>NORMS<em>sociobiology</em>production*DIVERSITY</td>
<td>0.333333</td>
<td>0.636364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>theory<em>LANGUAGE</em>NORMS<em>SOCIIOBIOLOGY</em>production*DIVERSITY</td>
<td>0.190476</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THEORY<em>LANGUAGE</em>NORMS<em>production</em>DIVERSITY*GLOBALIZATION</td>
<td>0.619048</td>
<td>0.722222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LANGUAGE<em>NORMS</em>SOCIIOBIOLOGY<em>production</em>DIVERSITY*GLOBALIZATION</td>
<td>0.523810</td>
<td>0.846154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Solution</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.952381</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.714286</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Production</td>
<td>THEORY<em>LANGUAGE</em>NORMS<em>DIVERSITY</em>GLOBALIZATION</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THEORY<em>LANGUAGE</em>NORMS<em>sociobiology</em>POPCULTURE*DIVERSITY</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>theory<em>LANGUAGE</em>NORMS<em>SOCIIOBIOLOGY</em>POPCULTURE*DIVERSITY</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>theory<em>LANGUAGE</em>NORMS<em>sociobiology</em>POPCULTURE<em>production</em>DIVERSITY</td>
<td>0.333333</td>
<td>0.333333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Solution</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.333333</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.035714</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>THEORY<em>LANGUAGE</em>NORMS<em>production</em>GLOBALIZATION</td>
<td>0.529412</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THEORY<em>LANGUAGE</em>NORMS<em>SOCIIOBIOLOGY</em>POPCULTURE*production</td>
<td>0.088235</td>
<td>0.750000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THEORY<em>LANGUAGE</em>NORMS<em>sociobiology</em>POPCULTURE*production</td>
<td>0.205882</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>theory<em>LANGUAGE</em>NORMS<em>SOCIIOBIOLOGY</em>POPCULTURE*production</td>
<td>0.117647</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>theory<em>LANGUAGE</em>NORMS<em>sociobiology</em>POPCULTURE<em>production</em>globalization</td>
<td>0.058824</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Solution</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.823529</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.965517</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalization</td>
<td>THEORY<em>LANGUAGE</em>NORMS<em>production</em>DIVERSITY</td>
<td>0.818182</td>
<td>0.782609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LANGUAGE<em>NORMS</em>sociobiology<em>POPCULTURE</em>production*DIVERSITY</td>
<td>0.136364</td>
<td>0.500000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As indicated by the results, language, norms, and diversity had very, very high coverage and consistency. When a solution had high coverage, this means that the amount of the outcome explained by the combinations presented is quite large. Similarly, consistency refers to the amount of the solution that is included in the outcome (the equation $I - \text{consistency}$ would represent the amount of the solution that is NOT included in the outcome). Therefore, a solution with high coverage indicates a set of causal combinations that explain a large percentage of the outcome (in this case, the outcome varies). A large consistency score suggests there is a large percent of cases in a given configuration that lead to the outcome.

The results indicate that when there is focus on a particular topic (the outcome), some particular combinations exist which tend to lead a textbook author to cover that topic. For example, when “language” is covered in a textbook, that same textbook will also be likely to cover theory, norms/values, diversity, and globalization, but will leave out cultural production. These textbooks may also cover popular culture instead of globalization, though not as often. When norms and/or values were discussed in a textbook, it was more often the case that that book also covered theory, language, diversity, and globalization while leaving out cultural production. In fact, language was

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LANGUAGE<em>NORMS</em>SOCIIOBIOLOGY<em>POP CULTURE</em>production*DIVERSITY</td>
<td>0.500000</td>
<td>0.846154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution</td>
<td>0.909091</td>
<td>0.689655</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: QCA Results for Topics
present in ALL combinations, suggesting that when language was discussed in any textbook, so too were norms and values (both of these topics are part of the Anthropological frame, so this is not surprising). Finally, when diversity was the topic of coverage, it was often accompanied by discussions of theory, language, norms, and globalization (again without coverage of production).

The results of the QCA for topic coverage seem to suggest that there are topics that appear to go hand in hand - language and norms/values, for example - and others that rarely appear together, such as sociobiology and production. While this is not an exhaustive study of textbook coverage, nor is QCA the only analytical tool for investigating coverage, its contribution to a larger understanding of textbook coverage is useful.

Frames

Two different analyses were completed in order to examine the role of framing in introductory textbooks. The first was qualitative comparative analysis using the themes as causal conditions (with an outcome variable of “1” for all conditions).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>production*DIVERSITY</td>
<td>0.634146</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTHROPOLOGICAL<em>popculture</em>diversity</td>
<td>0.341463</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anthropological<em>production</em>POPCULTURE</td>
<td>0.048780</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solution</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.000000</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.000000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: QCA Results for Frames
Coverage and consistency for this solution are 1.00 because all cases led to the outcome, so it cannot be used as a means for evaluation. However, the coverage of the separate causal conditions is still quite interesting in its descriptive abilities. For example, 63.4% of the cases in the sample included both a diversity frame and the lack of a production frame. Likewise, 34.1% of the cases included the anthropological frame while simultaneously not including popular culture or diversity frames. The other piece of information provided by this analysis is that nearly all cases (97.55%) included diversity OR anthropological frames, which was anecdotally observed while coding.

A diversity frame was very clear within the texts themselves. For example, in Anderson & Taylor’s (2006) *Sociology*, every chapter has a breakout section, highlighted in a different colored box, entitled “Understanding Diversity.” These boxes cover such topics as “My Childhood: An Interview with Bong Hwan Kim” and “Is Ability Tracking Still Around?” (Anderson & Taylor 2006: 82-83; 435). Macionis’ *Society: The Basics* (2006) uses the same technique but titles its boxes “Diversity: Race, Class, & Gender” and “Global Sociology” (Macionis 2006). Similarly, nearly every single book in the culture chapter discussed language, norms, and values (usually in the context of ‘components of culture’) and many of the definitions of culture included in the sampled textbooks referenced language, norms, or values (which earned all of them a code of “1” for the anthropological frame).

The second major analysis of the frames was a multiple correspondence analysis. Three different models were run; including one using only the frames, one using the
frames as well as year of publication, and one plotting individual cases in addition to frames and years. A complete collection of all MCA plots and outputs can be found in Appendix C. The first analysis, including only the frames, shows that, as expected, the frames of production and popular culture are extreme outliers. Additionally, clustered located near the origin are diversity, anthropological, nopopculture, and noproduction. This suggests that these elements were least strongly associated with the presence or absence of other frames (in other words, they occurred on their own). The noanthropological frame (the lack of the anthropological frame) seemed to be pulled towards this diversity-noproduction cluster as well. This would suggest that when the diversity frame was used, noanthropological was not far. Indeed, when considering the second and third dimensions (Plot is available in Appendix C), there also seemed to be a relationship between nodiversity and anthropological frames, suggesting that when a textbook included the diversity frame, it did not also include the anthropological frame.
The second MCA performed included the frames from the first analysis but added in the year of publication for the textbooks. This allowed for the possible exploration of time as a factor in textbook coverage. This analysis was the most useful of the three MCAs performed.
The results of the second MCA performed provided some interesting results.

First, there is a clear cluster of years (which turns out to be 1975, 1977, 1982, 1984, and 1989) in close proximity to nodiversity. Indeed, none of the older textbooks in the sample (those published before 1990) framed culture in terms of diversity. A second
cluster of years included 1997 and 2002 and was located very close to the diversity frame. Another interesting cluster appears for years 2006 and 2007, which seem to be related to noanthropological and noproduction, indicating that textbooks during these years \((n=15)\) predominantly did not include anthropological or production frames. In fact, it seems that some of the books published during these years might be likely to include popular culture as a frame instead.

There is also a cluster of years between 1997 and 2008 and the diversity frame. These likely indicate several editions of Macionis’ *Sociology* text, which used the diversity frame in every edition. In order to pull out more information about which textbooks were outliers and which were overlapping, a third MCA was performed adding in the individual textbook data.
This analysis clearly confirms the cluster of most textbooks at the central axes, indicating that most textbooks, in most years, utilized either a diversity or anthropological frame and not a popular culture or production frame. Analysis 3 also illustrates the only text to utilize the production frame (Kornblum’s Sociology in a Changing World, 7th Edition only) and the few to use the popular culture frame (Anderson & Taylor’s Sociology: The Essentials in particular, but also Schaefer’s Sociology and Kendall’s Sociology In Our Times: The Essentials).
Change in textbook coverage of culture over time proved to be quite difficult to measure with the given sample. The most basic measure of coverage, percent of textbook dedicated to culture, was simply determined by dividing the number of pages dedicated to culture by the total number of pages in the book. This was plotted by year in order to give some approximation of how much coverage of culture was included in textbooks during any given year. A simple regression was performed to give an indication of trends.

As evidenced by the graph, there has been little overall change in percent coverage over the years among all textbooks. If anything, there is a slight decrease in the amount of culture presented in textbooks today as compared with the past. Indeed, the $R^2$ value is quite low, signifying that there is very little variance in the data. $R^2$, of course, refers to the proportion of variability that is accounted for by a particular model.
As mentioned before, each edition of Stark’s *Sociology* (1989, 2004, and 2006) split “culture” into two chapters, the second of which was titled “Biology, Culture and Society” and which only ever discussed culture in two or three pages. These chapters are represented by the three lowest points on the graph (in 1989, 2004, and 2006). Thus, I removed the second chapter of each edition from the analysis to see whether this changed the analysis in any way.

Though the second regression did provide a slightly higher $R^2$ value, neither are very strong. This indicates that there is not a strong relationship between year of publication and percent coverage of culture, but that a (weak) decrease in percent coverage has occurred over time.

Another, more systematic, way that change over time could be measured would be across several editions of the same textbook. However, there was very little change over multiple editions of the same textbook. For example, across six editions of Macionis’ *Sociology*, there were only very minor changes to two of the eight topic areas (both
sociobiology and globalization were included at slightly lower levels than in previous editions). There was no change in the overall frames used by the author/textbook over time, nor were there changes in any frames used within textbook cases over time.

The overall lack of change is likely due to the fact that authors are expected to produce a new edition of their textbook every year or two, and few authors (if any) completely revise the previous editions, so much of the material remains virtually identical from edition to edition. Indeed, to truly capture change over time, one would have to use a much larger sample with greater representation from earlier years. This would be an extremely difficult and expensive undertaking; most of these older textbooks are simply not available (they are out of print, are often recycled without being kept for posterity, or have degraded to the point of unreadability).

The only way to gauge change over time from the current sample, then, is in a general, more anecdotal sense. Of course, the sample size of older (pre-2000) textbooks was extremely small (n=8) and was sampled by convenience, not market success. Future examinations of textbook coverage over time would necessarily include a more rigorous sampling method of older textbooks. Nevertheless, a few patterns emerged from the various analyses reported above. For example, before 1994, no textbooks used any frame other than the anthropological one. In other words, earlier Introductory textbooks almost exclusively looked at culture as the sum of its parts (language, norms, values, etc) and little more. It is only in the mid-nineties that books began incorporating other frames, such as diversity, into their purview.
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS

Discussion

First and foremost, it is clear that most introductory textbooks do not fully represent the academic scholarship that currently exists in the field. That is, those areas of research and theoretical work that are currently being undertaken in the field (as evidenced by the field mapping of Chapter 2) are not fully represented in the frames, or even topical coverage, of the top textbooks on the market. This is particularly true of cultural production and, to a lesser extent, popular culture. Indeed, this is a trend that has not changed significantly in decades. In fact, the actual textbooks themselves have not changed significantly in decades, either.

To be fair, there are a multitude of conditions under which textbooks are produced, and more specifically how and where disciplinary ideas meet market incentives and constraints.

In view of the financial risks, and potential rewards, of introductory textbook publishing, it is hardly surprising that the creation of a textbook will depart from other kinds of scholarly writings. For the latter, where significant profits are extremely rare, authors are largely left to their own devices to write their books (with greater editorial assistance provided for the occasional “trade” books that publishers believe can find a lay audience). To reduce the uncertainty for textbooks, however, publishers utilize far more extensive and intrusive models of editorial control, which can follow a logic in which “books write authors” (Manza et al 2010: 285).

That is not to say that culture is ignored by introductory texts. In fact, one would be hard-pressed to find a single introductory sociology textbook that does NOT include
culture as a topic (or, indeed, an entire chapter). However, the presentation of this concept (and its related elements) is almost always completed in terms of one or two different frames that represent only one specific area of the field. To answer the guiding research question for this dissertation (*how is culture presented in introductory-level sociology textbooks*?), one must consider whether members of the field are content with the knowledge about culture being passed on in introductory texts, or whether they are willing to do something about it. Indeed, the authors of textbooks differ somewhat markedly from their research-oriented counterparts.

Nearly all of the introductory textbooks that were market leaders from the late 1970s through the early 2000s were written by sociologists teaching at neither leading research universities nor highly prestigious liberal arts colleges… Only three among the [top fifteen best-]sellers in 2003 are authored by scholars teaching at [“research”] institutions. (Manza et al 2010: 291).

Of course, textbook authors needn’t be employed in tenure-track positions at research universities to assist in the dissemination of information to introductory-level students. But the implications of this, of course, are that those topics which practitioners of the sociology of culture define as their purview are not represented at the introductory level. In other words, there is a disconnect between current academic scholarship and research in the sociology of culture and the inclusion of this information in introductory textbooks. To be sure, Introduction to Sociology courses (and their textbooks) are just that; introductions to the material, and therefore introductory students should probably not be asked to understand the detailed theoretical implications of Bourdieu’s theory of practice.
Nevertheless, it is important for pedagogical as well as practical reasons to keep students abreast of advances in our field(s).

It is clear what is NOT often included in textbooks, but what IS covered? The results of several different analyses suggest that textbooks often cover culture in terms of its elements (language, norms, and values, for example). In the QCA for topics, language was present in all combinations when the outcome variable was norms/values, suggesting that when language was discussed in any textbook, so too were norms and values. Not only was topical coverage most likely to include this approach to culture, but the most often-used frame for culture (31 out of 42 textbooks analyzed used it). In fact, earlier Introductory textbooks (especially those published before 1995) almost exclusively looked at culture as the sum of its parts (language, norms, values, etc) and little more. It is only in the mid-nineties that books began incorporating other frames, such as diversity, into their purview.

Second to culture-in-terms-of-its-parts was culture as diversity; teaching and learning about culture as another way to discourage ethnocentrism and teach students about multiculturalism. While these are noble endeavors, they are not at the heart of the field of the sociology of culture. However, textbooks seem to indicate otherwise. Twenty-six of the 42 sampled books used the diversity frame (and, at the same time, lacking a production frame, which is most closely aligned with academic scholarship in the field).
There are also implications for studying change over time in textbook coverage. For examples, a separate way of thinking about change over time would be to investigate the change in framing over time, rather than the change in percent coverage of the topic of culture as was done in the current study. Future analyses should necessarily include such an investigation.

A more thorough analysis of even the current data should also include investigation of any of the slight anomalies present in the regression analysis (in particular, the apparent “jump” in coverage between the late 1980s and mid-1990s). There may be factors in the academic or textbook publishing fields that could account for this change, such as the ‘cultural turn’ of earlier decades may account for increased attention to culture being paid in textbooks published after the mid-1970s.

Finally, one could look at the average or most recent year of publication for the citations used in the chapter on culture (readily available in the references section or footnotes of each textbook), which would help uncover the existence and nature of a “lag” (if any) between cultural scholarship and dissemination of that scholarship in textbooks.

Future Directions

For Field Mapping

One of the constants in the sociology of culture is its complexity. It is characterized by ongoing discourses and is constantly changing. To that end, the current
study is by no means a complete mapping of the field of culture. It faces many limitations. For example, one limitation of the oral history data is that the interviewed scholars were not asked directly to discuss the subfields of cultural sociology, rather the focus was on the creation of the Culture Section itself. A more complete analysis would involve true interviews with scholars in the field and prepared questions that address the issue under consideration.

A more complete field mapping endeavor would also include data from other sources; one clear area from which to cull future data would be to examine carefully the content of sessions at the annual meetings of the ASA. Another possible source of data would be the Section newsletters. The ‘Culture Section’ of the ASA produces a semiannual newsletter and distributes it to its members. The Section also archives many of these newsletters on its website. At least one newsletter per year is available online for the years 1987-1989 and 1992-2010. Additional issues of newsletters are also available for 1988 and 1993-2009. In total fifty-five section newsletters are available in various electronic formats.

An additional source of data would be to examine syllabi in both graduate and undergraduate courses in the Sociology of Culture. The population of syllabi, of course, numbers in the millions (when taking into account the number of institutions offering the course as well as the number of semesters it has been offered). The most effective way to study these syllabi would be to create a stratified random sample of institutions offering
the course, and then to generate a sample of the syllabi for those courses. Unfortunately, for this and other reasons, the scope of this endeavor was too time-consuming for the present study. However, a future analysis of the field of culture could certainly include such an undertaking. A final additional source of information could come from interviews with both cultural scholars as well as textbook producers that is aimed at obtaining their explanations of the data.

For Textbook Analysis and Pedagogy

One of the major shortcomings of this research is the small $n$. Due to the nature of content analysis and qualitative coding, using 41 textbooks was time-consuming and adequate for a dissertation, but future analyses, particularly those interested in the effect of time, should necessarily include larger samples (and from a larger range of time). As most textbooks on the market today do not extend beyond the 8th or 9th edition (Macionis’ *Sociology* notwithstanding), it is hard to use change within a textbook (across editions) to adequately measure change over time, particularly because these texts simply do NOT change over time.

There are many different models to use for content analysis. For example, Kimberly Neuendorf (2001) utilizes her own methodology when conducting content analysis that varies greatly from use of QCA or MCA (as was used in the present study). Recent studies of textbook content, including Suarez & Balaji (2008) and Manza et al
(2010), utilized a more ethnographic, qualitative analysis. It would be immensely beneficial for future research in the area of textbook content to standardize different approaches to content analysis in order for scholars to begin comparing textbook coverage of wider and wider ranges of subjects areas.

A final analysis that could garner further information on this topic would be to compare culture’s coverage in textbooks with other sociological areas (such as gender\textsuperscript{13} or theory\textsuperscript{14}). It would be interesting to compare the coverage of different topics to see whether the trends identified in this research are specific to the topic of culture or are endemic to textbook production itself. This could be done by comparing the results of research already completed by the scholars mentioned above or by utilizing the same coding/framing/analyses reported here but for different subject matter. This undertaking would be more time-consuming but would yield a much better ability to compare subject areas’ coverage in textbooks.

Contribution

This dissertation can offer a lot to the canon of the sociology of culture. In his American Sociological Association presidential address, Burawoy (2005) specified four broad types of sociology: critical, public, policy and professional. The pursuit of professional sociology (even if modified by its ‘critical’ sociological conscience) enables a distinctive voice of the discipline to be created and defended, with its particular

\textsuperscript{13} see Suarez & Balaji (2008)

\textsuperscript{14} see Manza et al (2010)
expertise in a range of sociological methods, generating knowledge framed by particular sociological theories. Policy-relevant sociology allows a particular form of outward-looking engagement with non-sociologists, albeit one that tends to be dominated by the values of policy makers (Seale 2008). But ‘public’ sociology involves a different kind of outward-looking sociology, taking ‘knowledge back to those from whom it came, making public issues out of private troubles, and thus regenerating sociology’s moral fiber’ (Burawoy 2005: 261). It is for this reason that this dissertation is valuable; this project helps to identify the trends and shortcomings (if any) in the textbooks we use to indoctrinate the next generation with sociological knowledge. What more public use of sociology is there than passing it on?

Additionally, there is an element of reflexivity that makes this dissertation important. Pierre Bourdieu made famous in academic circles his almost singular obsession with reflexivity, with “the inclusion of a theory of intellectual practice as an integral component and necessary condition of a critical theory of society” (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992: 36). Bourdieu’s reflexivity differs from those of anthropologists like Garfinkel or postmodernists such as Gouldner and Giddens in three ways.

First, its primary target is not the individual analyst but the social and intellectual unconscious embedded in analytic tools and operations; second, it must be a collective enterprise rather than the burden of the lone academic; and, third, it seeks not to assault but to buttress the epistemological security of sociology (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992: 36, emphasis in original).

This dissertation elucidates some ways by which these goals can be achieved. First, by mapping the field of culture and seeing how closely textbooks ‘follow’ the field, one is
able to uncover discrepancies; that is, one can uncover the *social and intellectual unconscious* ideas about culture embedded in textbooks, some of which are the very tools we use to pass on our knowledge. Secondly, although this dissertation is indeed the undertaking of one ‘lone academic,’ the implications of this study may help to improve the quality and content of textbooks (which are created by the *collective enterprise* of authors, publishers, and editors). Finally, this dissertation is meant to *buttress the epistemological security of sociology* through “self-analysis of the sociologist as cultural producer” (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992: 36). Textbooks are cultural products through which sociologists can pass down their knowledge, practices, and predictions about sociology to those willing to learn. By strengthening our knowledge of how they are created, we can better control the content of these texts, thereby securing a place for the sociology of culture within sociology as a whole.

Finally, this dissertation contributes in its own way to pedagogy in the field of sociology and the subfield of sociology of culture. By understanding more about where the source material with which we teach our students comes from and how it behaves, we can more successfully turn students on to sociology and help them learn the concepts and theories that we find so compelling.
### APPENDIX A: TOP TWENTY TEXTBOOKS, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISBN</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Ed.</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>(C)</th>
<th>Pub.</th>
<th>Used in Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>020550440X</td>
<td>Essentials of Sociology: A Down to Earth Approach</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Henslin</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>PEG</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205473059</td>
<td>Sociology: A Down-to-Earth Approach</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Henslin</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>PEG</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132184745</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Macionis</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>PEG</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132284901</td>
<td>Society: The Basics</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Macionis</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>PEG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393929213</td>
<td>Introduction to Sociology</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Giddens et al</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>WWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495096563</td>
<td>Sociology in Our Times</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kendall</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>CEN</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73209473</td>
<td>Sociology, (PK w/Powerweb)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Schaefer</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>MGH</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495006831</td>
<td>Sociology: The Essentials</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Andersen/Taylor</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>CEN</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536333866</td>
<td>SOC 100 Introduction to Sociology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020549658X</td>
<td>Sociology: A down-to-Earth Approach, Core Conc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Henslin</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>PEG</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495006858</td>
<td>Sociology in Our Times</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kendall</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>CEN</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495093440</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Stark</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>CEN</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495096350</td>
<td>Sociology in a Changing World</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kornblum</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>CEN</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73528072</td>
<td>Mapping the Social Landscape:Readings in Sociology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ferguson</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>MGH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495005614</td>
<td>Sociology: A Global Perspective</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ferrante</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>CEN</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205484948</td>
<td>In Conflict and Order: Understanding Society</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Eitzen/Baca Zin</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>PEG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141293706X</td>
<td>Our Social World: Introduction to Sociology</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ballantine/Rob</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>SAG</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495096369</td>
<td>Essentials of Sociology</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Brinkerhoff et al</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>CEN</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73528129</td>
<td>Sociology: The Core</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hughes/Kroehl</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>MGH</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136016456</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Macionis</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>PEG</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Monument Information Resource, 2008
APPENDIX B: FULL CITATIONS FOR TEXTBOOKS USED IN ANALYSIS


APPENDIX C: MCA PLOTS AND OUTPUTS

PLOTS 1-3: FRAMES ONLY (MCA 1)

PLOT 1

Frames 1,2
PLOT 2

Frames 2,3

Dim 2 (24.83%)

Dim 3 (21.69%)

-2 -1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6

-2 -1 0 1 2 3 4

production

anthropological

popculture

nodiversity

noproduction

nodiversity

nopopculture

noanthropological
PLOTS 4-6: FRAMES AND YEARS (MCA 2)

PLOT 4

Frames 1,2 year

Dim 1 (11.52%)
Dim 2 (8.513%)

-3 -2 -1 0 1 2 3
-4 -2 0 2 4


popculture nopopculture noanthropological anthropological production nodiversity diversity

79
**PLOT 6**

**Frames 1,3 year**

![Graph showing MCA output for MCA with frames and years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mass</th>
<th>ChiDis2.9</th>
<th>Inertia</th>
<th>Dim. 1</th>
<th>Dim. 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mass</th>
<th>ChiDis2.9</th>
<th>Inertia</th>
<th>Dim. 1</th>
<th>Dim. 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-diversity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular-culture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-popular-culture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-production</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropological</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-anthropological</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MCA OUTPUT FOR MCA WITH FRAMES AND YEARS:**

- Mass
- ChiDis2.9
- Inertia
- Dim. 1
- Dim. 2

- Diversity
- No-diversity
- Popular-culture
- No-popular-culture
- Production
- No-production
- Anthropological
- No-anthropological
Frame 2,3 indiv

Dim 2 (8.513%)

Dim 3 (7.598%)

production
Kornblum7
y2005
AndersenTaylor5
popculture
y2009
Ferrante6
BallantineRoberts2
MacionisSociology8
MacionisSociety2
KendallSIOTEssentials6
Schaefer10
AndersenTaylor4
HenslinEssentials6
HenslinSociology9
Macionis12
Stark10a
Stark10b
Stark9a
Stark9b
Kornblum8
KendallInOurTimes6
y1975
y1977
y1982
y1984
y1989
y1994
y1997
y1999
y2001
y2004
y2005
y2006
y2007
y2008
y2009

nopopculture
noanthropological
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