

schools comprise an 'academic elite' who have the largest number of faculty members in the discipline who have a vested interest in maintaining the 'definition of the situation' (Thomas, 1931) that they are the best?" Our data suggests the latter and appears to support Helmer's (1974:42) contention that "the hierarchy of prestige is thus fundamentally a hierarchy of power unequally distributed. No more in sociology than in the rest of the world do the deserving get their just reward."

REFERENCES

- American Sociological Association
1983 Guide to Graduate Departments of Sociology. Washington, D.C.: American Sociological Association.
- Berelson, B.
1960 Graduate Education in the United States. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Caplow, T. and R.J. McGee
1965 The Academic Marketplace. New York: Anchor-Doubleday.
- Cartter, A.M.
1966 An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Changing Times
1983 "Best Places to be for a Ph.D." Changing Times (November):64-67.
- Gross, G.R.
1970 "The Organization Set: A Study of Sociology Departments." American Sociologist 5:25-29.
- Helmer, J.
1974 The Deadly Simple Mechanics of Society. New York: The Seabury Press.
- Knudsen, D.D. and T.R. Vaughan
1969 "Quality in Graduate Education: A Re-evaluation of the Rankings of Sociology Departments in the Cartter Report." American Sociologist 4:12-19.
- Lewis, L.S.
1968 "On Subjective and Objective Rankings of Sociology Departments." American Sociologist 3:129-131.
- Shamblin, D.H.
1970 "Prestige of Sociology Departments and the Placing of New Ph.D.s" American Sociologist 5:154-156.
- Shichor, D.
1970 "Prestige of Sociology Departments and the Placing of New Ph.D.s" American Sociologist 5:157-160.
- Thomas, W.I.
1931 The Unadjusted Girl. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

AN EMPIRICAL EXAMINATION OF THE EXISTENCE
OF ART, ART/CRAFT, AND CRAFT SEGMENT
AMONG CRAFT MEDIA WORKERS*

Jerry Neapolitan
and

Maurice Ethridge
Tennessee Technological University

In the last twenty years there has been a dramatic resurgence in the creation, sales, and use of hand-crafted objects in the United States. However, the craft media workers of today no longer serve their local community creating utilitarian objects, but work in diverse styles according to diverse standards. Becker (1978) has proposed that three largely distinct segments exist among craft media workers: an art segment, an art/craft segment, and a craft segment. These segments can be distinguished from each other by their differing conventions and orientations. These conventions and orientations then serve as the basis for cooperative activity and result in the segments not only creating different styles of objects but with different institutional links and audiences. This study, utilizing data from a national survey of craft media workers conducted for the National Endowment for the Arts, tests Becker's propositions by examining whether craft media workers who have different conventions and orientations constitute different segments having different training, involvements, markets, goals, satisfactions, and problems.

For western society prior to the Renaissance, art was not distinguished from craft. It was during this period that painting and sculpture attained a new status and importance, largely through elite support, and art emerged as a distinct and elite enterprise. Craft, on the other hand, sank to a lower status of being "merely" utilitarian or decorative in contrast to the higher

*Data for this analysis were collected by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., in a nationwide survey of craft-artists sponsored by the National Endowment for the Arts.

attainment of art (Smith, 1981; Bennett, 1978). Since the industrial revolution provided objects which filled the same utilitarian functions as crafts and were much less expensive, crafts virtually disappeared during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, being cut off from both elite and general public support. Meanwhile, art solidified its position as the elite who purchased and collected art began to control access as to what could be considered art in order to protect their investments (Bensen and Gerver, 1958; Mukherji, 1978).

Throughout the twentieth century there has been a gradual reappearance of craft media objects in the United States, and in the last twenty years or so the growth in the creation, sales, and use of craft media objects has been phenomenal. For example, the Rhinebeck Craft Fair in New York, the largest craft fair in the country, had sales of \$18,000 in 1965 and had sales of almost eight million dollars in 1983.¹ Other major fairs have had similar growth patterns and Carol Sedestrom, president of American Craft Enterprises which runs the five largest craft fairs in the United States, estimates sales from all craft fairs to have been about eighty million dollars in 1968 and to be well over two billion dollars per year now.²

The American Craft Council, the largest craft organization in the country, had 2,000 members in 1959 and currently has over 35,000. A survey conducted for the National Endowment for the Arts found there were over 1,000 craft organizations in the United States with a total membership between 150,000 and 180,000, and that the typical organization had been founded in 1968 (Cerf et al., 1982). Information on the proliferation of craft shops, wholesale sales, university courses in crafts, craft fairs, and so on could be cited to demonstrate that crafts have become a large-scale social phenomenon.³

As is often the case (Blau, 1974), the tremendous growth has been accompanied by increased differentiation and complexity. Craft media workers of today no longer serve the local community by providing quality, utilitarian objects. There are craft media workers who still work toward traditional ends and by traditional standards. However, many are more interested in the form and beauty of a piece rather than how well it functions. There are others who have totally abandoned utility and work in the tradition of the fine art world, with emphasis on conceptual and self-expression. Similarly, people who purchase craft media

objects do so for reasons ranging from utility to display and contemplation, and even as investments.

The growth of and change in crafts can be related to the secondary effects of technological changes which originally led to their near elimination. The needs once satisfied by craft objects and craft work became filled by mass produced objects and work in organizations which created them. However, eventually technology led to new needs and value shifts conducive to the reemergence and growth of crafts in their new forms. A full discussion of the impact of technological changes on people's needs and values is beyond the scope of this paper. Noting some of the more obvious ones will serve to make our point.

Technology has led to a more educated and sophisticated populace who have more time and money to spend on goods and services. Many of these people have developed a desire or need for aesthetic rewards, self-expression, self-reflection, and creative outlets. Working in impersonal, bureaucratic organizations doing narrowly defined tasks, many cannot fill these needs in their work. Outside of work they face a complex, stressful world where much of the cultural production appeals to the lowest common denominator. The mass-produced objects which replaced craft objects are often homogeneous, artificial, and of poor quality. Further, people are increasingly aware of related resource and environmental problems.

Both craft work and craft media objects function to fill the needs described above and are compatible with values relating to conservation and industrial responsibility. Through making, buying, displaying, and using craft media objects people can fill needs for self-expression, self-reflection, and creativity. The naturalness and quality of craft media and objects appeal to people concerned with artificiality and environmental problems. The diversity of craft media objects and people's tastes means that craft work and objects can penetrate to real communication between maker and buyer. Thus in much the same way as Watt (1957) explained the rise of the novel in eighteenth century England through increased literacy and the rising middle class, the growth and change in crafts can be related to the increased education, sophistication, and size of the middle and upper-middle classes in the United States.

In examining the five taste publics in the United States, Gans (1974) found the upper-middle taste public, composed of

college educated professionals, to be the fastest growing. Furthermore, he found this taste public desired cultural products which are neither too experimental nor cliché, and thus had difficulty relating to high culture or mass culture. The art and art/craft media objects fit this criteria and unlike many art objects are not overly expressive. He found the largest taste public to be the lower middle who, due to increased education, have an increasing desire for more original cultural products but still preferred the more "representational" craft, and many art/craft media objects appeal to this group. More recently Yankelovich (1981) has identified a "new breed" of American more interested in sacred/expressive rewards than instrumental ones, and it is quite likely this new breed who make and buy craft media objects.

While Gans (1974) focused on cultural consumption, Becker (1974, 1978, 1982) has done the most interesting and influential work on cultural production and the sociology of art in recent years. His major contribution has been to show how the creation and distribution of art objects require organized art worlds which cooperate via shared conventions. He defines an art world as a "network of people whose cooperative activity, organized via their joint conventional means of doing things, produces the kind of art works that art world is noted for" (Becker, 1982:x). In this conceptualization conventions have definitional priority, for it is shared conventions which allow the cooperative activity necessary for art worlds to exist and produce works. Becker (1978:704) states, "Conventions make possible the cooperative activities through which the [art] world's production comes about." In her analysis of Becker's position, Rosenblum (1978:423) said, ". . . conventions or shared agreements is the principal independent variable that accounts for recurrent, patterned activity."

Becker (1978, 1982) has also analyzed the relationship between art and craft and how craft media workers organized their production. He identified three segments existing among craft media workers which could be distinguished from each other by differing conventions and orientations. According to Becker the craft segment follows the traditional craft conventions of "utility," making quality, useful objects, and "virtuoso skill," mastering of techniques and the ability to make nearly

identical objects. They are also oriented toward catering to the desires of their audience, and preservation of a traditional craft world. Becker (1978:876) notes, ". . . most of the possibilities for orientations, modes of action, and careers that existed in the craft world still exist. . . ." The art segment adheres to the conventions of the fine art world. These are "uniqueness," making one-of-a-kind objects, and "beauty," making objects whose function is decorative or expressive. This segment also has an ideology or orientation of audience indifference. Members of this segment desire acceptance in the fine art world, but because craft media are not fully accepted in fine art and access to the fine art world is controlled, many if not most remain marginal to it. The art/craft segment shares conventions with each of the other two and so also shared audiences and institutional arrangements.

Despite the importance and influence of Becker's ideas, they have never to our knowledge been empirically examined. Becker (1978:868) admitted in formulating his concepts regarding art and craft that he had not "examined any systematic body of knowledge in any systematic way." Silver (1979) has argued that Becker's conceptualization confuses rather than clarifies our understanding of art and craft differences. If shared conventions do serve as the basis for cooperation among trainers, creators, sellers, and buyers of art type objects then Becker's ideas have great value in explaining art worlds and the social organization of art. This research examines this proposition.

METHOD

Sample

A national survey of "craft-artists" conducted by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., for the National Endowment for the Arts provided an opportunity to examine the most basic of Becker's ideas regarding art worlds, which is that shared conventions serve as the basis of cooperative activities necessary for art workers to be created. They drew their sample from memberships listings of all craft-artists organizations which they had identified in a previous study. The organizations were stratified by media, size, and geographic location in order to adjust for skewed distributions. The target sample was 5,320 of which 3,785 responded. However, 1,121 were identified as not being

crafts-artists, leaving a sample of 2,664. Comparisons of this sample with crafts-artists who subscribed to craft journals but did not belong to organizations, and to crafts-artists who showed and exhibited work but did not belong to organizations led Mathematica researchers to conclude: "Accordingly, there is a basis for concluding that the survey of craft-artists belonging to craft membership organizations is representative of the characteristics of highly skilled craft-artists and of subscribers as well as members and that the estimated population of member craft-artists overlaps to a large degree with the total craft-artists universe" (Cerf et al., 1982).

Division of Sample Into Segments

Ideally we would have liked to use all the conventions and orientations Becker proposed to distinguish among art, art/craft, and craft segments: utility, virtuoso skill, uniqueness, beauty, audience orientation, and art world orientation. However, as the survey was not designed for the purposes of this research this was not possible. Respondents were asked if they mainly produced "one of a kind" works or "multiples of the same work." The first is indicative of uniqueness as a convention and the second of virtuoso skill. They were also asked if they worked primarily according to "your own standards of form and expression" or the "demands of the market." The first is indicative of the fine art ideology of audience indifference while the latter is indicative of the traditional craft orientation of serving one's audience. Of course, even artists, as Becker (1978) acknowledges, internalize the desires of their audience to a large degree, but that does not alter the fact that indifference to audience demands is an important shared orientation. Subjects were also given five choices in response to the question, "Is your work primarily influenced by: American folk themes, ethnic cultural traditions, current trends in your craft, other art forms, or a movement or school in art world?" The first three reflect conventions more typical of craft while the latter two clearly reflect an art world orientation.

Subjects who reported they primarily made "one of a kind" works, worked in response to their "own standards of form and expression," and were primarily influenced by one of the two art influences were placed in the art segment. Subjects who reported they primarily made "multiples of the same work,"

work in response to the "demands of the market," and were primarily influenced by one of the three craft influences were placed in the craft segment. The remaining subjects were placed in the art/craft segment which, as Becker (1978) argues, shares conventions and institutional arrangements with each of the other segments.

RESULTS

The method described above resulted in 27 subjects not being classified because they failed to answer one or more of the questions used. Of the remainder 38.7 percent (1,021) were placed in the art segment, 45.4 percent (1,189) were placed in the art/craft segment, and 15.9 percent (418) were placed in the craft segment. The sample was 70.2 percent female, 97.9 percent white, and had a mean age of 51.8. Four media were chosen by over ten percent of the sample: fiber (41.8%), clay (17.4%), wood (16.5%) and metal (12.5%). There were no significant differences among the segments regarding sex or race, and differences for media were small. However, the mean age of the art segment was 44.5; for the art/craft segment, 50.2; and for the craft segment, 61.4 (art versus craft, $t = 3.21$, $P = .001$; art versus art/craft, $t = 1.78$, $P = .075$; craft versus art/craft, $t = 1.65$, $P = .009$). These age differences might indicate a trend of increased use of craft media according to art conventions and an increase in the size of the art segment. These age differences are also suggestive that these segments might actually represent largely distinct groups of people. Despite the age differences there were virtually no differences for years of involvement in craft media work (art = 15.51, art/craft = 15.43, craft = 15.45), indicating the art segment members enter craft media work at an earlier age.

Training and Involvements

Part of the cooperative network constituting an art world or segment is the manner in which new members are socialized into the conventions of that world and learn the appropriate skills. Thus we would expect the segments to differ in terms of types of training. Traditionally craft skills have been handed down from generation to generation, and people learned from

family, friends, and self-training. By contrast, formal university training has become virtually essential for entry and success in fine arts. As expected, the craft segment averaged the most years of learning from family and friends, and the art segment the least (art = 2.29; art/craft = 4.21; craft = 5.60; art versus craft, $t = 4.11$, $P. < .000$; art versus art/craft, $t = 3.21$, $P. < .000$; craft versus art/craft, $t = 1.40$, $P. = .161$), although the difference between craft and art/craft is not statistically significant. The same pattern held for mean years of self-training (art = 10.47; art/craft = 11.64; craft = 16.13; art versus craft, $t = 4.18$, $P. < .000$; art versus art/craft, $t = 1.28$, $P. = .201$; craft versus art/craft, $t = 3.23$, $P. = .001$), although in this case the difference between art and art/craft was not statistically significant.

To examine differences regarding formal university training, the sample was divided into four groups: (1) those who had no university training in arts and crafts, (2) those who had some but no degree, (3) those who had a bachelors degree in art or crafts, and (4) those who had done post-graduate work or had a master's degree. Table 1 shows that the art segment had more university training than the art/craft segment which had more than the craft segment.

Table 1

Art, Art/Craft and Craft Differences for University Training

	No University Training	Some University Training	Bachelors Degree in Art-Craft	Post Graduate Work
Art Segment	36.2%	29.5%	28.9%	5.4%
Art/Craft Segment	47.2	26.6	24.1	2.2
Craft Segment	65.9	15.1	17.2	1.4

Chi square = 119.24 $P. < .000$

tau c = -.159 $P. < .000$

In terms of continuing socialization and reflecting past socialization, we would also expect the segment to differ as to art and craft activities not directly tied to production or sales. In the fine arts, analysis of aesthetics and preservation and study of

important work is considered vital to success, whereas traditional crafts are made for utilitarian and decorative purposes, not posterity. Thus we would expect differences among the segments as to exchange and analysis of ideas and interest in the work of others. The art segment averaged membership in more organizations than the other segments (art = 2.00; art/craft = 1.58; craft = 1.57; art versus craft, $t = 4.81$, $P. < .000$; art versus art/craft, $t = 6.93$, $P. < .000$). Also members of the art segment were most likely and members of the craft segment least likely to: read art/craft journals (art = 91.6%, art/craft = 88.0%, craft = 82.4%, tau c = .049, $P. < .000$), visit galleries and museums (art = 94.0%, art/craft = 92.1%, craft = 80.0%, tau c = .081, $P. < .000$), and to collect art/craft objects (art = 74.3%, art/craft = 63.9%, craft = 58.9%, tau c = 1.26, $P. < .000$).

Audiences and Markets

Perhaps the most important cooperative link keeping an art segment or world going is that linking creators, sellers, and buyers. Thus, if shared conventions and orientations are the bases of cooperative activity, the segments should differ substantially as to how they display and sell their work and in the audience to which they appeal. Art objects basically appeal to an elite and thus are marketed through exhibitions in galleries and museums made for clients. Craft objects basically appeal to a non-elite and are marketed at fairs and retail outlets in order to reach the general public. Since questions regarding marketing and sales are only relevant to those craft media workers who sell their work, only those who sell were included in this analysis. This constituted all members of the art segment, 51.9% of the art/craft segment, and 67.0% of the craft segment.

The survey asked respondents if they participated in exhibitions at museums, galleries, or other places. Since exhibitions, particularly at museums and galleries, are typical of the fine art world and usually attract people seeking art, one would expect the art segment to take part in such exhibitions more than the art/craft segment, which would take part more than the craft segment. The results displayed in Table 2 support this proposition, particularly regarding museum and gallery exhibitions.

Subjects were asked to select which of ten types of marketing outlets they used to sell their work. Four were chosen by

Table 2
Art, Art/Craft and Craft Differences in Exhibiting and Selling

	Exhibit Museums	Exhibit Galleries	Exhibit Other	Sell Fairs	Sell Craft Shops	Sell Retail Shops	Sell Galleries	Sell on Commission
Art	24.9%	35.2%	27.0%	53.6%	30.4%	12.4%	45.5%	67.5%
Art/Craft	19.0	29.3	21.1	68.7	45.6	27.1	35.6	69.2
Craft	11.5	17.3	18.7	74.5	47.8	36.7	27.3	53.6
tau c	.096	.116	.070	.179	.163	.194	.139	.060
P.	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.004

All percentages are out of 100% of those in segment who sell.
tau c is based on three by two tables.

less than seven percent of those who sold and were not examined. Three of the ten: "art/craft fairs," "craft shops," and "other retail outlets," reach the general public and are traditional ways of marketing crafts, and thus one would expect the craft segment to use these most and the art segment to use them least. Two of the ten, "commissioned work for clients" and "art/craft galleries," are more typical of the fine art world and thus one would expect the art segment to use these most and the craft segment use them least. The other, "your own shop," depends upon the type of shop a person has as to whether it would appeal to a craft or an art audience. Table 2 shows that the craft segment was more likely than the art segment to sell at: "fairs," "craft shops," and "other retail outlets," while the art segment was more likely than the craft segment to do "commissioned work" and sell at "galleries."

The art/craft segment was in between the other two segments for five of the six methods of selling. The one unexpected result was that a slightly higher percentage of the art/craft segment as compared to the art segment sold commissioned work. This may be due to the increased use of art/craft objects in architecture and interior design. Thus, in general, differences in exhibiting and selling follow the expected pattern regarding differences in segments.

Since the art segment has an orientation of audience indifference, while the craft segment is oriented towards serving their audience, we would expect the art segment to place the least emphasis on marketing and the craft segment the most. The art segment devoted a smaller percentage of their craft-related time to marketing as compared to the art/craft segment which devoted a smaller percent than the craft segment (art = 5.63%; art/craft = 11.10%; craft = 15.60%; art versus craft, $t = 5.89$, $P. < .000$; art versus art/craft, $t = 5.08$, $P. < .000$; craft versus art/craft, $t = 2.93$, $P. = .003$). Also the subjects were asked how often they showed their work in a year and were given six choices from "not at all" to "continuously." Results showed a greater percentage of the craft segment as compared to the art/craft segment and a greater percentage of the art/craft segment as compared to the art segment fell into the top three categories with the pattern reversed for the bottom three categories (tau c = .135, $P. < .000$). This emphasis on marketing pays off for the craft segment

in that they average the most income per hours of work while the art segment averages the least (art = \$1.25; art/craft = \$2.41, craft = \$2.72; art versus craft, $t = 3.81$, $P. < .000$; art versus art/craft, $t = 4.61$, $P. < .000$; craft versus art/craft, $t = 1.74$, $P. = .461$), although difference between craft and art/craft is not statistically significant.

Since the segments have different markets and place differential emphasis on marketing, we would expect them to vary as to marketing problems. The respondents were asked to select which of seven "main problems you face in selling your work." Two were chosen by less than ten percent of the sample and were not examined. There were virtually no differences among the segments for the problems: "too few outlets," "presenting work to clients," and "communicating with clients." The art and art/craft segments were somewhat more likely than the craft segment to say "community poorly informed as to outlets" (art = 18.7%, art/craft = 20.5%, craft = 11.9%) and "lack of business skills" (art = 18.0%, art/craft = 19.8%, craft = 14.0%) were problems. However, even for these the pattern of art/craft being in between the other segments was not followed, and thus tau c was not statistically significant. Perhaps differences in perceptions of marketing problems did not follow the expected pattern because the greater orientation of the craft segment toward marketing offset the art segment actually experiencing more marketing problems.

Goals and Satisfaction

Since the segments differ in their conventions and audiences they should also differ as to their goals in their work and the satisfactions they desire from their work. Subjects were asked to choose which of five "particular goals in your craft work that you would like to achieve in the next five years?" They could pick none, all, or any ones they wanted. Traditionally craftspeople have seen recognition as coming from sales and satisfied customers, while artists have been more interested in critical recognition. Thus, it is not surprising that the art segment was most likely and the craft segment least likely to have as a goal "win recognition/award" (art = 46.8%, art/craft = 29.9%, craft = 20.1%, tau c = .213, $P. < .000$). This desire to win awards and recognition paid off in members of the art segment being most

likely to have actually won an award in the last three years, and members of the craft segment having been least likely to have done so (art = 36.1%, art/craft = 22.9%, craft = 18.9%, tau c = .151, $P. < .000$).

The same pattern was true for "develop artistic competence" as a goal (art = 61.1%, art/craft = 56.2%, craft = 40.7%, tau c = .130, $P. < .000$). It is not as clear why this goal should relate to differences in art and craft conventions: perhaps because of use of the word "artistic" or because those more art oriented are also more oriented to continual development and change. Similarly, while the reasons are not obvious, both the art and art/craft segments were more likely than the craft segment to "devote more time to craft" as a goal (art = 59.1%, art/craft = 59.6%, craft = 43.5%, tau c = .081, $P. < .000$). The other two goals, "increase income from sale of unique work" and "increase income from sale of production work," followed the expected pattern of the art segment being most likely to choose the former and the craft segment the latter. However, these results are not reported and these variables are not used in future analysis since the segments were created in part by responses to whether they primarily made "one of kind" or "multiples of the same work" making the relationships of the segments to this goal

Respondents were also asked to rank six "satisfactions derived from work" in order of importance to them. These were coded from one to three with one being most important, two second most, and three third most. Other responses were left uncoded by Mathematica, and we coded subjects responses to each satisfaction which was not one, two, or three as four. Thus, the results for satisfactions are based on three by four tables as can be seen in Table 3. There were virtually no differences among the segments for "sense of accomplishment" and "diversion from daily routine." This is not surprising as there is no reason to expect differences in art and craft conventions to relate to these. However, since the art segment follows the convention of working according to one's "own standards" it is not surprising the art segment tends to rank "means of creative expression" as a satisfaction higher than the art/craft segment which tends to rank it higher than the craft segment. To a lesser degree the same pattern holds for "life's work" as a satisfaction, although in this case the reason is not clear. The pattern is reversed for the satisfactions

Table 3
Art, Art/Craft, and Craft Differences in Satisfaction Derived from Work

	Means of Creative Expression				Life's Work				Produce Work* for Purchase				Derive* Significant Income			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Art	62.6	20.9	6.4	10.2 100%	12.3	11.6	12.4	63.7 100%	3.2	8.0	21.3	67.5 100%	1.7	3.2	7.0	88.1 100%
Art/Craft	51.4	22.2	9.9	16.4 100%	6.5	6.4	6.9	80.1 100%	7.6	13.5	21.5	57.4 100%	5.0	7.3	10.8	76.4 100%
Craft	30.4	18.2	15.6	35.9 100%	7.4	4.3	5.0	83.3 100%	14.4	19.8	20.9	45.0 100%	13.3	12.0	7.2	66.5 100%
tau c	.205				.128				.150				.200			
P	.000				.000				.000				.000			

*Only those who sell were included in these tables.

“produced work for purchase” and “derive significant income.” This again illustrates the greater craft orientation to selling, and the art orientation to more intrinsic motives and rewards.

Since the segments varied as to their goals and satisfactions, it was expected they would also vary as to perceived barriers to satisfaction. The survey asked subjects to choose from eleven “barriers to future satisfaction from your work.” The seven chosen by more than ten percent of the sample were examined. For “lack of training,” “lack of materials due to expense,” “lack of studio space” and “lack of marketability” there were no appreciable differences among the segments. Among these only “lack of marketability” was expected to differ among the segments. As in the case of selling problems, it may be that one’s products being more marketable is offset by one placing more importance on marketing. As noted earlier, recognition is generally more important to art oriented people and thus it is not surprising that the art segment was most likely and the craft segment least likely to see “lack of recognition” (art = 27.7%, art/craft = 16.4%, craft = 13.6%, tau c = 1.22, P. < .000) and “lack of exposure to and education of the public” (art = 37.1%, art/craft = 21.9%, craft = 18.7%, tau c = .162, P. < .000) as barriers to future satisfaction. The same pattern was true for “non-craft obligations” (art = 51.2%, art/craft = 46.2%, craft = 33.5%, tau c = .116, P. < .000).

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

For the great majority of variables examined, the results followed the predicted pattern: The art/craft segment was in the middle with the art and craft segments on either side. Most of the variables which did not follow this pattern were those for which there was no reason to expect they would. The exceptions were perception of selling problems and marketability as a barrier to future satisfaction. We have hypothesized this is due to people with art conventions experiencing more marketing problems, but people with craft conventions being more concerned with marketing.

Of course, many of the variables examined themselves probably covary and thus a discriminant analysis was run to see how well the variables taken together could distinguish among

Table 4
Discriminant Analyses for Art, Art/Craft and Craft Segments,
and for Art and Craft Segments

All Segments				Art and Craft Segment			
Function	Eigenvalue	Wilks' Lambda	Significance	Function	Eigenvalue	Wilks' Lambda	Significance
1	.315	.733	.0000	1	.495	.669	.0000
2	.037	.964	.0008				
Actual Group				Predicted Group			
	Art	Art/Craft	Craft	Art	Art	Craft	
Art	61.1%	26.4%	12.5%	Art	82.3%	17.7%	
Art/Craft	35.1	40.2	24.6	Craft	28.2	71.8	
Craft	15.5	25.5	59.0	Total percent correctly classified			79.8%
Total percent currently classified				53.0%			

the segments. The 30 variables which followed the predicted pattern were included in this analysis. Table 4 shows that 53.0% of all subjects were correctly classified with a majority of the art (61.1%) and craft (59.0%) correctly classified but only a plurality of the art/craft segment (40.2%). When art/craft segment members are mis-classified they are more often placed in the art rather than the craft segment indicating more overlap between these segments. Utilizing the same variables to distinguish just between art and craft segment members results in almost 80% of the subjects being correctly classified.

These results indicate that rather than there being three large distinct segments among craft media workers, there are two fairly distinct segments with a continuum of art/craft people floating in between the two ideal types. On one extreme is the craft segment which is organized around traditional craft conventions and does things in traditional craft ways. On the other extreme is the art segment which is linked to the fine art world and follows fine art conventions and practices. In between are a large group of craft media workers who have ambiguous conventions and orientations and who overlap with each of the other segments but do not appear to form a distinct segment of their own.

The data utilized here was sufficient to show that craft media workers having different conventions and orientations also differ as to other practices and perceptions as predicted by Becker (1978, 1982). However, it was not sufficient to tell us whether members of different segments have actual relationships and form real groups. We can infer they do since they are similar in age, learn in similar ways and places, market in similar places, and have similar involvements. Also Kadushin (1976) has shown that cultural fields having a large number of small producers tend to form informal circles which have no clear boundaries, involve much indirect interaction, have a greater density at their core, lack institutional structures, and are invisible in their totality. Byrstyn (1978), building upon Kadushin's work, found that such circles are linked to each other by individuals who are marginal to the circles. Thus, it appears quite likely that the art and crafts segment are informal social circles which are linked to the more diverse art/craft people by their marginal members. Whether the art/craft people constitute an informal social circle is less clear.

With the traditional craft worker possibly dying out and many art-oriented craft workers remaining marginal to the fine art world due to limited access and bias against craft media, what is the future of craft media work?

Possibly a new art/craft world will emerge and solidify out of the ambiguous and diverse art/craft segment. Becker (1982: 227) said, "An art world is born when it brings together people who never cooperated before to produce art based on using conventions previously unknown or not exploited in that way." Kadushin (1976:779) has shown there is a tendency for informal social circles to develop "greater artistic clarity" and "greater structural rigidity," and thus develop clear-cut boundaries and become an "establishment." However, Byrstyn (1978) has noted lack of consensus on conventions inhibits this development and prevents art movements from having a large impact, particularly when adversary relationships exist among circles. Marcus (1980: 6) has noted a ". . . growing polarization and conflict" among craft media workers. Indicative of this problem was Slivka's (1979:50) statement that she could no longer serve as editor of *American Craft* because of ". . . ideological differences in approach to the craft experience," specifically asking "is there too much emphasis on the market and not enough on ideas?"

Craft media workers are trying to organize and present a united front in order to gain support and recognition for craft media objects. An excellent example of this was National Crafts Council held in 1981 which involved over 1,700 craftspeople in the preliminary stages and was attended by 150 representing 45 states. This congress arrived at over 100 resolutions to promote crafts organized into ten categories. In 1982 they incorporated into a permanent body, The National Crafts Planning Board, and are currently working to have the President's Task Force on Art and the Humanities recognize craft as a separate and distinct area of consideration. They were also responsible for a 1981 meeting of the States and Arts Committee composed of fifty state legislators in which craftspeople argued for incorporation of crafts into state art programs. However, the final organization and progress of craft media workers remain uncertain, and we can only speculate as to how the segments will develop and relate to each other.

FOOTNOTES

1. This information was provided by Michael Scott, editor of *The Crafts Report*.
2. This information was provided by Carol Sedestrom in a personal conversation.
3. Reading of past issues of *American Craft* and *The Crafts Report* as well as numerous discussions with craftspeople led to this conclusion.

REFERENCES

- Becker, H.
 1974 "Art as Collective Action." *American Sociological Review* 39(6):767-776.
 1978 "Arts and Crafts." *American Journal of Sociology* 83(4):862-889.
 1982 *Art Worlds*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Bennett, P.
 1978 "What is Art? What is Craft?" *The Working Craftsman*. Spring: 34-35.
- Benson, J. and I. Gerver
 1958 "Art and Mass Society." *Social Problems* 6(Summer):4-10.
- Blau, P.
 1974 *On the Nature of Organizations*. New York: Wiley Press.
- Byrstyn, M.
 1981 "Variations in Artistic Circles." *Sociological Quarterly* 22 (Winter):119-132.
- Cerf, F., C. Citro and A. McDonald
 1982 *Methodology Report: Survey of Crafts-Artists*. Washington, D.C.: Mathematica Policy Research.
- Gans, H.
 1974 *Popular Culture and High Culture*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kadushin, C.
 1976 "Networks and Circles in the Production of Culture." *American Behavioral Scientist* 19(6):769-784.
- Mukherji, C.
 1978 "Artwork: Collection and Contemporary Culture." *American Journal of Sociology* 84(2):348-365.
- Nordness, L.
 1970 *Objects U.S.A.* New York: Viking Press.
- Rosenblum, B.
 1978 "Style as Social Process." *American Sociological Review* 43 (June):438-442.

Mid-American Review of Sociology

- Silver, H.
1979 "Rethinking Arts and Crafts: A Response to Becker." *American Journal of Sociology* 84(6):1452-1457.
- Slivka, R.
1979 "Affirmation: 1979." *American Craft* 39(3):50-51.
- Smith, C.
1981 *A Search for Structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Watt, I.
1957 *The Rise and Fall of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Yankelovich, D.
1981 "New Rules in American Life: Searching for Self-Fulfillment in a World Turned Upside Down." *Psychology Today* 1-15(4): 35-91.

ECONOMIC TRANSFORMATIONS AND THE
PROCESSING OF HYPERACTIVE SCHOOL CHILDREN*

Gary Kiger
Utah State University

Hyperactive behavior as a medically defined social problem is examined, in order to emphasize the role of political economy as it applies to social problems research. Much of the research on hyperkinesis tends to adopt an ahistorical, symbolic interactionist perspective and fails to account for the structural bases of social control practices. Structural (economic and legal) determinants are examined which influenced the emergence and development of hyperactive behavior as a social problem. The implications for other medically defined social problems are suggested.

The medicalization of deviant behavior and the development of medically defined social problems are important areas of concern in social problems research (Conrad and Schneider, 1980). However, much of the social problems research adopts a labeling, symbolic interactionist perspective without addressing more fundamental issues of political economy and its relation to social control practices (Spector and Kitsuse, 1977; Schur, 1980). For example, Spector and Kitsuse (1977:75) offer the following definition of social problems: "*the activity of individuals or groups making assertions or grievances and claims with respect to some putative conditions*" (emphasis in original). They admonish social problems researchers not to impute motives to interest groups, but to study claims-making activity itself.

A limitation of this perspective is that social problems research remains at the level of investigating ideological assertions. Becker's (1963) concept "moral entrepreneurs"—reformers who couch their claims about social conditions in moral terms to

*Direct all correspondence to: Gary Kiger, Department of Sociology, Utah State University, UMC07; Logan, UT 84322. I am grateful to Dr. Richard Warner, M.D. and Professor Ann Leffler for their comments on earlier drafts of this paper.