

On Contemporary Issues in the Sociology of Art: Introduction

Ewelina Wejbert-Wąsiewicz 

University of Lodz, Poland

Dominik Porczyński 

University of Rzeszów, Poland

Agata Rozalska 

Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw, Poland

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18778/1733-8069.17.3.01>

Keywords:

sociology of art,
sociology in Poland,
art worlds, research
traditions, research
directions

Abstract: In the introduction to this issue of *Przegląd Socjologii Jakościowej*, we undertake an attempt to characterize the contemporary field of the sociology of art in Poland. For the point of departure, we took four generations of the sociology of art as defined by Nathalie Heinich as well as the identification of the following four elements: an artwork and its reception, an artist and a creative process, an audience, and a social-institutional framework. We try to draw the timeline of this sub-discipline by means of indicating works of Stanisław Ossowski (the sociology of art *sensu largo*) and Florian Znaniecki (the sociology of artist) as its beginning in the country. We also define the unique status of art sociology in Poland as a sub-discipline of the sociology of culture, as well as its mutual relations with different sciences. We analyze the emergence of scientific communities and the appearance and disappearance of research specializations during the period of over 80 years. Additionally, we indicate missing pages as well as thematic fields and perspectives that are still developing. We are aware of the fact that it is difficult to exhaust the problem of the history and status of art sociology in Poland within one article, which is why our objective is, rather, to indicate problems, perspectives, and ideas that can begin the discussion on the topic.

Ewelina Wejbert-Wąsiewicz, sociologist, assistant professor in the Department of Art Sociology at the University of Łódź; her research interests include socio-cultural taboos, the sociology of film and cinema, the sociology of art and culture. Recent articles: Wejbert-Wąsiewicz E. (2020) "O Atrakcyjności kina ruchomego w dwudziestym i dwudziestym pierwszym wieku," *Art & Documentation* 21:59-72; Wejbert-Wąsiewicz, E. (2019) "The Łódź school of sociology of culture: From the study of the reception of verbal arts to visual arts,"

Culture And Society 63(3):75-92; Zimnica-Kuzioła, E., & Wejbert-Wąsiewicz, E. (2019) "Polish female directors of contemporary theater and cinema (selected examples)," *Acta Universitatis Lodzianensis. Folia Sociologica* 71:121-137.

Contact details:

Institute of Sociology, University of Lodz
ul. Rewolucji 1905 r. nr 41, 90-214 Łódź
email address: ewelina.wejbert@uni.lodz.pl

Dominik Porczyński, assistant professor at the University of Rzeszów, Institute of Sociology; in his research, he focuses on heritage, collective memory, museology, the sociology of art, and fan communities; Secretary-General of the Polish Association of Cultural Studies; member of the Board of the Sociology of Art Section of the Polish Sociological Association.

Contact details:

Institute of Sociology
University of Rzeszów
al. Rejtana 16c, 35-959 Rzeszów
email address: dporczynski@ur.edu.pl

Agata Rozalska, M.A., PhD student and academic in the Institute of Sociological Sciences at the Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw (UKSW); her main research areas include urban sociology and the sociology of art; member of the Main Board of the Polish Sociological Association as well as the Board of the Sociology of Art Section of the Polish Sociological Association.

Contact details:

Institute of Sociological Sciences
ul. Wóycickiego 1/3
01-938 Warszawa
email address: a.rozalska@uksw.edu.pl

The state of the sociology of art in Poland¹

The first generation of art sociologists, as Nathalie Heinich (2010) claims, involves sociologizing aestheticians (see: Ossowski 1966; Francastel 1973; Gołaszewska 1984), the second generation consists in social historians (see Hauser 1974), and the third generation includes empirical sociologists. Heinich wonders whether a fourth generation is emerging (2010:147-148). According to the author, the fourth generation would complement the previous ones by means of using their methodological, theoretical, and empirical achievements. An explicit element of their work would be to see art not through its re-

¹ This part of the text is based on scientific papers prepared by Ewelina Wejbert-Wąsiewicz and Emilia Zimnica-Kuzioła for the following international scientific conferences: 'International Scientific Conference on Slavonic and East European Studies', London, 23 June 2018, University of London (the paper: "Theater and Film as a subject of Polish Sociological Research"); International Scientific Conference 'Emerging Trends in Economics, Culture and Humanities (etECH)', Riga 26-28 April 2018, University of Economics and Culture in Riga [the paper: "Polish Sociology of Art. (Theatre and Film). Traditions and Trends"]. See Wejbert-Wąsiewicz and Zimnica-Kuzioła 2018a, 2018b.

lationship with society but, rather, to look at art *as a society*, and perhaps even perceive the sociology of art as a product of social actors. Art world perspectives developing within the tradition of sociological pragmatism (see: Fine 2004; Becker 2008), Pierre Bourdieu's (1996; 2007) field theory, or Niklas Luhmann's (2016) autopoietic system theory seem to be a step in that direction.

Studies within the sociology of art focus on four essential elements: the work of art and its reception; the artist and the creative process; the recipients; and the institutional and social frames of art (Kłoskowska 1981; see also Zolberg 1999). When Stanisław Ossowski was designing a new discipline in Poland in 1936², what he had in mind was first and foremost the sociology of works of art (Ossowski 1966:359-360; see also Stępnik 2010). The sociology of the creative process or reception issues were on the fringes of the author's scrutiny. He would also

² Through the first edition of "U podstaw estetyki" in *Dziela*.

write about works of art as a factor in social and economic change. An important issue for modern sociologists is how art is shaped by social settings as well as by the postindustrial economy. Claiming that a producer of a valuable work of art is not an artist, but a participant in the field of production, Pierre Bourdieu (2005) started the process of separating the sociology of art and esthetics on the one hand and the philosophy of beauty on the other (see also: Sułkowski 2008; Matuchniak-Krasuska 2010).

Stanisław Ossowski explains the concept of aesthetic value by an analysis of human responses and human motivations to certain objects. His work is on the border of philosophy of beauty (what is an aesthetic experience?) and psycho-sociology. His study is empirical. According to him, esthetics, like sociology, focuses on three aspects: the work of art, the creator, and the receiver. The difference between esthetics and the sociology of art is that sociology replaces the esthetic situation with a communicative situation, and the esthetic value is substituted by the semiotic concept of the artistic sign (see: Ossowski 1966:371; Sułkowski 1996:52-53). For the sociologist, the pragmatic function of the sign remains the most important one. Designing sociology as a "special" cultural science, Florian Znaniecki draws a line between this discipline and other fields of study. He argues that *[s]ociologists cannot compete with economists, students of material techniques, linguists, historians, and theorists of literature, art, music, philosophy, and science in their respective realms* (Znaniecki 1963:385), and further: *[i]f sociology is essentially the science of human or social relations, as experienced by those who participate in them, then the primary phenomena which sociologists have to investigate are social actions, just as the primary phenomena investigated by religionists, students of material technique, economists, and theorists of art are religious, technical, economic, artistic actions* (Znaniecki

1963:389). This does not mean that sociologists cannot study art, only that the disciplines with longer history have developed their own traditions, perspectives, and approaches which are not compatible and exceed the scope of interest of sociology as Znaniecki defines it, namely as the science of order among social actions. Artistic, religious, or technical practices focus on different values, but these values are the object of evaluation. Artworks and artists themselves are compared by other people interested in them. This means that particular systems of symbolic references exist, and people can invoke in their collective practices. Art as a value becomes a component of social action.

For over twenty years, Znaniecki was consistently developing an approach toward the study of social roles and groups (1945; 1954; 2011). He applied his terminology to the study of artists. In his analysis (Znaniecki 1937), he utilizes inductive reasoning in order to discuss the emergence and growing independence of the social role of the artist in history. Further development gives more detail as to the participation of the artist in different sections of society and the transferring of values between them, as Znaniecki shows based on the example of an artist involved in a religious group and a municipal group (1963:398).

In addition to semiotics, the hermeneutics of Hans Georg Gadamer (1993) as well as by Paul Ricoeur (1975) is a useful tool for an art sociologist. Hermeneutics does not demand a transcendental approach to art from the general audience. In this philosophical approach, the dialogical nature of the communicative situation is emphasized: the work of art asks the recipient questions and the recipient does the same with the work of art (Sułkowski 1996:54). The sociology of art also uses other interpretive ap-

proaches in the humanities: psychoanalysis, symbolic interactionism, ethnology, and findings of art historians, estheticians, the so-called psychologists of reception, as well as art critics. Stanisław Ossowski considered art as a social phenomenon. According to him, a work of art can connect people in various ways, fulfilling its communicative function. This specific communicative approach is already visible in Ossowski's views. The chapter titled "The work of art as a center of social relations" in his seminal work titled *U podstaw estetyki* [*The Foundations of Esthetics*] elaborates on this social conditioning in relation to works of art. Ossowski included in the field of the sociology of art also the issues of art as a product of social life, in particular the issues of art development and its correlation with other fields of culture. This postulate of research directed at the social functions of art was more often developed by art sociologists in Poland than the one mentioned before. Ossowski designed the future sociology of art as a discipline that would also deal with the superstructure, i.e. with the question of the origins of art and the social conditioning of esthetic theories. In this way, the sociology of art will be like the "sociology of esthetics" (Ossowski 1966:391–392). Some of the paths of Ossowski's sociology of art are still awaiting continuators among sociologists and estheticians; the legacy of Ossowski in terms of the sociology of art can still inspire researchers.

The sociology of art in Poland was initially treated as a sub-genre of the sociology of culture and as such did not draw significant attention among sociologists. Sociology of art scholars in the world and Poland were first and foremost sociologists of literature, music, in rare cases fine art and theatre. An essential part of theoretical and empirical work of art sociologists oscillates around genetic structuralism or communicative perspective of art. In Poland,

the list of important books dealing with sociology of art opens with the names of literary scholars, cultural experts (i.e., Jerzy Kmita, Sław Krzemiń-Ojak, Andrzej Mencwel, Stefan Żółkiewski, Michał Głowiński, Maryla Hopfinger). And in the circle of culture and art sociologists (including literature, theatre, fine arts, and film), the most eminent authors of theoretical and empirical studies are, among others, Aleksander Wallis, Antonina Kłoskowska, Bogusław Sułkowski, Marian Golka, Andrzej Siciński, Mieczysław Gałuszka, Kazimierz Kowalewicz, Cezary Prasek, Kazimierz Żygulski. Aleksander Wallis and Anna Matuchniak-Krasuska represented the sociology of fine arts. Kazimierz Żygulski, Mieczysław Gałuszka and Cezary Prasek were sociologists of film. Kazimierz Kowalewicz was interested in the sociology of theatre and film. Bogusław Sułkowski and Andrzej Siciński studied literature as a field of culture. Marian Golka became famous as the author of handbooks of sociology of art, including *Socjologia artysty* [*Sociology of the Artist*] (1995) and many theoretical works on the sociology of art (Golka 1991; 1995; 1996; 2008; 2013). The most prominent scientist was Antonina Kłoskowska. She created an empirically oriented "Lodz school" of sociology of culture covering fields of literature reception and visual arts research (See: Wejbert-Wąsiewicz 2019). Her students made a significant contribution to Polish sociology of art, sociology of literature, sociology of film, sociology of theater, and visual sociology. They formed the Sociology of Culture Department, founded by Antonina Kłoskowska, and later a new entity – Sociology of Art Department. One of Kłoskowska's students, Bogusław Sułkowski, established the first department of sociology of art in Poland in the 1990s. To this day it is the only such department in Poland. Two decades earlier (at the beginning of the 1970s) he published the book *Powieść i czytelnicy* (*Novel and*

Readers), an empirical treaty on the sociology of literature (Sułkowski 1972). The queen of Polish sociologists of culture, Antonina Kłoskowska (1956; 1976; 1992; Kłoskowska and Rokuszewska-Pawełek 1977), studied reception of literature representing national Polish canon, and her assistant Alicja Rokuszewska-Pawełek (1983) – social circulation of popular and entertainment literature. Subsequently, sociological studies of painting emerged in Lodz (by Anna Matuchniak-Krasuska³), artistic film (Mieczysław Gałuszka and Kazimierz Kowalewicz, Ewelina Wejbert-Wąsiewicz), photography (Tomasz Ferenc), theatre and music (Kazimierz Kowalewicz and Emilia Zimnica-Kuzioła), interactive art (Izabela Franckiewicz-Olczak). The Department of Sociology of Art scholars developed research in the field of symbolic culture (see Warzywoda-Kruszyńska 2015).

Art sociology, like any discipline, is subject to institutionalization. The researchers are active in the field of art sociology and in the Polish Sociological Association. Warszawa, Poznań, Kraków, Katowice, Łódź are strong centres of art sociology in Poland. The Section of Sociology of Art of the Polish Sociological Association was established in 2016. Przemysław Kisiel is the chairman of this section. The first section meeting took place during the 16th Polish Sociological Congress organized by Polish Sociological Association in Gdańsk (2016). The Section brings together members and supporters. In 2020 the section consists of forty-seven members according to the information received from Przemysław Kisiel. In addition, more than a dozen associate members, i.e., people who do not belong to Polish Sociological Association, but sympathize with the Section and

they are interested in art sociology and events (e.g., The Conference of the Section of Sociology of Art and the other scientific conferences or seminars).

The sub-disciplines of art sociology in Poland developed gradually over different periods. The empirical sociology of art first focused on literature and music. It seems that currently the former is the neglected field of study (Boksański 1966; Sułkowski 1983; 1994; Łęcki 2000; Ćwikła 2006; Stetkiewicz⁴ 2011; see also: Ślęzak⁵ 2009). However, Krzysztof Łęcki (2012; 2019) and Paweł Ćwikła (2012) are still active sociologist in this field. The processes of reception of literature are more interesting to translators and literary scholars than sociologists (see: Fabiszak, Gibińska, and Nawrocka 2004; Jankowicz and Tabaczyński 2016). A pioneering and highly successful attempt to apply sociological tools – Bourdieu's theory of the literary field in 21st century was the project of an interdisciplinary team of culture scholars and sociologists focused on Polish literature after 1989 (Jankowicz et al. 2014).

According to Barbara Jabłońska (2014), a sociological reflection on the meaning of music in peoples' life began with the birth of sociology as a separate scientific discipline. However, the founding fathers of sociology's interest in music were rather insignificant. In the case of Poland, the topic of music appears only in Stanisław Ossowski's works (Jabłońska 2014:78). Until 1989, the Polish sociology of music was developed by Paweł Beylin (1974), who was the first to conduct quantitative research on the perception of music. Another important person was

⁴ Lucyna Stetkiewicz died in April 2017.

⁵ Izabela Ślęzak analyzed the social world of art in terms of poetry and the process of becoming a poet. The concept and theory of the sociology of literature and the sociology art was used by her to a limited extent (Ślęzak 2009:8-13), as she preferred Howard Becker's theory above all.

³ Dagna Kidoń from the Department of the Sociology of Art, University of Lodz, is preparing her PhD dissertation about reception in modern art museums in Poland. Her doctoral supervisor is Anna Matuchniak-Mystkowska.

Elżbieta Skotnicka-Illasiewicz, who researched the working-class music culture and composer's social milieu in the 1960s and 1970s. Also worth mentioning are Mieczysław Gałuszka and Kazimierz Kowalewicz (1979), who in the 1970s studied the styles of music perception using a technique called listening protocols.

After 1989, there was a significant decrease in interest in music-related research yet a number of scholars somehow tried to fill this gap. Two researchers deserve special attention: Jerzy Wertenstein-Żuławski and Mirosław Pęczak (1991), who research informal youth culture and the role that rock music played in this group. Wertenstein-Żuławski (1990) dealt with youth musical culture while Pęczak (1992) started from researching rock music and its social contexts and moved to the research of youth subcultures (Choczyński, Rozalska, Drzewek 2019).

Among the people important for Polish sociology of music there are also two anthropologists, Wojciech Burszta, who studied music in the socio-cultural context (Burszta and Rychlewski 2003), and Waldemar Kuligowski (2001), who deals with ethnic and folk music in the context of creolization.

Music was also present in the research of Marcin Rychlewski (2011), a researcher of rock and popular music, Krzysztof Abriszewski (1998), writing about hardcore music, and Tomasz Szlendak (1998), who studied techno music fans communities. Bogumiła Mika (2010) and Barbara Pabjan (2010) dealt with the reception of classical music. In his doctoral dissertation, Michał Libera (2013) undertook the problem of the reception of musical work and the contexts of its creation, and Igor Pietraszewski (2012) put under scrutiny the economic situation of Polish jazz musicians during the communist period.

In recent years, the sociology of music in Poland has been developed by Barbara Jabłońska (2014) (the author of the first textbook on the sociology of music in Poland) and Katarzyna Wyrzykowska (2017), who once dealt with the music market, the dynamics of musicians' careers, musical culture of young people, and now with musical distinctions and stratification.

Nowadays, it seems the sociology of the fine arts finds no followers, rather, the field of cultural production is examined (Możdżyński 2015). The important works in the field of the sociology of fine arts were studies of Anna Matuchniak-Krasuska (1984; 1988; 1999⁶) written many years ago, and Marian Golka's sociology of the artist (Golka 1995; 2013). Anna Matuchniak-Krasuska popularised Bourdieu's theory in Poland (Matuchniak-Krasuska 1988; 1999; 2010). It is worth mentioning that Marian Golka (1991; 1996; 2008) is the author of three sociology of art handbooks. Another Poznań sociologist Marek Krajewski (1995; 2004; 2005; 2011; 2012) represents the sociology of visual art oriented towards the object, and institutions of culture (cultural institutions, public art, recipients). The researchers from Poznań and Toruń are strongly focused on visual sociology (Olechnicki 2003a; 2003b; Kaczmarek 2004; 2008a; 2014; 2020; Drozdowski and Krajewski 2010). They deal with images in a broad sense, including film and photography.

There is no rich tradition in Poland in the field of the sociology of theatre, (while the history of the theater and theater studies (theatrology) developed well, Polish sociologists began to study the theater only at the end of the 20th century). Polish sociologists

⁶ The book titled *Publiczność wobec metafory plastycznej. O recepcji groteski Jerzego Duda-Gracza* (Matuchniak-Krasuska 1999) was dedicated to Professor Antonina Kłosowska.

(e.g. Kowalewicz 1979) wrote about the theory of reception of theatrical performance, they studied the social structure of the audience of specific theaters, they studied the colloquial and critical reception of the performance (those are the main topics of Emilia Zimnica-Kuzioła). Sociology of film in Poland was derived from film studies, differently than in Western countries, where the film was the subject of sociological studies even before the First World War. In the 1970s sociology of film remained the best-developed field of sociology of culture, mainly thanks to Kazimierz Żygulski, who sketched its program and conducted numerous empirical studies. Like in other countries, they focused mostly on cinema audiences. It is worth mentioning that film sociologists usually invoke not art sociology concepts or theories.

Architecture is regarded as a “fine art” at least from the 17th century (Tatarkiewicz 1991:393). Paradoxically, among other fields of art sociology, it has the shortest history. As Magdalena Łukasiuk (2011) argues sociology of architecture, despite some considerations made by Georg Simmel in 1909 develops from the 1970s. In Poland, this field of study is poorly explored, and it seems it needs time to fully develop as a fairly independent subdiscipline. At the moment its history bears some resemblances to the history of art sociology itself (Heinich 2010). At least in Poland it is more often discussed by art historians or architects than sociologists. The problems of the social role of architecture, its relationship with social class or lifestyles, and the social responsibilities of architects are more often undertaken by the formers (cf. Nowicki 1980; Basista 1995; 2001; Rybczyński 1996; 2003; Stachura 2009; Wiszniowski 2011; Jędrisko and Sieńsko-Dragosz 2015; Kilanowski 2017; Ziółkowska 2017). There is a lack of empirical studies of social actors: creators

and users of architecture, their practices, attitudes, evaluations, etc. This does not mean that Polish sociologists ignore or do not recognize those issues. More proper to say is that they are rather distributed among a significant number of studies from the fields of urban sociology (Wallis 1967; 1977a, 1977b, Majer 2020), sociology of space (Wallis 1970; Jałowiecki and Szczepański 2002; Jałowiecki 2005; Jałowiecki and Łukowski 2008; Jałowiecki 2010; 2012; Wańtuch-Matla 2016; Łukasiuk 2017), revitalization and gentrification (Sinewali 2010; Gądecki 2012; Groyecka 2015, Przywojska 2016; Sosnowska 2016; Drozda 2017), sociology of local communities (Łukasiuk 2015), landscape sociology (Łukasiuk 2011; Porczyński and Gajdek 2019), territorial branding (Kajdanek 2017; Porczyński 2017), sociology of the architectural profession (Jałowiecki 2011; Frąckowiak 2018), social anthropology (Karpińska 2000) or collective memory (Czajkowski and Pabjan 2012). This is not surprising, since architecture is a complex phenomenon and connects the problems of the organization of space and its use with the sphere of aesthetics. When concerning this “aesthetic” component of architecture it is analyzed as a factor of class distinction (e.g., Wallis 1979; Gądecki 2009; 2012; Jałowiecki 2012), identity (Gądecki 2005; Czajkowski and Pabjan 2012; Porczyński and Gajdek 2019), or expression of values shared by a society (Jałowiecki 2012). Last but not least, along with the sociology of the artist, some remarks about the sociology of the architect emerged (Jałowiecki 2012).

The current sociology of architecture is driven by a so-called spatial turn (Łukasiuk 2011; Rogowski 2015). After decades of ignoring material aspects of spaces inhabited by human collectivities, objects we possess, produce, and use are treated as non-human actors in social processes. This somehow corresponds to Jeffrey Alexander’s (2010) idea of cultural

sociology – culture is not only what human produces but it is also what makes ‘bald ape’ human.

Among the Polish sociologists practicing art sociology for many years are: Bogusław Sułkowski, Anna Matuchniak-Mystkowska, Marian Golka, Kazimierz Kowalewicz, Marek Krajewski, Krzysztof Łęcki, Paweł Ćwikła, Przemysław Kisiel, Paweł Możdżyński, Jerzy Kaczmarek⁷, Tomasz Ferenc, Emilia Zimnica-Kuzioła, Małgorzata Stępnik, Ewelina Wejbert-Wąsiewicz, Izabela Franckiewicz-Olczak, Elżbieta Nieroba and other sociologist of culture. The researchers, sociologists of culture and art were various thematically oriented in the 21st century. They interested the cultural promotion, the cultural policy, and the participation in culture, e.g. Rafał Wiśniewski (2016; Wiśniewski and Kukołowicz 2017; Wiśniewski and Bukalska 2020), Barbara Fatyga, Rafał Drozdowski, Marek Krajewski, Mirosław Filiciak and Krzysztof Olechnicki (Drozdowski 2006; Drozdowski et al. 2014; Szlendak and Olechnicki 2014; 2017; Afeltowicz et al. 2020); the museums and other institutions of art and culture and their recipients, e.g. Przemysław Kisiel (2003; 2013; 2016), Dominik Porczyński (Porczyński and Vargova 2019; 2020), Elżbieta Nieroba (2018; 2019), Izabela Franckiewicz-Olczak (2017; Franckiewicz-Olczak and Grunwald 2019); the art of war prisoners: Anna Matuchniak-Mystkowska (2014:140-182); the artistic careers, e.g. Izabela Wagner (2015), Tomasz Ferenc (2012; Józwiak, Ferenc, and Różycki 2020); the social art, e.g. Katarzyna Niziołek (2015), the interactive art, e.g. Izabela Franckiewicz-Olczak (2016a; 2016b; 2017), and the detailed sociologies of art, including literature, music, theatre, film: Paweł Ćwikła (2006; 2012), Krzysztof Łęcki (2012; 2019), Paweł Możdżyński (2011; 2015), Jerzy Kaczmarek (2008b; 2014), Bar-

bara Jabłońska (2014), Katarzyna Wyrzykowska and Ziemowit Socha (Wyrzykowska 2012; Białkowski et al. 2014; Wyrzykowska and Socha 2016; Domański et al. 2020), Marcin Darmas (2014), Beata Łaciak (2013), Ewelina Wejbert-Wąsiewicz (2017; 2019), Emilia Zimnica-Kuzioła (2018; 2020), Kamila Lewandowska (2018; 2020). There is also a young generation of cultural sociologists willingly addressing the above-mentioned issues and those related to art, its disciplines, as well as artists: Agata Sulikowska-Dejena (2017; 2020), Marcin Choczyński (Choczyński, Rozalska, and Drzewek 2019; Choczyński 2020), Agata Rozalska (Choczyński, Rozalska, and Drzewek 2019), Stanisław Krawczyk (2015). Some of them are the authors of the texts in this issue.

An overview of themes within this issue of *Przegląd Socjologii Jakościowej*

This issue of the Journal presents contemporary sociological reflections and research on the sociology of theater, the sociology of art, including the role of art and cultural institutions, cultural animation, the sociology of artists, and the sociology of film and cinema.

Marek Krajewski and Maciej Frąckowiak discuss the very actual problem of Polish theaters' situation during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. The researchers reconstruct the representations of the role as well as the importance and diversification of the theater field shared by managers of those institutions. This knowledge is defined by the authors as the *positioning* (or *situating*) of a theater institution. The qualitative in-depth interviews conducted with Polish theater managers allowed the researchers to position these institutions among other cultural units and describe their unique traits. The reconstruction is then strengthened by the discussion of how per-

⁷ Jerzy Kaczmarek died in April 2021.

forming arts are different from other spheres of aesthetic practice and what the relationships between various types of theater institutions are. As the authors summarize their discussion, the introduced concept proved to be very useful in their explorations. It turned out that one of the most significant resources in the theater field is safety (and, more specifically, the lack of it). It strongly influences relationships between particular institutions – especially public, independent, and private ones. According to the authors, the concept of positioning effectively complements different theoretical approaches, particularly those connected with the notion of network and related ones. It also develops the Bourdiean perspective by means of introducing to the dynamics of the field the concept of actors possessing certain agency and influencing the social world with his/her ideas.

The question of the theater during the pandemic was undertaken also by the team composed of Katarzyna Kalinowska, Katarzyna Kułakowska, Maria Babicka, and Michał Bargielski. The authors focus on the sphere of alternative theater and locate their approach within the social world perspective. The paper is based on the qualitative mixed-methods approach and as such it includes participant observation, netnography, in-depth interviews, and a qualitative survey research carried out via the Internet. The research was conducted among members of alternative theaters' staff. According to the interviewees, the pandemic is another difficulty to overcome, similarly to the breakdown of the alternative theater world that affects various spheres of its existence. The new situation leads to a re-thinking of the relationship between the market and the sphere of culture embodied in the public grant system. Another outcome is understanding the importance of community and

developing the ability to function in a turbulent environment. The new situation leads to suspending some of the activities and focusing on different ones, even if they are not directly connected to theater jobs, such as face-masks-sewing. Other ideas concern switching between waiting for the general situation to improve or going online. The authors show how, paradoxically, the pandemic that led to the merging of private and professional lives separated those spheres in the case of alternative theaters. The researchers conclude that members of the studied social world are, in fact, used to the difficulties and are trying to organize their lives under the new conditions.

The article titled "The Process of Becoming a Professional Actor" refers to the social world of actors. Emilia Zimnica-Kuzioła reactivates the field neglected by Polish theater sociologists. In her two most recent publications, she has studied dramatic public theaters (Zimnica-Kuzioła 2018) and theater actors (Zimnica-Kuzioła 2020). In the paper contained in this very issue, the author focuses on the processes of building the professional identity of actors, motives for choosing the acting profession, and the role of significant others in the life of actors. Zimnica-Kuzioła points to different identity-related activities, negotiations with regard to identity, and the cultivation of professional identification. Based on empirical data, she distinguishes between five categories of people important to the professional role: stimulator, activator, stabilizer, symbolic authority, and demotivator. The author shows that the choice of the acting profession is a result of defensive and offensive motives, and the consequence of the long process of both primary and secondary socialization. A separate part of the article involves a comparison of facts and stereotypes regarding entrance exams and education in a public drama school. In

the process of becoming an actor, passing the exam to a public drama school (e.g. Warsaw or Cracow) is an extremely important moment. Zimnica-Kuzioła discusses many factors conducive to the development of professional identification, e.g. the attitude to the profession, motivation to work, responsibility for one's own actions, satisfaction with the results of one's own involvement in the implementation of professional tasks, etc. The author proves how important professional identification is in the process of becoming an actor, determined by a sense of connection with people in the particular profession as well as the interiorization of norms, patterns of behavior, and values specific to the particular profession.

Kamila Lewandowska looks into the problem of esthetic judgment with the use of the approach grounded in the tradition of sociological pragmatism. The author follows the turn that, according to her, is taking place in the sociological research into arts. A number of scholars in the field no longer treat artworks only as products of artistic practices or objects of the human-actor manipulation. Some of the sociologists include in their analyses the content and meaning of artworks and – following developments in different disciplines – start treating them as non-human actors influencing the course of interaction. The pragmatically-oriented sociology of art focuses on particular acts of art appreciation and esthetic judgment. It studies not only the perspective of authorities in the field, but also the reception of common participants. In the approach discussed by Lewandowska, meanings and values are not pre-defined, but emerge during interactions. Apart from presenting current developments in the pragmatic theory of art, the author also considers some possible directions for future studies.

Agata Sulikowska-Dejena's portrayal of Polish art worlds utilizes different sources of data: interviews personally conducted by the author, records of talks carried out by other people for different purposes, and press articles. The paper is an example of regular contemporary qualitative research, a *bricoleur*-like approach supported by the methodology of grounded theory. Sulikowska-Dejena focuses on the practices of differentiation in the Polish artistic environments. In her paper, art, its form, and its contents become a boundary object, around which social networks emerge, partially separated yet mutually aware of each other. The author calls them peripheral modernity and mainstream contemporariness in order to provide a syncretical description of values that both collectivities are up to. The discussion shows different perspectives on art developed in groups related to more peripheral Art Exhibition Bureaus and Contemporary Art Centers. The former community remains faithful to the ideals of the 20th-century Paris avantgarde, while the latter focuses on youth and on critical and groundbreaking efforts.

Ewa Grigar concentrates on the relationship between art museums and galleries and their audiences. The author draws a picture of the field controlled by the elites and their trustees. However, more recent observations show the emergence of a new type of audience: young people demanding more agency in the museum context, and for whom new technologies are a significant element of everyday life. The study is based on research conducted in Prague by the author on the one hand, and another one carried by Przemysław Kisiel in Cracow. The outcomes are then compared, with Grigar utilizing both quantitative and qualitative data. The results give an interesting feedback on young visitors' perspectives on contemporary art museum exhibitions. While the

majority of participants confirm their interest in art, a significant part show dissatisfaction with the museum experience. Some answers are not surprising; young people would like to see more new technologies in museum environments, more information videos, or interactive contents. At the same time, they undermine the popular idea of youth who are constantly glued to their smartphone screens; the majority of interviewees do not need this during their museum experience. The most disturbing outcome of the research is, however, that even half a century after Bourdieu and Darbel's study had been carried out, schools do too little to encourage lower- and middle-class children to visit museums. The museum can do a lot to adjust to its audience, but without systemic support for the attendance, only few visitors would experience the new faces of the institutions.

Dominik Porczyński and Agata Rozalska's paper locates itself at the intersection of the sociology of locality, sociology of objects, and, obviously, sociology of arts. The authors assume that the study of contemporary collectivities, social practices, and identities should rely on the understanding of the past. Museums are considered here as one of many actors contributing to the development of local identities. They are an institutionalized way of making the past present in the life of contemporary communities. The study is based on the assumption that collections – and particularly exhibitions – are more or less faithful representations of culture and as such they contribute to today's understanding of the local past. In their considerations, Porczyński and Rozalska focus on artworks as both objects of collecting practices and components of the original context in which they had been produced and used. They are understood here as objects bearing unique esthetic qualities,

but also showing documentary significance. Because of that, they are used in the museum's meaning-making practices. Esthetic objects are analyzed in reference to their gradable 'power' in invoking the past. This feature of artworks is the object of debate among different members of museum staff. Since art is only a fragment of the inherited past, it competes with other artifacts as a way of describing the essence of the locality. This makes the construction of locality representation a discursive process, while artworks – boundary objects.

Rafał Wiśniewski and Grażyna Pol's contribution to the issue touches two problems simultaneously. Firstly, it analyzes possible applications of hybrid ethnography and, secondly, it discusses factors influencing culture animators' careers. The paper focuses on selected outcomes of a broader research project utilizing methods combining more traditional approaches with new technologies. The hybrid methodology applied by the authors is based on the involvement of recruited animators. They were responsible for keeping a journal and taking photographs for a period of a week. In addition, their movements were tracked by GPS. Data collected through these methods allowed the researchers to analyze the spatial practices of the participants. It turns out that cultural animators are mobile and often work in several places. Their professional responsibilities strongly intertwine with voluntary work and household duties. They also maintain social bonds in their private lives. The authors provide a critical analysis of the applied methodology, suggesting that there is a need for longer periods of data collection, which would have made it possible to notice some regularities in research into the participant's spatial activity. The problem of unsystematic data entries by some of the animators might have also influenced the outcome.

The article by Ewelina Wejbert-Wąsiewicz is a study into traveling cinema. The film project titled "Polska Światłoczuła" has been operating since 2011. The author describes this informal institution and its creators, participants, and audiences from the interactionist and functional perspective; she relies on her own field studies, interviews, observations, the analysis of data, and both collected and induced materials. She invokes the atmosphere of meetings, rituals, broadcasting, as well as receiving attitudes. Wejbert-Wąsiewicz returned to her findings after four years and has now enriched them with a new perspective. Traveling cinema in Poland is an attractive form of entertainment as well as a cultural institution. The screening in the traveling cinema continues to have a festive value. The author shows the motivations of the film viewers and participants of meetings, creating a typology of viewers/receivers: naïve, consumer, passionate, erudite, and professional. Their revealed attitudes to film-meeting can be different: entertainment and play, esthetic experience, meeting with the film creator, affiliate reasons, film-meeting as a celebration, a desire to present themselves in the social arena, an incidental case, or random onlooking. Wejbert-Wąsiewicz provides insight into individual and combined practices – collective, that of broadcasters, that of audiences, and that of the organizers of the film culture. She classifies these cultural practices and points to the types of local communities as well as groups involved in the traveling cinema project. The criteria taken into account consist in the degree of the manifested public diversity as well as the motivational criterion of the members of the group or collective.

The article by Tomasz Ferenc is an example of biographically-oriented sociology of art, specifically a study in the sociology of the artist, one at the intersection of sociology and art history. It should

be added that Ferenc collaborated on a book about an iconic figure for the Polish and European art of photography of the second half of the 20th century, namely Zofia Rydet (Józwiak, Ferenc, and Różycki 2020). Although the artist left behind an enormous creative legacy, her biography remains a mystery in many respects; the field studies by Józwiak, Ferenc and Różycki constitute a thorough investigation. In *The Sociology of the Artist in the Post-Modern Era: Pride and Uncertainty* (2013), Marian Golka stressed the role of artistic mythologization in different times. The greater the artist and the more famous he/she is, the more often the process of mythologizing his/her creative attitudes and works occurs. Tomasz Ferenc draws attention to those interpretations of Zofia Rydet's works which differ from the artist's original intentions. Biographically-oriented sociology of art requires research to use archives, analyses of various collected materials, and interviews with witnesses. The main question that the author focuses on is – 'How was Zofia Rydet remembered by her colleagues, friends, photographers?' Owing to such research, one can learn about the artist's creative attitude, her basic and creative personality, as well as her way of living and functioning in the field of art.

Sharaf Rehman's article titled "Dilip Kumar: An Auteur Actor" is another case study in the sociology of the artist. Dilip Kumar is a prominent Indian actor and filmmaker. Sharaf Rehman conducted a meticulous analysis of his career path, paying attention to collective action in film production, specific feedbacks in the period of an artistic career, and moments of success and failure. The article is situated at the intersection of film studies and the sociology of the artist. The author does not explicitly refer to the sociology of art or its sub-disciplines, nor is it straightforward sociology of film or cinema, or the very the sociology of an artist. Rather, his article

should be considered as an outline of a broader sociological perspective within the field of sociology of the artist, namely that revolving around the figure of the actor. Dilip Kumar is an icon of the Indian cinema, and Sharaf Rehman's intention was to dedicate a sketch written about him for *Przegląd Socjologii Jakościowej* specifically. The author died at the age of 72 on March 4, 2021; he did not manage to read the reviews or supplement his text with sociological readings of the described artistic phenomenon. He was a media scholar and sociologist employed at the University of Texas Rio Grande Valley, associated with the University of Lodz's Faculty of Economics and Sociology since 2016. He was passionate about photography and film.

An attempt to analyze the phenomenon of the acting role in the sociological terms involving the concept of a social role was made in the "Afterword" by Dominik Porczyński, who has interpreted Kumar's biography and combined it with theory. The author describes the difference between the film role and the social role, and he shows how a sociologist should study the film actor role. "Afterword: The Sociology of a Film Actor" highlights several mutually-supportive perspectives (role theory, biographical perspective). Porczyński adapts the events that make up the trajectory of the actor's life in the social world of cinematography with the activities of film culture as such, as well as with the sphere of social practice. It turns out that practices, negotiations, social circles, institutions, and values all define the status of an iconic actor. This perspective was lacking in Rehman's text about Dilip Kumar. The proposed "Afterword" is one of the sociological interpretations of Sharaf Rehman's conclusions about the Indian cult artist and the author of the cinematography, namely Dilip Kumar. As the Editors of this issue, we hope that if the author of the

article were still alive, he would have accepted this supplement. We are convinced that by publishing Rehman's last article without editorial interference together with the said "Afterword," we are in line with the author's request.

Summary

The sociology of art in Poland has its own history, which we tried to describe. With this overview of the field, we do not want to close the discussion but, rather, to provoke it. Since the topic is quite broad, we are certain that we were not able to completely describe all groups, trends, and perspectives, and, above all, to list all the important publications. As every scientific discipline at the intersection of several sciences, the sociology of art struggles with various methodological and identity-related problems. It is not our aim to analyze them here. However, it is worth emphasizing that in Poland representatives of different theoretical and empirical sociologies of art exist, as well as scholars specializing in the history of art sociology as well as, finally, representatives of particular sociologies, namely that of theatre, music, literature, film and cinema, artists, institutions of art, and culture. The sociology of art in Poland is characterized by an unequal development of its sub-disciplines. There can be at least two reasons for this. Some of the sub-fields can be considered as self-centered, while others are treated as supplementary. The scientific community of art sociologists is quite dispersed and represents different theoretical and empirical approaches. It is necessary to emphasize which topics and fields are poorly explored by Polish art sociologists; there is, for instance, a weak representation within the field of sociology of literature, film, and cinema. There is also a lack of contemporary sociological research on the reception of painting. We also recognize analytical deficiencies in the aspect of women's careers in the

field of art (the sociology of the artist). The sociology of architecture is also poorly developed in Poland; it is usually conducted by architects and lacks empirical research engaging people. In order to become a more significant research area, it should establish contact with sociological theories. As Magdalena Łukasiuk (2011:100) notes, a sociologist of architecture currently borrows concepts from the neighboring fields of study. Another weakness of the sociology of art in Poland is too much attachment to the analysis of creative activities and the achievements of individual artists. The phenomenon of creative collectives rarely appears in art sociologists' areas of interest. Only single publications appear, such as the one about Małgorzata Pelkowska's 'Super-Honorable Girls' [Pol. 'Dziewczęta Przeszanowne'] (2010). Moreover, there is a lack of description and analysis of artistic groups in the country (see Leśniak 2019), as well as works about places of creation and art studios.

Marian Golka (2017) admits that it would be difficult to unequivocally and responsibly show thematic gaps in sociology, or at least to compile those that are noticed by other sociologists. Due to the fact that this is a particular feeling of researchers and it is difficult to even argue with it, it is probably more important to initiate a discussion and reflect on why some research areas are not willingly taken within sociology. There might be several reasons. First of all, it happens that the ideology and the context of authority do not favor particular subjects, or that limitations are caused by broadly understood correctness. On the other hand, if certain paradigms and practices hardly relate to potential research areas, it will most likely result in giving up ideas or interests, e.g. due to the lack of financial support for this type of research. Also crucially important is the problem of access to the relevant literature (Golka 2017:8).

References

- Abriszewski, Krzysztof. 1998. "Szczególny obowiązek cywilizacji zachodniej (krótka analiza ruchu hardcore)." *Kultura Współczesna* 1(16):27-42.
- Afeltowicz, Łukasz et al. 2020. "How to make the white elephant work: findings from ethnographic research into Polish new cultural institutions." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 27(3):377-393.
- Alexander, Jeffrey. 2010. *Znaczenia społeczne. Studia z socjologii kulturowej*. Cracow: Nomos.
- Basista, Andrzej. 1995. *Opowieści budynków. Architektura czterech kultur*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Basista, Andrzej. 2001. *Betonowe dziedzictwo. Architektura w Polsce czasów komunizmu*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Becker, Howard. 2008. *Art worlds. 25 anniversary edition*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Beylin, Paweł. 1974. *O muzyce i wokół muzyki*. Cracow: Polskie Wydawnictwo Muzyczne.
- Białkowski, Andrzej et al. 2014. *Muzykowanie w Polsce. Badanie podstawowych form aktywności muzycznych Polaków*. Warsaw: FMJDW.
- Boksański, Zbigniew. 1966. "Robotnicy – czytelnicy literatury elitarniej w środowisku łódzkim." *Przegląd Socjologiczny* 19:83-99.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1996. *Photography. A Middle-brow Art*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 2005. *Dystynkcja. Społeczna krytyka władzy sądzienia*. Warsaw: Scholar.

- Bourdieu, Pierre. 2007. *Reguły sztuki. Geneza i struktura pola literackiego*. Cracow: Universitas.
- Burszta, Wojciech and Marcin Rychlewski, eds. 2003. *A po co nam rock. Między duszą a ciałem*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Twój Styl.
- Choczyński, Marcin. 2020. "Figuracja disco polo: ilustracja muzyczna polskiej transformacji." *Kultura i Społeczeństwo* 4:74-96.
- Choczyński, Marcin, Agata Rozalska, and Katarzyna Drzewek, eds. 2019. *Socjologia muzyki w Polsce. Pęknięcia i kontynuacje*. Warsaw: Warszawskie Wydawnictwo Socjologiczne.
- Czajkowski, Paweł and Barbara Pabjan. 2012. "Perception of the architectural heritage elements of Wrocław by the students of Wrocław high schools." *Architectus* 32(2):27-33.
- Ćwikła, Paweł. 2006. "Kilka uwag o związku socjologii z literaturą." *Kultura i Społeczeństwo* 2:127-158.
- Ćwikła, Paweł. 2012. "Socjologia w literaturze. Casus 'Wojny Końca Świata' Mario Vargasa Llosy." *Studia Socjologiczne* 2:47-80.
- Darmas, Marcin. 2014. *Obywatel rycerz. Zarys socjologii filmu*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- Domański, Henryk et al. 2020. "The Homology of Musical Tastes in Poland." *Studia Socjologiczne* 4:183-211.
- Drozda, Łukasz. 2017. *Uszlachetniając przestrzeń. Jak działa gentryfikacja i jak się ją mierzy*. Warsaw: Instytut Wydawniczy Książka i Prasa.
- Drozdowski, Rafał. 2006. *Obraza na obrazach. Strategie społecznego oporu wobec obrazów dominujących*. Poznan: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.
- Drozdowski, Rafał and Marek Krajewski. 2010. *Za fotografię! w stronę radykalnego programu socjologii wizualnej*. Warsaw: Fundacja Nowej Kultury Bęc zmiana.
- Drozdowski, Rafał et al. 2014. *Praktyki kulturalne Polaków*. Torun: Wyd. UMK.
- Fabizak, Jacek, Marta Gibińska, and Ewa Nawrocka, eds. 2004. *Gry w Szekspira, Współczesna recepcja Szekspira w krajach nadbałtyckich*. Materiały z II Międzynarodowej Konferencji Szekspirowskiej 6-8 sierpnia 2004, Gdańsk.
- Ferenc, Tomasz. 2012. *Artysta jako obcy. Socjologiczne studium artystów polskich na emigracji*. Lodz: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, Wydawnictwo Państwowej Wyższej Szkoły Filmowej, Telewizyjnej i Teatralnej.
- Fine, Gary Alan. 2004. *Everyday genius. Self-taught Art. And the Culture of Authenticity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Francastel, Pierre. 1973. *Twórczość malarska i społeczeństwo*. Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
- Franckiewicz-Olczak, Izabela. 2016a. *Sztuka interaktywna. Społeczny kontekst odbioru*. Warsaw: Oficyna Naukowa.
- Franckiewicz-Olczak, Izabela. 2016b. "Rytuał a nowomediałna sztuka interaktywna." *Zeszyty Artystyczne* 2:101-110.
- Franckiewicz-Olczak, Izabela. 2017. "Nowe media w muzeum. Demokratyzacja kultury a unifikacja muzeów i aktywizacja odbiorców." *Studia Sociologica* 9:106-114.
- Franckiewicz-Olczak, Izabela and Anna Grunwald. 2019. "Badanie publiczności jako integralny element tworzenia ekspozycji czasowej. Wystawy Teens Love Design i Rzeczy kultowe. Państwowego Muzeum Etnograficznego w Warszawie." *Zarządzanie w Kulturze* 4:517-527.
- Frąckowiak, Maciej. 2018. *Architektem się bywa. Raport z badania jakościowego warszawskich architektów*. Retrieved August 16, 2021 (<https://www.nck.pl/badania/raporty/827384961>).
- Gadamer, Hans Georg. 1993. *Prawda i metoda*. Cracow: Inter Esse.
- Gałuszka, Marian and Kazimierz Kowalewicz. 1979. "Z badań nad odbiorem muzyki." *Ruch Muzyczny* 13:4-6.
- Gądecki, Jacek. 2005. *Architektura i tożsamość. Rzecz o antropologii architektury*. Nowa Wies: Wydawnictwo Rolewski.
- Gądecki, Jacek. 2009. *Za murami. Osiedla grodzone w Polsce. Analiza dyskursu*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Gądecki, Jacek. 2012. "Gating Warsaw. Enclosed housing estates and the aesthetics of luxury." Pp. 109-132 in *Chasing Warsaw: Socio-Material Dynamics of Urban Change Since 1990*, edited by M. Grubbauer and J. Kusiak. Frankfurt am Mein: Campus Verlag.
- Golka, Marian. 1991. *Rynek sztuki*. Poznan: Agencja Badawczo-Promocyjna "Artia."

- Golka, Marian. 1995. *Socjologia artysty*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Ars Nova.
- Golka, Marian. 1996. *Socjologiczny obraz sztuki*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Ars Nova.
- Golka, Marian. 2008. *Socjologia sztuki*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo DIFIN.
- Golka, Marian. 2013. *The Sociology of the Artist in the Postmodern Era. Pride and Uncertainty*. Wien-Berlin: LIT Verlag.
- Golka, Marian. 2017. "Źródła białych plam w socjologii." *Opuscula Sociologica* 1(19). DOI: 10.18276/os.2017.1-01.
- Gołaszewska, Maria. 1984. *Zarys estetyki*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo naukowe PWN.
- Groycka, Dorota. 2015. *Gentryfikacja Berlina: od życia na podłuchu do kultury caffè latte*. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Katedra.
- Hauser, Arnold. 1974. *Spoleczna historia sztuki i literatury*. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
- Heinich, Nathalie. 2010. *Socjologia sztuki*. Warszawa: Oficyna Naukowa.
- Jabłońska, Barbara. 2014. *Socjologia muzyki*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar Sp. z o.o.
- Jałowicki, Bohdan. 2005. "Społeczny język architektury. Od gotyckiej katedry do supermarketu." Pp. 21-36 in *Przemiany miasta. Wokół socjologii Aleksandra Wallisa*, edited by B. Jałowicki, A. Majer, and M. Szczepański. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.
- Jałowicki, Bohdan. 2010. *Spoleczne wytwarzanie przestrzeni (wydanie poprawione)*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.
- Jałowicki, Bohdan. 2011. "Społeczne uwarunkowania zawodu architekta." Pp. 117-126 in *Stare i nowe struktury społeczne w Polsce*, Vol. IX, *Przestrzeń antropogeniczna miasta Lublina: waloryzacja, wytwarzanie, użytkowanie*, edited by J. Styk. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Jałowicki, Bohdan. 2012. *Czytanie przestrzeni*. Cracow, Rzeszów, Zamost: Konsorcjum Akademickie.
- Jałowicki, Bohdan and Wojciech Łukowski, eds. 2008. *Szata informacyjna miasta*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.
- Jałowicki, Bohdan and Marek Szczepański. 2002. *Miasto i przestrzeń w perspektywie socjologicznej*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.
- Jankowicz, Grzegorz and Michał Tabaczyński, eds. 2016. *Socjologia literatury. Antologia*. Cracow: Korporacja Ha! Art.
- Jankowicz, Grzegorz et al. 2014. *Literatura polska po 1989 roku w świetle teorii Pierre'a Bourdieu. Raport z badań*. Cracow: Korporacja Ha! art.
- Jędrisko, Anna and Katarzyna Sieńko-Drągosz, eds. 2015. *Spoleczna rola architektury*, vol. 1 and 2. Nowy Targ: Podhalańska Państwowa Wyższa Szkoła Zawodowa w Nowym Targu.
- Jóźwiak, Karol, Tomasz Ferenc, and Andrzej Różycki. 2020. *Zapiski pamięci. Historie Zofii Rydet*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Kaczmarek, Jerzy, ed. 2004. *Kadrowanie rzeczywistości. Szkice z socjologii wizualnej*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Adama Mickiewicza.
- Kaczmarek, Jerzy. 2008a. *Do zobaczenia! Socjologia wizualna w praktyce badawczej*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza.
- Kaczmarek, Jerzy. 2008b. "Soziologischer Film – theoretische und praktische Aspekte." *Forum: Qualitative Sozialforschung Social Research* 9(3): art 34. Retrieved May 22, 2021 (<https://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1164>).
- Kaczmarek, Jerzy. 2014. *Zobaczyć społeczeństwo: film i wideo w badaniach socjologicznych*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza.
- Kaczmarek, Jerzy. 2020. "Visual sociological research using film and video, on the example of urban studies." *Acta Universitatis Lodzensis. Folia Sociologica* 73:5-19.
- Kajdanek, Katarzyna. 2017. "Tożsamość na sprzedaż? Wizerunek wewnętrzny i zewnętrzny Wrocławia oraz jego komercjalizacja." *Architectus* 50(2):15-27.
- Karpińska, Grażyna Ewa. 2000. *Miejsce wyodrębnione ze świata. Przykład łódzkich kamienic czynszowych*. Łódź: Polskie Towarzystwo Ludoznawcze.
- Kilanowski, Piotr. 2017. "Rozplanowanie kondygnacji mieszkalnych w śródmiejskich kamienicach warszawskich na przełomie XIX i XX wieku." Pp. 219-244 in *Architektura w mieście*,

- architektura dla miasta. *Spoleczne i kulturowe aspekty funkcjonowania architektury na ziemiach polskich lat 1815-1914*, edited by M. Getka-Kenig and A. Łupienko. Warsaw: Instytut Historii PAN.
- Kisiel, Przemysław. 2003. *Współczesna kultura artystyczna. Społeczny wymiar uczestnictwa*. Cracow: Akademia Ekonomiczna.
- Kisiel, Przemysław. 2013. "Współczesne wzory uczestnictwa w kulturze." Pp. 345-380 in *Kultura a rozwój*, edited by J. Hausner, A. Karwińska, and J. Purchala. Cracow: Narodowe Centrum Kultury.
- Kisiel, Przemysław. 2016. "Millennials – nowy uczestnik życia społecznego?" *Studia Socialia Cracoviensia* 1:93-94.
- Kłoskowska, Antonina. 1956. "Autor, publiczność, cenzura (Wokół warszawskiego wydania 'Pism' A. Mickiewicza z 1858 r.)." *Nauka Polska* 2-3:127-174.
- Kłoskowska, Antonina. 1976. "Potoczny odbiór literatury na przykładzie utworów Żeromskiego." *Pamiętnik Literacki* 1:65-91.
- Kłoskowska, Antonina. 1981. *Socjologia kultury*. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Kłoskowska, Antonina. 1992. "Potoczny odbiór i funkcje literatury." Pp. 212-228 in *Mimesis w literaturze, kulturze i sztuce*, edited by Z. Mitosek. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Kłoskowska, Antonina and Alicja Rokuszewska-Pawełek. 1977. "Mity literackie w świadomości potocznej: (przykład potocznego odbioru Wesela)." *Kultura i Społeczeństwo* 1:35-62.
- Kowalewicz, Kazimierz. 1979. "Dzieło sztuki wobec odbiorcy (na przykładzie teatru)." *Przegląd Socjologiczny* 31(1):97-113.
- Krajewski, Marek. 1995. "Sztuka jako praktyka społeczna: miejsce instytucji świata artystycznego w społecznej rzeczywistości." *Kultura i Społeczeństwo* 1:49-63.
- Krajewski, Marek. 2004. "Śmieci w sztuce. Sztuka jako śmieć." *Zeszyty Artystyczne* 13:50-65.
- Krajewski, Marek. 2005. "Co to jest sztuka publiczna?" *Kultura i Społeczeństwo* 1:57-79.
- Krajewski, Marek. 2011. "Instytucje kultury a uczestnicy kultury. Nowe relacje." Pp. 26-37 in *Strategie dla kultury. Kultura dla rozwoju*, edited by M. Śliwa. Cracow: Wydawnictwo MIK.
- Krajewski, Marek. 2012. "Od odbiorcy do uczestnika. Znikający widz i jego współcześni następcy." Pp. 79-91 in *Co z tym odbiorcą. Wokół zagadnienia odbioru sztuki*, edited by M. Kędziora, W. Nowak, and J. Ryczek. Poznan: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Adama Mickiewicza.
- Krawczyk, Stanisław. 2015. "Socjologia literatury fantastycznej w polskim i anglosaskim obiegu akademickim." Pp. 37-48 in *Literatura i kultura popularna. Badania, analizy, interpretacje*, edited by A. Gemra. Wrocław: Uniwersytet Wrocławski.
- Kuligowski, Waldemar. 2001. "Wytwarzanie autentyczności: polska muzyka folk." *Literatura Ludowa* 1:3-12.
- Leśniak, Anka. 2019. "Grupy artystyczne: przemiany w strategiach grup artystycznych w Polsce na wybranych przykładach." *Sztuka i Dokumentacja* 21:89-101.
- Lewandowska, Kamila. 2018. "Are Polish theatres autonomous? Artistic institutions in a bureaucratic system of culture funding." *Policy Studies* 39:1-18.
- Lewandowska, Kamila. 2020. "'Talking sense' about art: Evaluation of theatre as a social process." *Studies in Theatre and Performance* 1-17. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14682761.2020.25201810500>.
- Libera, Michał. 2013. *Doskonale zwyczajna rzeczywistość socjologia geografii labo metafizyka muzyki*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Krytyki Politycznej.
- Luhmann, Niklas. 2016. *Pisma o sztuce i literaturze*. Warsaw: Scholar.
- Łaciak, Beata. 2013. *Kwestie społeczne w polskich serialach obyczajowych - prezentacje i odbiór*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwa Akademickie Żak.
- Łęcki, Krzysztof. 2000. "Socjologia literatury." Pp. 163-155 in *Literatura polska XX wieku. Przewodnik encyklopedyczny*, edited by A. Hutnikiewicz and A. Lam. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Łęcki, Krzysztof. 2012. *Inny zapis: „sekretny dziennik pisarza jako przedmiot rozważań socjologicznych na przykładzie dzienników Stefana Kisielewskiego*. Katowice: Uniwersytet Śląski.
- Łęcki, Krzysztof. 2019. *Według Tukidydesa. Rozważania socjologia literatury nad wojną peloponeską*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Łukasiuk, Magdalena. 2011. "Socjologia architektury w badaniach krajobrazu kulturowego miasta." *Przegląd Socjologiczny* 60(2-3):93-109.

- Łukasiuk, Magdalena. 2015. "Lokalność w kontekście architektury i atmosfery." *Societas/Communitas* 19-20(1-2):225-236.
- Łukasiuk, Magdalena. 2017. "Interakcje z architekturą: społeczne sprawstwo zabudowy." *Kultura Popularna* 52(2):44-54.
- Majer, Andrzej. 2020. *Miasto według socjologii. Wybrane tematy*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Matuchniak-Krasuska, Anna. 1984. "O interpretacji obrazu. Socjologiczne studium recepcji malarstwa." *Kultura i Społeczeństwo* 2:191-210.
- Matuchniak-Krasuska, Anna. 1988. *Gust i kompetencja. Społeczne zróżnicowanie recepcji malarstwa*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Matuchniak-Krasuska, Anna. 1999. *Publiczność wobec metafory plastycznej. O recepcji groteski Jerzego Dudy-Gracza*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Matuchniak-Krasuska, Anna. 2010. *Zarys socjologii sztuki Pierre'a Bourdieu*. Warsaw: Oficyna Naukowa.
- Matuchniak-Mystkowska, Anna. 2014. *Za drutami oflagów. Studium socjologiczne*. Opole: Centrum Muzeum Jeńców Wojennych w Łambinowicach-Opolu.
- Mika, Bogumiła. 2010. "Anwesend – abwesend. Zur Rezeption der Musik Alfred Schnittkes." Pp. 51-67 in *Polen in Alfred Schnittke – Analyse, Interpretation, Rezeption (essay collection)*, edited by A. Flechsig and C. Storch. Hildesheim, Zürich, New York: Georg Olms Verlag.
- Możdżyński, Paweł. 2011. *Inicjacje i transgresje. Antystrukturalność sztuki XX i XXI wieku w oczach socjologa*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- Możdżyński, Paweł. 2015. "Transformacje w sztuce polskiej po 1989: Rekonfiguracje i dezorientacja. Pole sztuk plastycznych w Polsce 1989–2015." *Sztuka i Dokumentacja* 13:11-28.
- Nieroba, Elżbieta. 2018. "National Museums and Museums of Modern Art in Poland – Competition for Domination in the Field of Museums." *Muzeologia a kultúrne dedičstvo* 2:45-58.
- Nieroba, Elżbieta. 2019. "Muzeum jako przestrzeń dialogu. O koncepcji zwrotu edukacyjnego w muzeum." *Kultura Współczesna* 2:106-115.
- Niziołek, Katarzyna. 2015. *Sztuka społeczna. Koncepcje – dyskursy – praktyki*. Białystok: Wydział Historyczno-Socjologiczny Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku, Fundacja Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku Universitas Bialostocensis.
- Nowicki, Jacek. 1980. *Kształt przestrzeni mieszkalnej*. Warsaw: Zakład Wydawnictw CZSR.
- Olechnicki, Krzysztof, ed. 2003a. *Obrazy w działaniu*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika.
- Olechnicki, Krzysztof. 2003b. *Antropologia obrazu. Fotografia jako metoda, przedmiot i medium nauk społecznych*. Warsaw: Oficyna Naukowa.
- Ossowski, Stanisław. 1966. "U podstaw estetyki." Vol. 1. In *Dzieła*, Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Pabjan, Barbara. 2010. "The Reception of Chopin and His Music in Polish Society." *International Review of the Aesthetics and Sociology of Music* 41(2):343-378.
- Pelkowska, Małgorzata. 2010. "Dziewczęta Przeszanowne." *Sztuka i Dokumentacja* 3:65-69.
- Pęczak, Mirosław. 1992. *Mały słownik subkultur młodzieżowych*. Warsaw: Semper.
- Pietraszewski, Igor. 2012. *Jazz w Polsce. Wolność improwizowana*. Cracow: Zakład Wydawniczy Nomos
- Porczyński, Dominik. 2017. "Rola muzeów w budowie konkurencyjności samorządów lokalnych województwa podkarpackiego." *UR Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences* 4(3):67-89.
- Porczyński, Dominik and Agata Gajdek. 2019. "Trwanie granic rozumowych w praktykach, kolekcjach i krajobrazie. W poszukiwaniu punktów stykowych socjologii, muzeologii i architektury krajobrazu." *Politeja* 58(1):311-340.
- Porczyński, Dominik and Lenka Vargova. 2019. "Between an object and a tale: Strategies of local narratives construction in semi-peripheral museums." *Opuscula Musealia* 26:173-182.
- Porczyński, Dominik and Lenka Vargova. 2020. "Museum education in semi-peripheries: social, cultural and economic aspects of the globalisation of Polish and Slovak heritage institutions." *Muzeologia a kultúrne dedičstvo* 2:31-54.
- Przywojska, Justyna. 2016. *Rewitalizacja miast. Aspekt społeczny*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Ricoeur, Paul. 1975. *Egzystencja i hermeneutyka: rozprawa o metodzie*. Warsaw: Pax.

- Rogowski, Łukasz. 2015. "Estetyki lokalności. Miejska ikonosfera w perspektywie zwrotu przestrzennego." Pp. 11-20 in *Miasto w oczach ludzi. Wizualność współczesnej ikonosfery miejskiej*, edited by J. Kubera and Ł. Rogowski. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Adama Mickiewicza.
- Rokuszewska-Pawełek, Alicja. 1983. "Potoczny odbiór literatury popularnej na przykładzie społecznej recepcji powieści kryminalnej." *Kultura i Społeczeństwo* 1:99-112.
- Rybczyński, Witold. 1996. *Dom. Krótka historia idei*. Gdańsk, Warszawa: Volumen.
- Rybczyński, Witold. 2003. *Najpiękniejszy dom na świecie*. Cra-cow: Wydawnictwo Literackie.
- Rychlewski, Marcin. 2011. *Revolucja rocka. Semiotyczne wy-miary elektrycznej ekstazy*. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Oficynka.
- Sinewali, Veronika. 2010. *Gentryfikacja. Lokatorzy w ogniu woj-ny socjalnej*. Poznań: Oficyna Wydawnicza "Bractwo Trojka."
- Sosnowska, Anna. 2016. *Polski Greenpoint a Nowy Jork. Gen-tryfikacja, stosunki etniczne i imigrancki rynek pracy na prze-łomie XX i XXI wieku*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.
- Stachura, Ewa. 2009. *Determinanty zmian w architekturze miesz-kaniowej okresu transformacji w Polsce*. Gliwice: Wydawnictwo Politechniki Śląskiej.
- Stetkiewicz, Lucyna. 2011. *Kulturowi wszytkożercy sięgają po książkę. Czytelnictwo ludyczne jako forma uczestnictwa w kulturze literackiej*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UMK.
- Stępnik, Małgorzata. 2010. *Stanisława Ossowskiego koncepcja so-cjologii sztuki*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Skło-dowskiej-Curie.
- Sulikowska-Dejena, Agata. 2017. "Doświadczenie codzien-ności jako klucz do świata artystek: o wartościach w sztuce współczesnej." *Kultura i Wartości* 3:61-72.
- Sulikowska-Dejana, Agata. 2020. "Przemiany ról społecznych w polskim świecie artystycznym po 2000 roku." *Młoda Huma-nistyka* 2:1-17. Retrieved August 16, 2021 (<http://www.humanistyka.com/index.php/MH/article/view/170/148>).
- Sułkowski, Bogusław. 1972. *Powieść i czytelnicy. Społeczne uwa-runkowanie zjawisk odbioru*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Sułkowski, Bogusław. 1983. "Artyści-dyletanci w wielkim mie-ście przemysłowym." *Kultura i Społeczeństwo* 27:151-163.
- Sułkowski, Bogusław. 1994. *Hanletyzowanie nasze. Socjologia sztuki, polityki i codzienności*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersy-tetu Łódzkiego.
- Sułkowski, Bogusław. 1996. "Rzecz o socjologii sztuk na pery-feriach estetyki." *Przegląd Humanistyczny* 2:51-59.
- Sułkowski, Bogusław. 2008. "Dzisiejsze pola i fronty socjologii sztuki a program Stanisława Ossowskiego." *Przegląd Humani-styczny* 52:21-36.
- Szlendak, Tomasz. 1998. *Technomania. Cyberplemię w zwierciadle socjologii*. Toruń: Graffiti BC.
- Szlendak, Tomasz and Krzysztof Olechnicki. 2014. "Megace-remoniały i subświaty. O potransformacyjnych przemianach uczestnictwa Polaków w kulturze." *Ruch Prawniczy, Ekonomicz-ny i Socjologiczny* 2:293-308.
- Szlendak, Tomasz and Krzysztof Olechnicki. 2017. *Nowe prakty-ki kulturowe Polaków*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Ślęzak, Izabela. 2009. *Stawanie się poetą. Analiza interakcjonistycz-no-symboliczna. Przegląd Socjologii Jakościowej* 5(1).
- Tatarkiewicz, Władysław. 1991. *Historia estetyki, T. 3, Estetyka nowożytna*. Warszawa: Arkady.
- Wagner, Izabela. 2015. *Producing Excellence: The Making of Virtu-osos*. New Jersey, New Brunswick, London: Rutgers Press.
- Wallis, Aleksander. 1967. "The city and its symbols." *The Polish Sociological Bulletin* 1:35-43.
- Wallis, Aleksander. 1970. "Spatial arrangement of culture." *Society and Leisure* 2:48-77.
- Wallis, Aleksander. 1977a. *Miasto i przestrzeń*. Warszawa: Pań-stwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Wallis, Aleksander. 1977b. "Społeczeństwo i zabytki." *Miesięcz-nik Literacki* 1:59-66.
- Wallis, Aleksander. 1979. *Informacja i gwar. O miejskim centrum*. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
- Wańtuch-Matla, Dorota. 2016. *Przestrzeń publiczna 2.0. Miasto u progu XXI wieku*. Łódź: Księży Młyn Dom Wydawniczy.

- Warzywoda-Kruszyńska, Wielisława. 2015. "Katedra Socjologii Sztuki." Pp. 186-191 in *Szkoły naukowe i kierunki badań na Wydziale Ekonomiczno-Socjologicznym Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego. Tradycja i współczesność*, edited by J. Grotowska-Leder and E. Kwiatkowski. Lodz: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Wejbert-Wąsiewicz, Ewelina. 2017. *Bez retuszu czy po liftingu? Obrazy starości i aborcji w filmie*. Lodz: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Wejbert-Wąsiewicz, Ewelina. 2019. "Łódzka szkoła socjologii kultury. Od badań odbioru sztuk werbalnych do sztuk wizualnych." *Kultura i Społeczeństwo* 3:75-92.
- Wejbert-Wąsiewicz, Ewelina and Emilia Zimnica-Kuzioła. 2018a. "Polish Sociology of Art. (Theatre and Film). Traditions and Trends." Pp. 46-55 in *Emerging Trends in Economics, Culture and Humanities-etECH2018. Conference proceedings*, Riga.
- Wejbert-Wąsiewicz, Ewelina and Emilia Zimnica-Kuzioła. 2018b. "Theater and Film as a subject of Polish Sociological Researches." Pp. 65-74 in *Slavonic and East European Studies: Traditions and Transformations*, edited by I. Diadko and M. Isaienkova. Warsaw: IRF Press.
- Wertenstein-Żuławski, Jerzy. 1990. *To tylko rock'n'roll*. Warsaw: Zarząd Główny Polskich Autorów i Kompozytorów ZAKR.
- Wertenstein-Żuławski, Jerzy and Mirosław Pęczak. 1991. *Spontaniczna kultura młodzieżowa. Wybrane zjawiska*. Wrocław: Fundacja dla Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego – Wiedza o Kulturze.
- Wiszniewski, Jacek. 2011. "Responsibility of the architect to the local community." *Architectus* 30(2):63-67.
- Wiśniewski, Rafał. 2016. *Transgresja kompetencji międzykulturowych. Studium socjologiczne młodzieży akademickiej*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Kardynała Stefana Wyszyńskiego.
- Wiśniewski, Rafał and Tomasz Kukołowicz. 2017. "Pięć kierunków poszerzania pola kultury, czyli uwagi o współczesnej polityce kulturalnej." Pp. 95-229 in *Pomorskie poszerzenie pola kultury: dylematy – konteksty – działania?*, edited by C. Obrachta-Prondzyński and P. Zbieranek. Gdansk: Uniwersytet Gdański.
- Wiśniewski, Rafał and Izabela Bukalska. 2020. "The Interactive Dimension of Creating Cultural Artifacts Using Agile Methodologies." *Qualitative Sociology Review* 4:198-210. Retrieved August 16, 2021 (http://www.qualitativesociologyreview.org/ENG/index_eng.php).
- Wyrzykowska, Katarzyna. 2012. "Muzyka w relacjach społecznych. O integrującej funkcji muzyki na przykładzie kultury afroamerykańskiej, Horyzonty kultury: pomiędzy ciągłością a zmianą." Pp. 431-447 in *Horyzonty kultury: pomiędzy ciągłością a zmianą. Tom jubileuszowy dedykowany Profesor Elżbiecie Reklajtis*, edited by M. Szupejko and R. Wiśniewski. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Kardynała Stefana Wyszyńskiego.
- Wyrzykowska, Katarzyna M. 2017. *Muzyka, młodzież i styl życia. O uczestnictwie w kulturze muzycznej warszawskiej młodzieży*. Warsaw: Warszawskie Wydawnictwo Socjologiczne.
- Wyrzykowska, Katarzyna and Ziemowit Socha. 2016. *Dynamika karier muzyków w obszarze całego środowiska muzycznego*. Warsaw: Polska Rada Muzyczna.
- Zimnica-Kuzioła, Emilia. 2018. *Społeczny świat teatru. Areny polskich publicznych teatrów dramatycznych*. Lodz: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Zimnica-Kuzioła, Emilia. 2020. *Aktorzy polskich publicznych teatrów dramatycznych. Studium socjologiczne*. Lodz: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Ziółkowska, Emilia. 2017. "Program funkcjonalny wewnątrz rezydencji a model rodziny burżuazji warszawskiej w okresie popowstaniowym." Pp. 191-218 in *Architektura w mieście, architektura dla miasta. Społeczne i kulturowe aspekty funkcjonowania architektury na ziemiach polskich lat 1815-1914*, edited by M. Getka-Kenig and A. Łupienko. Warsaw: Instytut Historii PAN.
- Znanecki, Florian. 1937. "Rola Społeczna Artysty." *Wiedza i Życie* 12(8-9):503-517.
- Znanecki, Florian. 1945. "Social Organization and Institutions." Pp. 172-217 in *Twentieth Century Sociology*, edited by G. Gurvich and W. E. Moore. New York: The Philosophical Library.
- Znanecki, Florian. 1954. "Social Groups in the Modern World." Pp. 125-140 in *Freedom and control in modern society*, edited by M. Berger, T. Abel, and C. H. Page. New York: D. van Nostrand Company, Inc.
- Znanecki, Florian. 1963. *Cultural Sciences. Their Origin and Development*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Znanecki, Florian. 2011. *Relacje społeczne i role społeczne*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Zolberg, Vera. 1999. *Constructing a Sociology of the Arts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Citation

Wejbert-Wąsiewicz, Ewelina, Dominik Porczyński and Agata Rozalska. 2021. "On Contemporary Issues in the Sociology of Art: Introduction." *Przegląd Socjologii Jakościowej* 17(3):6-26. Retrieved Month, Year (www.przehladsocjologiijakosciowej.org). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18778/1733-8069.17.3.01>

O współczesnych problemach w socjologii sztuki. Wprowadzenie

Abstrakt: We wstępie do niniejszego wydania „Przeglądu Socjologii Jakościowej” podejmujemy próbę scharakteryzowania współczesnego pola socjologii sztuki w Polsce. Punkt wyjścia stanowią cztery generacje socjologii sztuki zdefiniowane przez Nathalie Heinich oraz identyfikacja czterech podstawowych elementów: dzieła sztuki oraz jego recepcji, artysty i procesu twórczego, odbiorców oraz ram społeczno-instytucjonalnych. Podejmujemy się próby zakreslenia ram czasowych subdyscypliny, wskazując jako jej początki w kraju prace Stanisława Ossowskiego (socjologia sztuki sensu largo), Floriana Znanięckiego (socjologia artysty). Definiujemy także specyficzny status socjologii sztuki w Polsce jako subdyscypliny socjologii kultury oraz jej wzajemne relacje z innymi naukami. Analizujemy wyodrębnianie się środowisk naukowych, pojawianie się i zanikanie specjalności badawczych w ciągu ponad 80 lat. Dodatkowo wskazujemy białe plamy oraz obszary tematyczne i perspektywy, które dopiero się rozwijają. Zdajemy sobie sprawę, że w ramach jednego tekstu trudno jest wyczerpać problem historii i statusu socjologii sztuki w Polsce, stąd naszym celem jest raczej wskazanie wątków, perspektyw i idei w celu rozpoczęcia dyskusji na ten temat.

Słowa kluczowe: socjologia sztuki, socjologia w Polsce, światy sztuki, tradycje badawcze, kierunki badań