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Scholars have used a variety of labels to describe broad social and cultural changes characteristic of Western societies since the 1950s, such as postmodernism, consumerism, individualization, and globalization, to name only a few. Accompanying such broad changes, scholars also contend that traditional cultural hierarchies (i.e. “high culture”) have been eroded by the “massification of elite culture” (Lash 1990), as well as through declining cohesiveness among elites (DiMaggio 1991, 1992) and increasing eclecticism in their cultural preferences (Peterson and Kern 1996). Meanwhile, the concomitant commercialization of cultural fields, including those that deal in high culture (e.g. symphony orchestras), has been associated with factors ranging from the growing market orientation of arts professionals (Peterson 1986; DiMaggio 1986, 1991) to the rise of consumption practices as a source of individual and collective identity (Featherstone 1991, Zukin and Maguire 2004). In addition to declining hierarchy and commercialization of the arts, others point to the rapid expansion in the volume and variety of cultural goods available in the global marketplace, which has intensified and destabilized global cultural flows (Appadurai 1996; Tomlinson 1999).

The changes described above have consequences for cultural classification systems, by which I mean the ways that societies classify cultural products and develop associated norms and practices. As a result of such changes, cultural classification systems in Western societies appear to have become less hierarchical, more differentiated, more weakly bounded, less universally shared, more market-oriented, and more international since the 1950s. Yet at the same time, comparative research suggests that the timing of such shifts and the degree to which cultural hierarchies have diminished varies considerably cross-nationally (for example, see Lamont and Thévenot 2000). In the chapters that follow, I seek to expand on comparative research on cultural classification systems by focusing on musical
categories and hierarchies in the US, Germany, France, and the Netherlands from 1955 to 2005. Additionally, I build on recent studies of cultural consecration and legitimating discourse to examine the ways in which certain popular music albums achieve consecrated status in the United States. In cases of classification and consecration, I consider how the symbolic boundaries that distinguish legitimate musical categories from illegitimate ones or consecrated albums from the unconsecrated albums are related to social boundaries based on gender.

Music provides an interesting case with which to explore broader changes in cultural classification systems because it is a field of cultural production that has experienced considerable transformations during the study period. Among other changes, scholars suggest that this period has witnessed an increased mixing of musical styles (Erlmann 2003, Stokes 2004), a proliferation of musical genres (Negus 1997), a decline in the honorific status of classical music (DiMaggio 1991, 1992; Dowd et al 2002), the widespread acceptance of jazz music as a legitimate art form (Lopes 2002), as well as the globalization and valorization of popular musical forms like rock ‘n’ roll and rap (Regev 1994, 1997; Mitchell 2001). However, the degree to which certain popular musical forms have become widely accepted as having artistic merit differs across time and space (Phillips and Owens 2004; Bevers 2005).

Corresponding to the substantive chapters that follow, the central research questions driving this dissertation can thus be stated:

1. To what degree has popular music, in general, gained cultural status and what musical categories, in particular, have become more or less legitimate over time and across countries? What role has critical discourse (e.g. newspaper coverage) played in formalizing, diffusing, and legitimating musical categories in the four countries?
2. How tightly coupled are musical and social categories during the period of study and across each of the four countries? In other words, how closely linked are symbolic boundaries in the popular music field to social boundaries based on gender and how does the relationship vary by country?
3. What forms of cultural legitimacy affect consecration in the field of popular music? Why are some albums placed among “the greatest of all time” instead of others?
4. How are various forms of cultural legitimacy distributed by gender in the popular music and how does this impact the likelihood that female musicians are consecrated? What are the discursive strategies employed to legitimate consecrated artists and how does this discourse differ for male and female musicians?

In the next section, I discuss the key theoretical considerations relevant to the questions raised regarding the classification and consecration of popular music. Following the theoretical considerations, I briefly address the cross-national comparative aspects of this project and then give a basic overview of the data and methods used in each of the empirical chapters that follow. I conclude with a brief summary that recaps the basic findings of each chapter, reflects on the implications of the findings, and offers suggestions about directions for further research.

**Theoretical considerations**

*Cultural classification systems*

Systems of classification have long been a central theme in sociological thought. For Durkheim (1965 [1915]), society provides the individual with the classifying categories that correspond with the prevailing social order. The familiar Durkheimian distinction between “sacred” and “profane,” for example, represents a set of shared mental categories that emerges from collective totemic rites and social participation. Although Bergesen (2004) has recently highlighted findings regarding the cognitive architecture of infants that call into question the mechanism whereby Durkheim proposes mental categories originate, comparative research makes clear that humans acquire the cultural material that generates and reinforces classification systems. Thus, despite the possibility of a “pre-social” cognitive structure, the content and meaning of social and cultural boundaries is the product of shared experience, cultural categories, and existing social arrangements.

In her application of Durkheim’s insights concerning mental categories, Douglas (1986) refers to the shared cognition created by a social group’s classification system as a “thought world”. The thought world helps establish and reinforce the
correctness of social categories and symbolic boundaries. Similarly, an “art world” (Becker 1982) produces and sustains the conventions and categories associated with artistic classification systems. Just as members of society are socialized into the social order and its correspondent thought world, art worlds instruct their participants in the standards and knowledge necessary for legitimate involvement in its activities. Among the lessons learned through socialization into an art world are how to classify and evaluate art works and their creators as well as where the symbolic boundary that separates “art” from “non-art” is appropriately drawn.

Yet such classifications are not permanently fixed and symbolic boundaries are not static. Rather, they often vary in many ways from one social group to another and they can change over time. In the 19th century United States, for example, classical music was not highly differentiated from or ranked above other musical forms (Levine 1988, DiMaggio 1982). Through nonprofit arts organizations, like the Boston Symphony Orchestra, urban elites successfully sacralized classical music and distinguished “high” culture from its “lesser” relatives (DiMaggio 1982). As this organizational form spread to other cultural forms and other American cities, the boundary separating “high” culture from “lowbrow” popular culture gained potency and widespread endorsement by the 1920s (DiMaggio 1991). Curricula at elite colleges further reinforced the privileged position of high cultural forms like classical music (DiMaggio 1982).

In his theory of artistic classification systems, DiMaggio (1987) suggests four dimensions along which such systems differ at the societal level as well as several social structural factors that might affect each dimension. For one, artistic classification systems can vary in their differentiation, or the degree to which genres are institutionally bounded. Art worlds that are highly segmented with many identifiable genres are highly differentiated. Second, artistic classification systems can vary in the degree to which genres are ranked by prestige, which is an indicator of hierarchy. In more hierarchical systems, genres diverge widely in prestige and command unequal resources. A third dimension of variation is universality, or the
degree to which there is agreement among members of a society in the ways they recognize and classify genres. Finally, artistic classification systems can vary in their boundary strength, or the degree to which genre boundaries are highly ritualized and difficult to transgress. Thus, as classical music became sacralized in the US, we could say that musical classifications went from being relatively undifferentiated, weakly bounded, less hierarchical, and provincial to being differentiated, strongly bounded, hierarchical, and widely accepted in American society. In Bourdieu’s (1984) terms, classical music attained the status of “legitimate culture” and other musical forms became more or less conspicuously excluded from this designation.

A related point of interest concerns the extent to which popular music has more recently gained in cultural status within such systems and perhaps acquired the honorific designation of art, a process that some label “aesthetic mobility” to indicate movement up the classification hierarchy. Because classification systems are always subject to change, DiMaggio (1987) suggests that they must continually reenact both their organizational and cognitive components. In considering the factors that enable cultural forms to gain legitimacy, sociologists have paid particular attention to the role of social change in creating an opportunity space for ascendant art forms (DiMaggio 1992; Peterson 1994) and to the institutionalization of resources by actors within a cultural field (Becker 1982). Such research tends to accentuate the organizational components of aesthetic classification systems relative to their cognitive ones. Somewhat less empirical research has focused on the role of a legitimating ideology in articulating and circulating claims to artistic worth (Baumann 2001, 2007). This relative inattention is surprising given evident empirical regularities. In arenas as disparate as the US stock market (Zuckerman 1999) and the French gastronomic field (Ferguson 1998), critics play a central role in the development and dispersal of classification systems and the legitimate categories they entail. As such, critical discourse represents a key site where the cognitive components of classification systems are publicly enacted and thereby legitimated.
Critical discourse and cultural legitimacy

For some time, sociologists have considered the role of critics in the reception and interpretation of a variety of cultural forms, objects, and producers. Whether as “tastemakers” (Lynes 1954), “gatekeepers” (Hirsch 1972), “intermediate consumers” (Griswold 1987), or “reputational entrepreneurs” (Fine 1996), critics are generally thought to impact the reputation and often the commercial success of cultural products. Through their discourse, aestheticians and critics create the ideological systems by which artists and their products are classified and evaluated (Becker 1982); they signal the legitimacy of an object or idea and often indicate the appropriate category into which it can be classified (Zuckerman 1999). As such, criticism is a vital component in the institutional apparatus of contemporary art worlds. However, little is known about the conditions under which critical discourse has a more or less pronounced impact on the legitimacy of cultural products, although aspects of the broader classification system are likely to shape the scope of its influence.

Many have suggested that the influence of critics is likely to be more pronounced in elite art worlds in which their role is more highly institutionalized relative to non-elite art worlds (Lang 1958; Bourdieu 1984; Shrum 1991, 1996), where their standing and expertise is reinforced through academic programs at institutions of higher education (DiMaggio 1982; Bauman 2001), or where audience members are unclear about the appropriate evaluative criteria (e.g. abstract art, see Greenfield 1989). At the same time, many “non-elite” art worlds have developed a stable critical apparatus, increasingly found place at institutions of higher education, and created systems of expertise that reduce ambiguity among audience members regarding the appropriate standards of art.

In the case of film in the United States, for example, Baumann (2001) shows that film criticism became highly institutionalized and that film studies programs at universities proliferated. Furthermore, this study highlighted the impact of critical discourse in the apparent aesthetic mobility of American film, which has been
extended to other popular cultural forms as well. In his seminal study, Baumann (2001) shows that the intellectualizing discourse of film critics, who over the years increasingly drew on terminology (e.g. “art”, “genius”) and reviewing techniques (e.g. director is named and compared with other directors) associated with high culture, contributed to the valorization of film in the US. That is, their discourse increasingly treated film as an art form rather than as mere entertainment. Likewise, television reviews appear to have become more intellectual and to have increasingly drawn on “high art” discourse in recent years (Bielby, Moloney, and Ngo 2005).

Similar arguments, albeit with less empirical substantiation, have been put forward about the role of rock critics in creating a legitimating ideology for popular music. In particular, Regev (1994) argues that American and British rock critics of the 1960s were influential in identifying a canon of rock performers who -- as “autonomous artists” -- fit within the existing parameters of art. Since that time, the role of critics has become highly institutionalized in popular music, extending not only to specialty publications (Jones 2002; Lindberg et al. 2005) but to elite newspapers as well (Janssen 1999; Janssen et al. 2008). Perhaps as a result, expert evaluation came to play a more prominent role in the popular music field. Greenfield (1989) argued that critical experts become more influential in fields like abstract art because audiences are not sure how to appraise aesthetic value. However, critics can exert influence as experts in popular music when the distinction between certain types of music is ambiguous. Thus, Macan (1997) argues that rock critics negatively affected the aesthetic legitimacy of progressive rock music by distinguishing it from the “authentic” form of rock created by its canonical figures. As the above examples suggest, some scholars have arguably understated the role of critical discourse in popular cultural genres.

Indeed, while the role of critics and their discourse may vary across elite vs. non-elite art worlds, it is perhaps more likely to vary across countries. In a study of popular music album reviews in the US, Germany, and the Netherlands, van Venrooij and Schmutz (forthcoming) demonstrate that intellectualizing discourse is
present in popular music criticism, but to varying degrees. While popular music reviewers in elite newspapers do draw on “high art” discourse, the prevalence of “high art” versus “popular” aesthetic criteria varies considerably across countries. Thus, it appears that the role of critics in legitimating popular music may differ in each country and is likely associated with broader cultural classifications and hierarchies. By taking a comparative approach, I aim to directly address the relationship between critical discourse and the cultural legitimacy of popular music in each country.

Legitimacy is a widely used concept that has been defined in numerous ways. An influential characterization comes from Suchman (1995) who defines legitimacy as “a generalized perception or assumption that the actions of an entity are desirable, proper, or appropriate within some socially constructed system of norms, values, beliefs, and definitions” (574). Drawing on this and other definitions in the sociological literature, Johnson, Dowd, and Ridgeway (2006) conceive of legitimacy as a social process whereby an innovation becomes locally validated, then diffused more broadly, and eventually achieves general validation or widespread acceptance. From this perspective, legitimacy is a multidimensional, gradual, and processual phenomenon. Thus, it is important to clarify the extent to which certain musical forms have achieved legitimacy (e.g. local vs. general validation) as well as the process by which this occurs.

In several ways, critics can be seen as relevant to the stages identified in this general process of legitimation. For one, critical attention itself can be an indication that a particular innovation is legitimate. Consider, for example, that when relatively new American firms conduct initial public offerings, the number of reviews the firm receives is positively associated with its stock price regardless of the tenor of such reviews (Pollock and Rindova 2003). The long-term success of a firm, however, requires continued attention and favorable evaluations from securities analysts (Zuckerman 1999). Thus, critical recognition itself can be an important source of initial validation, but sustained attention is required to achieve general validation.
As a cultural form moves from local to general validation, critics often play a role in formalizing and diffusing the criteria by which the objects of their attention are classified and evaluated. Ferguson (1998) details how an “expansive culinary discourse” formalized the gastronomic field in France and diffused its accepted products, values, and conventions. In the process, culinary texts brought general validation to gastronomy and secured its prestigious position in the French cultural hierarchy. Thus, critics in a wide variety of organizational and cultural fields can play a significant role at each stage in the legitimation process.

Newspaper coverage provides an especially appealing basis for obtaining comparative information about musical classification systems and the legitimating ideology that sustains them. As Peterson suggests (2005), it represents a plentiful and accessible data source for making longitudinal, cross-national comparisons. Whereas newspaper coverage is a relatively visible and widely circulated venue for music discourse, there are often other sources of less conspicuous but highly influential writing about music. In the case of jazz music, enthusiasts created an underground network of newsletters, fanzines, and other material, while critics writing for both specialty magazines (e.g. Metronome, Down Beat) and mainstream periodicals (Harper’s, Esquire) also worked to legitimate jazz as an art form (Lopes 2002). Likewise, early rock critics writing for alternative or specialty publications (e.g. Creem, Rolling Stone, and Crawdaddy in the US; Musikexpress in Germany; Rock & Folk and Best in France; and Oor in the Netherlands) were influential in creating the aesthetic standards associated with authentic and artistic rock music (Regev 1994; Macan 1997). In both cases, a thriving underground press was vital in articulating and circulating claims of artistic worth for jazz and rock music.

In the process of legitimating popular music forms, we might consider such limited circulation publications as a key source of local validation. As their claims become more widely diffused through publications with wider circulation and eventually national newspapers, some music genres achieve general validation. By focusing on newspaper coverage and other forms of critical discourse about music in
the four countries, this study aims to clarify the role of critics in developing an ideology that formalizes, diffuses, and legitimates cultural categories. In addition, I seek to understand the impact such discourse has on the status of popular music, in general, and the reputation of particular musical products and their creators, in particular. By examining the relationship between critical discourse and the cultural standing of popular music in different national contexts, our understanding of the conditions under which critics are more or less able to influence the legitimacy of cultural forms can be enhanced.

Other forms of cultural legitimacy

Critical discourse is certainly not the only means by which cultural products are classified and evaluated. One weakness of many studies that address the impact of critics is that they do not consider the relative influence of other types of recognition on the outcomes they attribute to critical acclaim. In any field of cultural production, Bourdieu (1993) argues that bourgeois, specific, and popular forms of cultural legitimacy compete to define its preferred forms, products and producers. Critical discourse can be seen as a form of bourgeois legitimacy bestowed by “reputational entrepreneurs” who, as agents of the dominant class, possess the requisite institutional resources to diffuse their assessments (Fine 1996). Newspaper coverage and the other forms of critical discourse are the main indicators of bourgeois legitimacy in this study. Specific legitimacy, by contrast, is achieved through professional recognition, conferred on artists or their works by other creative personnel in their field of production. In the field of music, professional academies confer such legitimacy on the musical forms and participants they recognize. An occasion when this is particularly evident is when academies conduct award ceremonies to honor exemplars in various musical categories. In the US, for example, the National Academy of the Recording Arts and Sciences began giving Grammy Awards in 1958 to give what they saw as recognition “based on excellence rather than merely on popular recognition” (Franks 1996, 167). As Anand and Watson
(2004) argue, events like the Grammy Awards distribute prestige in a ceremonial fashion that is intended to attract the attention of the musical field. In this way, professional associations shape cultural classifications by enhancing the esteem of particular musical categories and specific actors in the field.

Finally, popular legitimacy is acquired through public acclaim. In the musical field, charts like those featured in *Billboard*, which track the commercial success of musicians and their works (e.g. album sales), are an important source of this type of legitimacy. The *Billboard* music charts act as potent “sensemaking” devices in the commercial music industry, providing a routine way for actors to sort through the voluminous and often ambiguous information about the music market (Anand and Peterson 2000). In this way, *Billboard* focuses the attention of the field and profoundly impacts the way recording firms and other organizations distribute both symbolic and economic resources.

In the US, some studies have tried to compare the effects of these competing forms of legitimacy on the reputations of films (Allen and Lincoln 2004; Hicks and Petrova 2006). Although both studies found support for the notion that critical recognition enhances the standing of cultural products, they also found that certain measures of professional and popular acclaim enhance the status of films in some instances. Yet the conditions under which critical assessments and competing forms of cultural legitimacy become more or less salient are not directly addressed. By giving heed to the broader cultural classification systems in each country, the present study may help explain why certain forms of cultural legitimacy are more or less influential at different times and in different places. By considering Bourdieu’s (1993) competing forms of legitimacy, this study seeks to elucidate how critics interact and contend with a variety of classifications and conceptions of artistic worth.
Social and symbolic boundaries

Closely related to scholarship on classification systems is a vast and growing social scientific literature that deals with the study of boundaries (for a review, see Lamont and Molnár 2002). Classification systems rely on conceptual distinctions, or symbolic boundaries, that sort people, places, and things into their correct categories. Sociologists have used the notion of symbolic boundaries to explain the relational processes by which people distinguish between a variety of phenomena, such as occupational groups (Lamont 1992), social class and racial groups (Lamont 2000), and even music genres (Bryson 1996). Such boundaries often serve to symbolically exclude categories that are seen as less desirable, unworthy, or illegitimate (Douglas 1966, 1986; Boudieu 1984; Lamont 1992). Yet Lamont and Molnár (2002) call attention to the difference between the conceptual distinctions that constitute symbolic boundaries and social boundaries, which involve objectified forms of social inequality associated with unequal access to material and nonmaterial resources. They go on to argue that, while many scholars have considered the interplay between symbolic and social boundaries, the conditions under which the two are likely to be more or less closely linked are not well understood.

Musical classifications involve symbolic boundaries that have historically varied in how tightly coupled they are with social boundaries, such as race or gender (Dowd and Blyler 2002, Roy 2004, Dowd et al 2005). In the early US recording industry, for example, Roy (2004) shows how musical categories were overtly racialized and thereby tied to social categories. “Race records” and “hillbilly music” were constructed musical categories by which the major recording firms explicitly linked musical styles to social characteristics, primarily to race but also to class. Although the separation of the two categories had little to do with musical differences, the organizational division diffused to other firms and became institutionalized. Thus, symbolic boundaries (i.e. music genres) and social boundaries (i.e. race) became tightly coupled in the field of American popular music with long-term consequences. De facto segregation of the musician’s union and of
radio airplay likewise hindered the success of African American performers in the mainstream US music market (Dowd and Blyler 2002). Although musical categories have become less overtly racialized over time (Dowd and Blyler 2002, Roy 2004), they continue to produce racial disparities in access to resources and recording contracts (Negus 1999).

Likewise, symbolic boundaries linked to gender have constrained opportunities for women in the music industry (Dowd et al. 2005). In Vienna during Beethoven’s time, piano playing and musical “genius” became closely associated with masculinity, which virtually eliminated prospects for women in public performance (DeNora 1995). More recently, the masculinization of many popular music genres has meant few openings for women in jazz bands (Green 1997; Porter 2002), rock and heavy metal groups (Walser 1993; Clawson 1999), rap performance (Neal 2004), and so on. Although some opportunities have opened up for women – in alternative rock and punk bands (Clawson 1999; Leblanc 1999) or as rap artists (Keyes 2004), for instance – women continue to be underrepresented in the mainstream music industry (Menger 1999; Dowd et al. 2005). Further, the degree to which prospects have improved for women varies cross-nationally, as in the case of female rap performers in England and Germany (Bennett 2004). By giving heed to the relationship between musical categories and social categories based on gender, this project seeks to enhance our understanding of the link between symbolic and social boundaries and how that relationship varies over time and across countries.

The symbolic boundaries that differentiate music genres are not the only distinctions of interest. Symbolic divisions also separate music that is legitimate from music that is illegitimate, music that is newsworthy from music that is unworthy of media attention, music that wins prestigious awards from music that is undeserving of such esteem. Such divisions may transcend generic boundaries, but reinforce social boundaries based on gender. The relationship between musical boundaries and social boundaries is likely to vary and have different consequences depending on characteristics of the larger classification system. For instance, Roy’s (2004) typology
implies that hierarchical and strongly bounded systems are likely to produce social segregation in cultural fields, while less hierarchical and weakly bounded systems will yield more social integration. By looking over time and cross-nationally at the relationship between musical and social boundaries, the project can evaluate this claim and explore the conditions under which such boundaries become more or less tightly coupled.

*Cultural consecration*

One of the most potent symbolic boundaries in cultural fields is that which separates a select few of its “greatest” exemplars from its numerous others. Many sociologists have addressed the ways in which cultural producers and products achieve and maintain such a celebrated status. Bourdieu (1984, p. 6) used the term consecration to refer to the process whereby a “magical division” is constructed between the “pure” and “sacred” artistic offerings, on the one hand, and the “facile” or “profane” products on the other. Acts of cultural consecration identify a select few cultural producers and products that are deserving of particular esteem and approbation in contrast with the many that are not. Some acts of consecration occur retrospectively as individuals and institutions seek to elevate the status of their art world by emphasizing “elements of their pasts which are most clearly artistic, while suppressing less desirable ancestors” (Becker, 1982, p. 339).

Becker (1982, p. 346) further suggests that art worlds construct histories of their field to demonstrate that they have always produced work of artistic merit and that they continue to do so, which they typically accomplish by “concentrating on a few workers and works which embody the aesthetic now regarded as appropriate.” A common assumption that underlies instances of retrospective consecration is that the greatest cultural products are those that “last” and maintain their reputations over time. It is possible that works often last “not because large numbers of people actively appreciate them, but rather because they are historically important” (Becker, 1982, p. 367). Thus, retrospective cultural consecration is a means of recognizing the
greatest individual works or artists in an art world as well as a way of lending legitimacy to the entire field of artistic production.

Previous research has addressed retrospective projects of consecration in the US in cultural fields such as film (Allen and Lincoln 2004) and baseball (Allen and Parsons 2006). Such studies have demonstrated the influence of critical attention, professional recognition, and public acclaim on the likelihood that certain products or people are, in retrospect, counted among the "greatest of all time". In doing so, these studies have highlighted the role of Bourdieu’s (1993) competing forms of cultural legitimacy in consecrating certain cultural products and have found that critical recognition is particularly vital to such distinctions. I extend this research to the field of popular music to compare the impact of the competing forms of legitimacy on the odds of consecration. Furthermore, I build on this type of research by considering the extent to which the social characteristics of producers (e.g. gender) affect the odds of consecration, particularly when and where symbolic and social boundaries are tightly coupled.

In 2003, Rolling Stone magazine published a list of the 500 “greatest albums of all time” as determined by an expert panel of nearly 300 professional musicians, managers, producers, critics, historians, and prominent industry figures – representing a wide range of genres and generations. Each was asked to identify the 50 best albums of all time and a weighted point system, developed by the accounting firm Ernst & Young, was then used to calculate the rankings. The results were published by Rolling Stone as the 500 albums that “represent the finest in popular music, selected by the best in the business,” a compilation that captures everything from the “pioneer spirit” of early artists to the contemporary “hip-hop artistry” of rap musicians (Rolling Stone, 2003, p. 38). It claims to be a “celebration of the most exciting and vital albums ever recorded,” highlighting the albums that have been “crucial to the history” of popular music (Rolling Stone, 2003, p. 38).

Much like the film institutions studied by Allen and Lincoln (2004), Rolling Stone clearly sees itself as a preserver and celebrator of the best its art world has to
offer and accentuates the historical significance of the albums it consecrates. To further emphasize the influence and importance of the consecrated albums, *Rolling Stone* reminds readers that its compilation “does not reflect sales or chart positions” as evidenced by the fact that the top-selling album of all time (*Eagles: Their Greatest Hits, 1971-1975* at 28 million copies sold) does not appear on the list (*Rolling Stone*, 2003, p. 38). The top album on *Rolling Stone*’s list is The Beatles’ *Sgt. Pepper’s Lonely Hearts Club Band*. Although their album *Abbey Road* sold more copies and some commentators suggest *Revolver* has better songs, *Sgt. Pepper’s* is deemed the “most important” album ever made due to its innovative use of “concept, sound, songwriting, cover art and studio technology” (*Rolling Stone*, 2003, p. 85). By focusing on historical importance, technical significance, as well as social and cultural impact, *Rolling Stone* seeks to establish the legitimacy of its project and invoke the weight of consecration. By appealing to experts and by rationalizing the rankings through a sophisticated accounting procedure, *Rolling Stone* seeks to bring legitimacy to its project of consecration. Thus, it provides a useful case with which to address the questions raised in the present study regarding various dimensions of cultural consecration.

**Cross-national comparisons**

*Cultural classification systems in transition*

This dissertation represents, in part, a response to the call for more cross-national comparative research in the sociology of culture and the arts (Janssen and Peterson 2005). The time period and the countries selected coincide with a larger, collaborative project entitled “Cultural Classification Systems in Transition” (see Janssen 2002). Based on newspaper coverage of arts and culture in the US, Germany, France, and the Netherlands in reference years between 1955 and 2005, the larger study tracks journalistic attention to a variety of cultural forms, including film, literature, performing arts, visual arts, decorative arts, architecture, fashion, television, and music. The four countries were selected because they vary along key
dimensions theoretically relevant to cultural classifications (e.g. hierarchy) and because cross-national research has been suggestive of significant differences in their cultural hierarchies and classification systems.

For example, the US is a relatively market-oriented society with weak state intervention, particularly with regards to the funding of arts and culture (Mulcahy 2000), and a decentralized system of education; France tends to be more civic-minded, feature strong state intervention and a centralized system of education; and the Netherlands and Germany occupy positions somewhere in between. In the international cultural arena, the US holds a prominent position (some would argue hegemonic), while the Netherlands holds a less conspicuous place and has a much smaller cultural economy; France and Germany occupy middle positions in this regard (Heilbron 1999; Sassoon 2006). Whereas cultural policies in France have limited cultural imports in order to protect national cultural products, the Netherlands has typically been open to foreign, including American, cultural goods (Toepfler and Zimmer 2002).

Variation between the four countries in terms of size and centrality to cultural production systems also bear theoretical relevance. As Janssen (2006) demonstrates in her study of fashion reporting from 1955-2005 in three countries, French newspapers have traditionally given more attention to designer fashion, particularly to French designers, correspondent with their centrality in global fashion production. Yet as France’s influence in designer fashion has diminished, their fashion reporting has recently become more international in its scope. Although they typically provide less editorial space to fashion coverage, Dutch and German newspapers have lately expanded their fashion reporting as the designer fashion industry has emerged and grown in each country (Janssen 2006). Likewise, Janssen and colleagues (2008) find that the centrality of a country in the cultural “world-system” explains cross-national differences in orientation to the cultural products of other countries. As a result, the US increasingly becomes the most prominent focus of editorial attention in newspaper coverage of the arts and culture.
In addition to these general features, cross-national research is further suggestive of some specific differences between the four countries. Comparisons of cultural repertoires in France and the US are the subject of a volume edited by Lamont and Thévenot (2000), which draws on case studies dealing with a range of issues, including racism, book publishing, journalistic norms, contemporary art controversies, environmental disputes, and so on. Among other things, the contributors find that traditional cultural hierarchies remain more salient in France and that aesthetic criteria and civic solidarity more often form the basis of evaluations. In the US, on the other hand, market performance, morality, and individual liberty are more prominent bases for evaluation.

Cultural education in England, France, Germany, and the Netherlands varies considerably in the extent of its orientation to international cultural products and the degree to which it focuses on classical or “high” cultural forms (Bevers 2005). In his analysis of secondary school exams for music and art in each of the countries, Bevers (2005) finds that the Netherlands puts the least emphasis on canonical works and is most likely to include the culture of other nations as well as popular culture – including popular music – in its curricula. From 1965 to 1990, Dutch newspapers convey a similar trend as both elite and popular papers gave increasing editorial space to popular music during this time period, while classical music coverage declined (Janssen 1999). France and Germany, on the other hand, show the greatest propensity to focus on their own national culture as well as on the classical canon and high cultural forms in their secondary exams (Bevers 2005). As an indicator of its decentralized educational system and ambiguous cultural hierarchy, it is worth noting that the United States has no analogous standardized exam for music and art. A recent study of newspaper reviews of popular music albums further suggests that German critics rely more heavily on “high art” discourse and reviewing techniques than do their Dutch or American counterparts (van Venrooij and Schmutz 2007).

Building on comparative studies like those reviewed, this project has the potential to contribute to our understanding of cultural classifications in different
national contexts. The four countries represented in this study provide a useful basis for the comparative study of cultural classification systems as well as the factors associated with shifts in such systems. Further, it can shed light on how cultural classifications shape processes of legitimacy and consecration, impact the extent of commercialization and globalization, and interact with social boundaries in each country.

Data and methods

In the different chapters of this study, I draw on a variety of data sources and methods to answer the questions raised at the outset. The first two substantive chapters draw primarily from data on newspaper coverage of music in the four countries. Therefore, I will begin with a general description of the data from the four countries and how it will be used in each of those chapters. Following that discussion, I describe the data set used to study a particular instance of retrospective consecration in the popular music field in the United States as well as a description of how the data is used in each of those chapters.

**Newspaper coverage of music**

A central source of data for this study is content analysis of newspaper coverage of music in the US, Germany, France, and the Netherlands in reference years between 1955 and 2005, which is drawn from the “Cultural Classification Systems in Transition” project (see Janssen 2002). The reference years in which newspaper samples were collected in each of the countries are 1955, 1975, 1995, and 2005. In each country, two newspapers were selected, each of which has national (or at least supra-regional) circulation, relatively large and elite readerships, and is commercially available over the course of the entire study period. The newspapers selected for content analysis are: the *New York Times* and *Los Angeles Times* in the US; *Frankfurter Algemeine Zeitung* and *Sueddeutsche Zeitung* in Germany; *Le Monde* and *Le Figaro* in France; and *Volkskrant* and *NRC Handelsblad* in the Netherlands.
To control for potential variation in newspaper coverage by day of the week and by season, a stratified sample of four constructed weeks was generated (i.e. a Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday paper in each quarter of the reference year). As such, the sample size exceeds the two constructed weeks Riffe et al. (1993) suggest is sufficiently representative of one year’s newspaper content. Although the larger database contains information on every article or advertisement relevant to arts and culture from the sample editions, I use a subset of the data that focuses on editorial content about music.

Because the codebook used by the team of fourteen coders is quite large, I describe only the measures of particular relevance to the present study. For each article on music, the type of article is coded as an interview, preview, review, announcement, news story, background article, opinion piece, a regular column, or unclear. If the article is about a specific product, the data also indicate whether the product of interest is an album, a concert, or something else. In addition, the musical genre and subgenre are coded for each article. The amount of space (in square centimeters) the article occupies is measured as well. For each article, information about the main actors, including gender, is also coded.

Thus, the data on newspaper coverage of music, in each year, offer a snapshot of the range of musical genres and the range of musical actors that are seen as legitimate, or at least worthy of media attention, in each country. The way newspapers classify and report on different types of music represents a key site where cultural classifications are publicly articulated and disseminated. Further, the amount of space devoted to various genres and to various actors indicates the relative value placed on different types of music and people within a classification system. In particular, the editorial space given to popular music relative to classical music indicates the degree to which popular music has gained widespread legitimacy (i.e. general validation) in each country. Data on the gender of the actors who receive newspaper coverage will be used to address the relationship between

---

1 For further discussion of the coding scheme for these measures, see Appendix 1.
symbolic and social boundaries in each country. In sum, data on newspaper coverage provide a useful basis for addressing many of the research questions posed in this study and for understanding the position of popular music in broader classification systems.

In the second chapter, I use the data described above to give a general description of how elite newspaper coverage of popular music has changed in each of the four countries between 1955 and 2005. In particular, I address the extent to which popular music has achieved aesthetic mobility within the musical hierarchies of the four countries as indicated by the amount of newspaper space is devoted to popular music relative to classical music. Additionally, I consider which genres of popular music benefit the most from any increase in the cultural legitimacy of popular music. The chapter demonstrates that certain popular genres appear to have achieved a more general validation while certain genres are notably excluded from the attention of elite newspapers. Finally, this chapter also considers the types of articles that are written about popular music (e.g. reviews, news, interviews) and finds a general shift towards more critical and evaluative forms of popular music coverage (e.g. “reviews” rather than “news”).

Chapter 3 addresses the relationship between musical and social boundaries in the field of popular music. In this chapter, I look at how newspaper attention is distributed between various popular music genres and how that is associated with the distribution of newspaper space by gender. I also create a measure that I refer to as a “gender ratio,” described in greater detail in Chapter 3, to measure the amount of space devoted to male versus female musical actors. In general, I find that the rising prominence of popular music in elite newspapers benefits some genres more than others and that such genres tend to become more male-dominated. This general trend holds across countries and time periods as the most legitimate genres give disproportionate attention to male musical actors.
Popular music albums data

The fourth and fifth chapters draw on a different data source, partly patterned after Lincoln and Allen’s (2004) study of American film, to examine the research questions related to cultural consecration. In order to compare the effects of popular, professional, and critical reception on the likelihood that a popular music album was retrospectively consecrated, I constructed a sample of albums that received at least one such form of recognition at the time of their release. It would be impractical, of course, to analyze all popular music albums ever released, but it is possible to examine the characteristics that are associated with retrospective consecration for albums that received either professional, popular, or critical recognition. Because the sample focuses on popular music, I exclude classical, choral, comedy, and original cast albums.

To begin, I introduced each of *Rolling Stone*’s 500 “greatest albums of all time” into the sample. For popular recognition, I included all 595 popular music albums that reached the number one position on the *Billboard* album charts from its inception in 1955 through 2003. In terms of professional recognition, I added all albums that either received a Grammy nomination for Album of the Year or that had a track from the album nominated for Record or Song of the Year from 1958 to 2003; typically, there are five nominees in each category in any given year. I also included albums that received a Grammy Hall of Fame Award from 1973 to 2003. In total, 506 different popular music albums received at least one such form of professional recognition. Finally, for 1971 and for each year from 1974 to 2003, the top 20 albums on the *Village Voice* critics’ list were included in the sample, which contributes 618 additional albums. Due to overlap between albums that received more than one form of recognition, the final sample size is 1,687 albums.

For each album in the data set, a series of control variables is compiled (e.g. age of the album; whether the album is a soundtrack or compilation) as well as various measures of the three forms of cultural legitimacy. Measures of popular legitimacy, professional recognition, and critical acclaim are described in greater
detail in subsequent chapters. Also, the gender of the performers on the album is coded as female, male, or mixed in the case of groups that feature both women and men.

Both chapters four and five use logistic regression analyses to quantitatively estimate the predictors of consecration. Among other things, chapter four reinforces the influence of popular music critics in shaping what albums become included among the “greatest of all time”. Chapter five also considers the direct and indirect effects of gender on the odds of consecrating. Although the direct effect of gender has declined over time, female musicians are indirectly excluded from consecration through the mediating role of critics who tend to privilege male performers in their evaluations. Given the influential role of critics and their discourse, chapter five also contains content analysis of the reviews that accompany the 500 “greatest albums of all time” to consider the ways consecrated albums are discursively legitimated. This analysis reveals differences between the ways that the work of female and male musicians is legitimated by critics. In short, even when consecrated, female musicians are not fully legitimated.

Outline

I will now offer a brief outline of the substantive chapters that follow and review of the questions they address. Chapter 2 considers the relative position of popular music in each of the four countries over time. In particular, this chapter addresses the degree to which popular music has gained cultural status and what musical genres have become more or less legitimate over time and across countries. It focuses on the role of critical discourse in elite newspapers in formalizing, diffusing, and legitimating musical categories.

The third chapter focuses on how newspaper space is distributed by genre and by the gender of musical actors. In other words, it traces what types of popular music are the most legitimate in each country and what implications this has for the coverage of male and female actors in the popular music field. In doing so, it
addresses the relationship between musical and social categories in the four countries over time.

Chapter 4 addresses the question of why some albums are placed among the “greatest” while others are not. In particular, it compares various forms of cultural legitimacy to determine the strongest predictors of consecration in popular music. Chapter 5 builds on this study by considering the direct and indirect effects of gender on the odds of consecration. Furthermore, this chapter draws on studies of legitimating discourse to examine differences in the ways that critics justify the inclusion of male and female artists into the popular music canon. Thus, it addresses the interplay between symbolic boundaries (i.e. consecrated vs. unconsecrated) and social boundaries (i.e. gender). Following the substantive chapters, I briefly conclude with some comments that highlight the implications of the findings as well as avenues for further research.

The chapters in this dissertation are based on three published journal articles and one that has been revised and resubmitted for publication. Chapter 2 was published in the American Behavioral Scientist 48(11): 1510-1523. Chapter 3 appeared in Poetics: Journal for the empirical study of the Arts, Culture and Media 37(4): 298-314. Chapter 4 is forthcoming in Popular Music & Society. Chapter 5 has been resubmitted to Social Forces after a request for minor revisions.
Chapter Two

Change and continuity in newspaper coverage of popular music since 1955: Evidence from the United States, France, Germany, and the Netherlands

Introduction

In any art world, media discourse plays an important institutional role in distributing recognition and prestige to certain types of people and productions (Becker 1982). Through such discourse, music critics act as “gatekeepers of taste” (Shuker 1994, 92), operating as cultural intermediaries that shape opinions and perceptions about different types of music and musicians through the evaluations and interpretations they offer. As such, media discourse represents a valuable resource for musicians and the actors involved in producing their music. Indeed, musicians recognize the impact that such media attention can have in helping them sustain nascent musical careers (Brennan 2006) and record company publicists often measure success in column inches of press coverage (Negus 1993). Beyond the impact media discourse can have on individual actors within the field of popular music, it can also provide a legitimating ideology that elevates the status of the entire field (Baumann 2001).

Yet despite its widely recognized significance, Steve Jones (2002) notes that popular music discourse has been the subject of little systematic study and scholarly publication. Although recent years have seen more attention to the popular music press (for example, see Atton 2009; Jones 2002; Lindberg et al. 2005), much of this research focuses on American and British rock criticism in specialty magazines or fanzines (cf. Pires 2003; Schmutz 2009; van Venrooij and Schmutz, forthcoming). While such studies have provided key insights into the evolution of a burgeoning popular music discourse, particularly since the emergence of rock criticism in the 1960s, less is written about the position of popular music journalism in ‘quality’ papers and few systematic comparisons have been made across countries. Thus, we aim to contribute to this growing body of scholarship by documenting general
There are a number of reasons why the coverage of popular music in elite newspapers is a useful focus of inquiry. While popular music discourse in specialty magazines, fanzines, and like media can certainly be influential (for example, see Schmutz 2005), coverage in elite newspapers is a better indicator of society-wide legitimacy. In other words, we might consider discourse about popular music in specialty publications to be a source of “local validation”, while coverage of popular music in national or supra-regional newspapers represents a more “general validation” of the cultural form and indicates that it has received more widespread acceptance in society (Johnson, Dowd, and Ridgeway 2006). Coverage in such “prestige” media outlets is a source of cultural legitimacy, because “they are produced by and for societal elites, aspirants to elite status, and other participants in the cultural mainstream” (Deephouse and Suchman 2008, 56). Thus, popular music discourse in elite newspapers provides a glimpse at the distinction between “legitimate” and illegitimate culture (Bourdieu 1993) in the four countries at different time periods. On a pragmatic note, as Peterson suggests (2005), newspaper coverage represents a plentiful and accessible data source for making longitudinal, cross-national comparisons.

Drawing on a larger study of journalistic attention to arts and culture in the four countries, we focus on broad changes and continuities in the extent, form, and focus of popular music coverage in mainstream media outlets. First, we demonstrate the rising prominence of popular music in the quality papers as indicated by the amount of editorial space it receives relative to classical music. Additionally, we address the focus of popular music coverage by noting the genres that rise and fall in prominence in each country. Finally, we trace shifts in the role of the popular music journalist by considering the prevalence of concert and album reviews, interviews, and other forms of media coverage. Our longitudinal and cross-national approach allows us to highlight changes and continuities within each country as well as to
identify areas of transnational convergence and national distinctiveness in the
dynamic field of popular music since 1955.

**Media discourse and cultural legitimacy**

In a variety of cultural fields, ranging from American film to French cuisine, scholars have demonstrated the role of critical discourse in elevating the status of particular cultural genres. For instance, Baumann shows how film critics writing for mainstream American newspapers and magazines provided a legitimating ideology that enabled Hollywood film to be seen as art. After 1960, such critics increasingly incorporated “high art” reviewing techniques and more intellectualizing discourse, which enhanced the position of film in the cultural hierarchy. Likewise, in 19th century France, the development of an expansive culinary discourse transformed the “material into the intellectual, the imaginative, the symbolic, and the aesthetic” and thereby raised the cultural standing of French cuisine (Ferguson 1998, 610).

Parallel arguments have been put forward in the case of popular music. In the case of jazz, enthusiasts and critics produced a discourse that helped elevate the genre beyond its initial “lowlbrow” status (Lopes 2002, Jackson 2003). Jazz criticism eventually moved out of the fanzines and specialty publications and into more mainstream magazines, both indicating and enhancing its cultural standing. Likewise, beginning in the 1960s, Regev (1994) argues that critics sought to reshape rock music as a legitimate art. Comparable to the way auteur theory was adopted by film critics, he suggests that rock critics emphasized the authorial autonomy of rock musicians and created a canon of rock “artists”, thereby legitimating rock as an art form. Furthermore, the rock aesthetic diffused to discourses about other forms of popular music, which contributed to the general cultural legitimacy of popular music (Regev 1997). In seeking to articulate the difference between rock music and entertainment, other scholars agree that critics have successfully made it clear that “popular music may attain the status of at least semi-legitimate culture” (Gudmundsson et al 2002, 59). At the same time, however, we do not expect that
popular music has experienced the same degree of aesthetic mobility in the four countries.

The US, France, Germany, and the Netherlands were selected because they vary along key dimensions theoretically relevant to cultural classifications and hierarchies. In the international cultural arena, the US holds a prominent – some argue hegemonic -- position, while the Netherlands holds a less conspicuous place and has a much smaller cultural economy; France and Germany occupy middle positions in this regard. Such variation between the four countries in terms of size and centrality to cultural production systems bears theoretical relevance. As Janssen (2006) demonstrates in her study of fashion reporting from 1955-2005, French newspapers have traditionally given more attention to designer fashion, particularly to French designers, correspondent with their centrality in global fashion production. Yet as France’s influence in designer fashion has diminished, their fashion reporting has recently become more international in its scope, while Dutch and German newspapers have lately expanded their fashion reporting as their domestic designer fashion industries have emerged and grown.

Cultural policy and education may also affect openness to certain music genres and the degree to which popular music is integrated into school curricula. For instance, whereas cultural policies in France have limited cultural imports, the Netherlands has typically been open to foreign, including American, cultural products. In addition, cultural education in France, Germany, and the Netherlands varies considerably in its orientation to international cultural products and the degree to which it focuses on classical or “high” cultural forms. In his analysis of secondary school exams for music and art, Bevers (2005) finds that the Netherlands puts the least emphasis on canonical works and is most likely to include the culture of other nations and popular culture – including popular music – in its curricula, while France and Germany show the greatest propensity to focus on domestic culture as well as on the classical canon and high cultural forms. This is also evident in newspaper reviews of popular music albums, in which German critics rely much
more on “high art” discourse and reviewing techniques than do their Dutch or American counterparts (van Venrooij and Schmutz, forthcoming).

Thus, part of our aim is to understand the position of popular music within the cultural hierarchies of the four countries. As such, we focus on the extent to which popular music is covered by elite newspapers in each country as well as how that space is distributed among a wide variety of popular music genres. In addition, we consider the role of the popular music journalist and critic by looking at the types of articles they write about popular music in each country and across time.

Research method

Before turning to the findings, we will briefly discuss the research method employed in our study. Media attention to music was measured through detailed content analysis of newspapers in the US, France, Germany and the Netherlands in four sample years: 1955, 1975, 1995 and 2005. The newspapers selected are widely circulated at a national or supra-regional level and were in print from 1955 to 2005. In the European countries, the two newspapers with the average largest paid circulation during the study period were sampled: *Le Monde* and *Le Figaro* in France; *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* and *Suddeutsche Zeitung* in Germany; in the Netherlands, *NRC Handelsblad* and *de Volkskrant*. For the US, the *New York Times* and the *Los Angeles Times* are the papers included. All the papers selected target an elite readership and shape how the public and other media outlets discuss popular music. To control for seasonal variation, the sample is stratified by quarter with one edition selected at random for each day of the week in each quarter, producing four constructed weeks per sample year (i.e. 24 or 28 editions in each country per year).

The 14 coders on the project coded all articles related to arts and culture, but this paper is based on the 4,038 articles in the sample about music, particularly the 1,867 articles related to popular music. The music articles were coded as being either about “classical” or “popular” music and were classified into a variety of subgenres as well. In doing so, we use a broad definition of popular music that consists of jazz,
rock, R&B, blues, country, electronica, “pop” music (i.e. Top 40), world music, easy listening, brass band, and various regional genres such as chanson (France), schlager (German), and smartlap and kleinkunst (Dutch). In this paper, some of the above genres are a combination of one or more subgenres. Jazz includes eight subgenres, ranging from big band to bebop to bossa nova; rock includes punk and heavy metal; country includes bluegrass; electronica includes disco, techno, and house; and world music is comprised of subgenres from multiple regions.

In addition to the coding, each article was measured in square centimeters, which is a key indicator of the amount of newspaper space given to popular music in this paper. To give an idea of the relative position of popular music rather than of its absolute amount of space only, we provide comparisons to the amount of newspaper space occupied by classical music. Finally, the type of article was coded as being a review, interview, news, preview, announcement, background, opinion, or regular column. In the case of reviews, we also distinguish between reviews of albums and live performances to highlight the role of the popular music critic. The sections that follow report the findings of our study.

The rising prominence of popular music

Table 1 shows the number of articles as well as the average size and total space devoted to popular and classical music. In general, the findings point to the increasing legitimacy of popular music over time in all four countries. However, the size and timing of that shift varies substantially across countries. In particular, the US exhibits a much larger increase in popular music coverage relative to classical music coverage between 1955 and 1975, moving from 11.9% to 47.1% of the total space while none of the European countries allot more than 21.8% of the space to popular music in 1975. By 1995, however, the US, France, and the Netherlands all devote more newspaper space to popular music than to classical music. Meanwhile, Germany stands out in the relatively low amount of attention they give to popular music with classical music occupying more than twice as much space in the elite
newspapers. Although the German papers give a little more attention to popular music in 2005, it is still less than 40% of the overall space devoted to music, while France still gives a majority of space to popular music (53.8%) and the US and the Netherlands give nearly two-thirds of the space to popular music (64.1% and 66.3%, respectively).

Table 1. Increasing newspaper attention to popular music

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classical music</td>
<td>Popular music</td>
<td>Classical music</td>
<td>Popular music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of articles</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean cm²</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total space</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of articles</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean cm²</td>
<td>112.6</td>
<td>140.9</td>
<td>113.2</td>
<td>109.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total space</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of articles</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean cm²</td>
<td>260.7</td>
<td>221.6</td>
<td>125.0</td>
<td>125.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total space</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of articles</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean cm²</td>
<td>363.4</td>
<td>290.2</td>
<td>198.2</td>
<td>170.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total space</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, it would appear that the rock criticism that emerged in the late 1960s and early 1970s in the four countries was not as readily embraced by French, German, or Dutch newspapers. During this period in the US, magazines like *Crawdaddy!* (1966), *Rolling Stone* (1967), and *Creem* (1969) introduced a more serious treatment of rock and popular music that evidently found acceptance in elite newspapers by 1975. By comparison, a stable venue for popular music coverage emerged in France around the same time with the founding of *Rock & Folk* (1966) and *Best* (1968), but this does not appear to have led to widespread acceptance in the quality papers. In fact, French newspapers actually gave less attention to popular music in 1975 relative to 1955, despite the fact that it was not until the late 1960s, according to Pires (2003) that a popular music press came into being in France. Likewise, the Dutch popular music magazine *Oor* (originally called *Muziekkrant Oor*) was founded in 1971 and quickly found a loyal readership, but this seems to have
made little impact on the legitimacy of popular music as reflected in the elite papers of the Netherlands in its early years.

As noted, Germany stands out for its continuing lack of attention to popular music in its mainstream newspapers. Although rock criticism emerged in the late 1960s as in other countries (e.g. *Musikexpress* in 1969), popular music was largely excluded from the national newspapers in 1975, much as in France and the Netherlands. Yet unlike its European counterparts, popular music continues to be overshadowed by classical music in 1995 and 2005. One factor that likely helps to explain the early acceptance of popular music in the American papers and the continued focus on classical music in German papers relates to the centrality of each country in the production of such music. As Janssen et al (2008) show, the centrality of a country in the production of a given cultural product shapes the extent to which media attention focuses on domestic versus international actors in that field. In the US, which occupies a central position in the production of popular music, it is understandable that American newspapers embraced popular music more readily, while German centrality in the classical music field (Applegate and Potter 2002) is a likely reason for the continued attention to such music in the elite papers.

Beyond differences in the amount of attention to popular music, van Venrooij and Schmutz (forthcoming) find that German newspapers also differ in how they review popular music albums. In their study of recent American, German, and Dutch popular music reviews in elite newspapers, they find that although German reviews are less frequent, they are much longer and critics use more “intellectualizing” discourse and “high art” criteria than do reviewers in the US or the Netherlands. Taken together with the present findings, it appears that the intellectual style of German popular music critics may be partly an attempt to legitimate popular music by drawing on the type of discourse applied to classical music, which is most clearly placed above popular music in the German cultural hierarchy. This interpretation is also consistent with Bevers’ (2005) findings regarding secondary school exams in art and music, which showed that the
educational system does not legitimate popular music in Germany whereas the Dutch exams include knowledge of popular music. In the case of France, it appears that the elite newspapers are perhaps slightly more open to popular music than is the educational system, which focuses more exclusively on French culture and classical music. Thus, there is considerable variation in the cultural hierarchies of the four countries, even as the overarching trend has been towards more “general validation” of popular music as indicated by its inclusion in the pages of elite newspapers. Next, we turn to the question of which genres benefit most from the growing attention given to popular music.

**Patterned inclusion of popular music**

While the general trend of increasing coverage in elite newspapers indicates a greater cultural legitimacy for popular music, a closer look at the distribution of this attention suggests that there are patterned limits to the inclusion of popular music. In other words, certain genres benefit more than others from this process of legitimation and this varies across countries. Table 2 lists the five genres that had the highest number of articles in each reference year for the four countries.

The distribution of space by genre in elite American newspapers, for instance, appears to mirror patterns of elite music preferences. One explanation for the erosion of traditional hierarchies that once made strong distinctions between “high” culture and popular fare is the growing eclecticism of elite tastes in recent decades. As Peterson and Kern (1996) show, elites in the US have gone from being ‘univores’ that exclusively consume classical music to being ‘omnivores’ that are familiar with and enjoy a wide range of music genres. At the same time, however, Bryson (1996) finds that, although high status individuals in the US do have greater knowledge and appreciation of a wide range of genres, they often exclude musical forms associated with low status groups, such as heavy metal and country.
Table 2. Distribution of popular music articles by genre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th></th>
<th>France</th>
<th></th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th></th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top genres by # of articles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Top genres by # of articles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Top genres by # of articles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Top genres by # of articles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>Chanson</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Chanson</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easy listen</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>Schlager</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>Brass band</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>Chanson</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Film</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>Easy listen</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>Chanson</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>World</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>World</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electronica</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>Chanson</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>Dutch*</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easy listen</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>R&amp;B</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>Schlager</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>World</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>Other pop</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electronica</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>World</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>World</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>Electronica</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>Chanson</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>Electronica</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>World</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>Electronica</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>Schlager</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>Other pop</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>World</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>Electronica</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>Electronica</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electronica</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rap</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>Chanson</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>World</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>World</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>Electronica</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>Rap</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>Rap</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dutch music = smartlap, kleinkunst

In many ways, the newspaper coverage of popular music in the US appears compatible with research on elite music preferences. Even as elite newspapers become more eclectic and cover a wider range of genres, certain genres are notably absent or limited in their coverage. In particular, although a wide range of rock music genres, including punk, receive media coverage, heavy metal receives very little attention. In 1995, for example, 87 articles are categorized as rock music in the US newspapers, only 3 of which deal with heavy metal music. Likewise, although rap receives more attention in 2005 relative to 1995 in US newspapers, it remains somewhat peripheral. At the same time, coverage of rap music is much greater in the US, despite its global diffusion and impact (see Basu and Lemelle 2006), which may be due to American centrality in this musical form. In general, though, it
appears to be rock music – with the exception of heavy metal -- that benefits most from the greater attention to popular music in the American newspapers.

It is not only the papers in the US that devote burgeoning newspaper space for popular music primarily to rock. Although their overall increases in popular music coverage are modest in 1975, both Germany and the Netherlands see rock music emerge as the second most covered popular genre. In 1995 and 2005, the Dutch papers devote more articles to rock music than any other popular genre, while in Germany, rock takes up nearly half of all popular music articles in 2005 (43.9%). France, on the other hand, stands out for its lack of attention to rock music in 1975, which does not even register among the top five genres. Given that chanson receives the most newspaper articles by far in 1975, one possible explanation is that French papers rejected foreign popular music in favor of domestic popular music. However, the other genres covered (e.g. world and jazz) suggest some openness to non-French musical styles, but jazz is one that had already been legitimated and “made French” several decades earlier (Jackson 2003). Furthermore, publications like Rock &amp; Folk and Best had attracted a substantial readership by focusing on rock music, the former primarily on Anglophone rock musicians and the latter on French rock performers. Thus, it would seem that popular musical forms, with the exception of chanson, did not ascend the cultural hierarchy in France until later years and rock music continues to have a less central position in elite French newspapers than in the other countries.

In general, France and the Netherlands appear similar to the US in terms of the increasing eclecticism of music coverage in their newspapers. Such trends are consistent with the increasing eclecticism of elite cultural preferences in both countries (e.g. Coulangeon and Lemel 2007, in France; Van Eijck and Van Rees 2000, in the Netherlands). Both countries feature several popular genres that attract a good number of newspaper articles, while Germany seems to move towards a more exclusive focus on rock music and secondarily on electronica. However, the enhanced position of rock music in elite German newspapers does not extend to all of its forms. In 2005, the sample contains 36 articles on rock music but none deal with
heavy metal. Another notable exclusion is the lack of coverage of rap music, particularly in France and Germany, despite the impact and popularity of this globalized musical genre. In both countries, rap has become a popular and visible form of musical expression, particularly in immigrant communities (e.g. see Helenon 2006, in France; for Germany, see Bennett 1999, Brown 2006), but it is the subject of little attention in French and German newspapers.

By contrast, the eclectic papers in the Netherlands give relatively more space to rap, but stand out for the lack of attention they give to Dutch popular genres (e.g. smartlap, kleinkunst). Whereas chanson continues to rank among the top five genres in the Dutch papers in all sample years, and German schlager remains so in 1995, Dutch smartlap and kleinkunst are largely overlooked in 1995 and 2005. This is perhaps due, in part, to the relatively peripheral position of the Netherlands in the production of popular music and to its general openness to foreign cultural products (Janssen et al 2008). In sum, the increasing prominence of popular music privileges some genres over others even though all four countries cover a wider range of music over time. As a result, certain genres (e.g. heavy metal in the US and Germany, rap in France and Germany, smartlap and kleinkunst in the Netherlands) remain outside the purview of the elite newspapers and their legitimating power.

The form of popular music coverage

It is generally acknowledged that prior to the 1960s attention to popular music was limited to some news and gossip about pop stars (Lindberg et al 2005, Pires 2003). The emergence of outlets for rock criticism represented a shift in focus towards a more evaluative and critical approach to popular music. To what degree did the elite newspapers adopt the more evaluative style of critics in the specialty magazines and underground press? Looking at the types of articles published about popular music gives us a glimpse at how this impacted the approach to popular music in elite newspapers and what role music journalists at such papers assumed in
their coverage of popular music. Table 3 presents the most common types of articles about popular music that appeared in the elite newspapers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Top article types by # of articles</strong></td>
<td><strong>Top article types by # of articles</strong></td>
<td><strong>Top article types by # of articles</strong></td>
<td><strong>Top article types by # of articles</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>News 48.2%</td>
<td>News 50.0%</td>
<td>Announce 37.5%</td>
<td>News 30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviews 36.1%</td>
<td>Reviews 32.1%</td>
<td>Background 25.0%</td>
<td>Reviews 30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Announce 6.0%</td>
<td>Announce 10.7%</td>
<td>News 12.5%</td>
<td>Background 23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Background 4.8%</td>
<td>Interview 3.6%</td>
<td>Reviews 12.5%</td>
<td>Reviews 15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2.4%</td>
<td>Preview 3.6%</td>
<td>Opinion 12.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Reviews 54.7%</td>
<td>Announce 50.0%</td>
<td>News 40.0%</td>
<td>Reviews 44.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Announce 18.7%</td>
<td>Reviews 26.9%</td>
<td>Reviews 30.0%</td>
<td>News 26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Background 13.3%</td>
<td>News 7.7%</td>
<td>Background 15.0%</td>
<td>Announce 13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>News 7.3%</td>
<td>Interview 7.7%</td>
<td>Announce 10.0%</td>
<td>Interview 5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 3.3%</td>
<td>Background 7.7%</td>
<td>Opinion 5.0%</td>
<td>Column 3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Reviews 30.8%</td>
<td>Announce 49.0%</td>
<td>Reviews 35.4%</td>
<td>Reviews 49.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>News 23.9%</td>
<td>Reviews 16.5%</td>
<td>News 26.6%</td>
<td>News 23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Background 19.3%</td>
<td>News 15.5%</td>
<td>Background 24.1%</td>
<td>Background 10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Announce 16.1%</td>
<td>Background 10.2%</td>
<td>Announce 7.6%</td>
<td>Interview 9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opinion 6.6%</td>
<td>Interview 6.8%</td>
<td>Preview 3.8%</td>
<td>Opinion 3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Reviews 29.9%</td>
<td>Reviews 33.3%</td>
<td>News 32.3%</td>
<td>Reviews 42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>News 27.1%</td>
<td>Announce 31.7%</td>
<td>Reviews 30.3%</td>
<td>News 24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Background 22.2%</td>
<td>News 15.4%</td>
<td>Background 19.2%</td>
<td>Background 10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Announce 12.7%</td>
<td>Background 13.0%</td>
<td>Announce 14.1%</td>
<td>Announce 9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 4.2%</td>
<td>Interview 4.1%</td>
<td>Interview 4.0%</td>
<td>Interview 9.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As others have suggested, news items (i.e. those in which a topical event is signaled and described) were the most common form of popular music coverage in the US, France and the Netherlands in 1955. In Germany, announcements were the most common form of popular music article at the time, which are short information pieces (i.e. 10-30 lines) publicizing the availability of a new product. At the same time, however, a substantial number of reviews were published on popular music in 1955, albeit to a lesser extent in Germany. Reviews include reports on products – typically albums or live performances – that contain evaluative elements in addition to descriptive ones. Yet due to the limited amount of space given to popular music in 1955, the actual number of reviews is small despite the fact that they comprise over 30% of popular music articles in the US, France, and the Netherlands. In the US, the
30 reviews in the sample focus almost exclusively on reviews of jazz albums, a popular genre that had already achieved considerable legitimacy, in part due to the earlier emergence of jazz criticism in specialty publications (Lopes 2002). The 9 popular music reviews published in France in 1955 primarily concentrated on live performances of chanson and, to a lesser extent, jazz music, while the 4 reviews in Dutch newspapers also dealt with live chanson performances in the Netherlands.

By 1975, reviews had become much more common in American and Dutch newspapers, occupying a majority of popular music coverage in the US (54.7%) and over 40% in the Netherlands. As noted previously, however, the total amount of space devoted to popular music was much higher in the US relative to other countries in that year. While some jazz reviews continued to appear in the American papers, the coverage was dominated by reviews of rock music, both albums and live performances. In general, this provides additional support to the idea that the rock criticism of the 1960s found more ready acceptance in American elite newspapers than in other countries. Likewise, all popular music reviews in the Dutch papers during 1975 focused on jazz and rock music. Thus, although the emergence of rock criticism did not lead to a large overall increase in popular music attention in the Netherlands, it does appear that Dutch journalists adopted the more critical approach to popular music characteristic of publications like *Muziekkrant Oor*. By contrast, the 1975 sample of French and German papers contains only seven and six reviews, respectively, and do not focus on any particular genre, which further suggests that elite newspapers in these two countries did not readily embrace the critical approach that had emerged in popular music – especially rock music – publications.

By 1995, reviews were the most common type of popular music article in each country except France. The general increase in attention to popular music in all four countries seems to contribute to greater variety in the types of articles published. In the US, for example, reviews are the most common type, but news, background articles, and announcements all appear in good numbers along with a few opinion pieces. Likewise, reviews, news, and background articles are fairly common in
Germany, while France maintains a large number of announcements. In the US, reviews are mostly of rock music but also a fair amount on jazz and even some dealing with country or world music. Reviews in Germany are focused largely on live rock performances in 1995, but also a few of jazz and world music. By contrast, Dutch reviews in this year are most often on rock albums, but also on albums or performances of jazz, world, country, blues, and others. Although somewhat less focused on reviews in their coverage, French papers primarily focus on reviews of rock and jazz albums in 1995. Overall, it appears that the more critical approach of music reviews is widely accepted by 1995 and that this style is directed at genres beyond rock and jazz music, which may lend support to Regev’s (1997) claim that the evaluative criteria espoused by early rock critics diffused throughout the field and became the standard by which other popular musical forms are assessed.

By 2005, the review appears to be well established in all four countries, comprising about 30% or more of all popular music articles in the US, France, and Germany and over 40% of articles in the Netherlands. In both the American and Dutch papers, rock and jazz continue to receive most reviews, but a growing number of reviews appear for a wider variety of music genres. French reviewers divide their critical attention fairly equally between rock, jazz, and world music, while German reviews are focused almost entirely on rock albums. Thus, there is considerable variation in the focus of popular music reviews over time and across countries, although it has become a widely accepted format in all countries. To the extent that critical attention to certain genres signals the broader cultural legitimacy of those genres, it appears that a wider range of popular musics are legitimated in the US and the Netherlands. By comparison, rock, jazz, and world music appear to be the most legitimated popular genres in France, and rock music stands out as the primary beneficiary of the legitimating attention of elite newspapers in Germany. In general, the role of the popular music journalist appears to have increasingly become that of “critic” as they more often produce evaluative information along with news, announcements, and other descriptive accounts.
Conclusion

In sum, popular music has attracted a great deal more attention in the elite newspapers of the US, France, Germany, and the Netherlands since 1955. The larger number of popular music genres covered and greater variety in the types of articles written about them suggest that popular music has gained cultural legitimacy in the four countries. At the same time, however, the findings show that there is considerable variation across countries, with Germany remaining the least open to popular music, while the US and the Netherlands have become the most inclusive of popular music. Furthermore, the findings generally support the idea that the emergence of rock criticism in the 1960s had a profound effect on subsequent media discourse about popular music. Although its impact took longer to become apparent in the European countries in our study, the amount of space given to popular music as well as the shift towards a more critical and evaluative approach suggests that the style of writing about rock music became more generally adopted by elite newspapers. It is also important to note that the benefits of greater legitimacy and newspaper space are not distributed evenly as less legitimate genres are often overlooked. Similarly, other research shows that female musicians were most excluded from newspaper coverage of the genres that gained the most legitimacy in each country (Schmutz 2009). Thus, there are patterned limits to the inclusion of popular music and musicians in elite newspapers. Finally, the present study highlights certain areas of transnational convergence and national distinctiveness in the increasingly “global” cultural field of popular music. In particular, it suggests that size, centrality of cultural production, educational systems, cultural policy, elite taste and other factors contribute to a complex relationship between popular music and society.
Chapter 3
Social and symbolic boundaries in popular music: Gender and genre in newspaper coverage

Introduction

As discussed in the opening chapter, scholars have used a variety of labels to denote broad social and cultural changes characteristic of Western societies since the 1950s, such as postmodernism, consumerism, individualization, and globalization, to name only a few. Accompanying such broad changes, scholars contend that traditional cultural hierarchies (i.e. “high culture”) have been eroded by the “massification of elite culture” (Lash 1990), as well as through declining cohesiveness among elites (DiMaggio 1991, 1992) and increasing eclecticism in their cultural preferences (Peterson and Kern 1996). Meanwhile, the concomitant commercialization of cultural fields, including those that deal in high culture (DiMaggio 1986, 1991), and the rise of consumption practices as a source of individual and collective identity (Featherstone 1991; Zukin and Maguire 2004) have weakened the hierarchical distinction between “high” and “low” culture (see also Crane 1992). In addition, the rapid expansion in the volume and variety of cultural goods available in the global marketplace has intensified and destabilized global cultural flows (Appadurai 1996; Tomlinson 1999). Such flows have been further facilitated by late 20th century advances in communications technology, most notably the internet, which some suggest have democratized cultural reception and unsettled traditional forms of cultural authority (Lupo 2007).

Such changes have consequences for cultural classification systems, by which I mean the ways that societies classify cultural products and develop associated norms and practices that sustain them. Classification systems rely on conceptual distinctions, or symbolic boundaries, that sort people, places, and things into their correct categories. Such boundaries often serve to symbolically exclude categories that are seen as less desirable, unworthy, or illegitimate (Douglas 1966, 1986; Bourdieu 1984; Lamont 1992). The symbolic distinctions that emerge within cultural
classification systems shape which aesthetic categories are seen as more or less legitimate and are often linked to social categories (Pachucki et al. 2007). Thus, musical classifications and the degree of esteem granted to particular genres are often associated with durable social boundaries, such as race (Dowd and Blyler 2002; Roy 2002, 2004) and gender (DeNora 2002; Dowd et al. 2005). However, the legitimacy of particular music genres and the degree to which musical boundaries are tightly coupled with social boundaries varies over time and across space.

The focus of this paper is to explore the relationship between shifts in musical hierarchies and the salience of social boundaries based on gender by comparing media coverage of music in four countries. National newspapers are a highly visible site where the interplay between symbolic and social boundaries plays out and provide a good data source for longitudinal, cross-national comparisons (Peterson 2005; Janssen et al 2008). Furthermore, media discourse provides an important source of legitimacy for the aesthetic and social categories to which it gives attention. Thus, I focus on the amount of newspaper space devoted to classical versus popular music as an indicator of musical hierarchy and how that is related to the distribution of newspaper space by the gender of musical actors². By the same measure, certain popular genres are clearly seen as more legitimate than others, so I also examine the relationship between genre and gender in the newspaper coverage of popular music. By looking at the distribution of media attention to various forms of music in the US, France, Germany and the Netherlands from 1955 to 2005, I seek to contribute to our understanding of the relationship between social and symbolic boundaries and the conditions under which they become more or less tightly coupled (Lamont and Molnár 2002). In particular, I show that while increasing attention to popular music is generally associated with greater media space for female musical actors, the popular genres that attract the most attention become the most male-dominated. Thus, as musical hierarchies shift, social boundaries based on gender are reproduced,

² The term musical “actor” is used throughout the paper because, although much of the newspaper coverage focuses on musicians and performers, other types of actors within the musical field are also included.
with male actors receiving the most media attention in the central genres of the musical field.

Media and classification systems

A basic premise of the present study is that media attention can be an important source and indicator of cultural legitimacy (Deepphouse and Suchman 2008). Media discourse signals the appropriateness and legitimacy of aesthetic and social categories, thereby reinforcing the broader classification system and its symbolic boundaries (Zuckerman 1999). In particular, “prestige” media outlets are appealing indicators of legitimacy as they are produced by and for elites and often set the agenda for other media outlets (Boyle 2001; Gans 1979). Therefore, the amount of media attention given to different musical forms and to male versus female musical actors provides insights into classification systems, including both their symbolic and social hierarchies. Before turning to a discussion of gender and genre classifications in music, I first discuss the relationship between media discourse and cultural legitimacy.

Media discourse and cultural legitimacy

Many studies support the notion that media discourse is central to legitimacy processes in a variety of fields. Journalists and critics, who possess the institutional resources to produce such discourse, influence the status of individual actors, their works, and of entire fields of cultural production (Becker 1982; Bourdieu 1993). For example, critics have been shown to influence the reputations of political actors (Fine 1996), the careers of authors (Rees and Vermunt 1996) and canonization of literary works (Corse and Griffin 1997; Corse and Westervelt 2002; Rees 1983), the consecration of certain films (Allen and Lincoln, 2004; Hicks and Petrova, 2006) and popular music albums (Schmutz 2005), and the cultural standing of the gastronomic field in France (Ferguson 1998) and of film in the United States (Baumann 2001, 2007a). While most studies in this vein focus on how the content of such discourse
provides a “legitimating ideology” (Baumann 2007b), some also find that the extent of such discourse is itself an indicator of cultural legitimacy. The sheer quantity of articles about an athlete or the number of books about a director, for instance, can be a significant source of legitimacy that predicts who is placed among the “greatest” baseball players (Allen and Parsons 2006) and what films are retrospectively consecrated (Allen and Lincoln 2004).

Likewise, a growing number of organizational studies use the extent of media attention as an indicator of legitimacy (see Deephouse and Suchman 2008). For one, media recognition signals belonging to an accepted category within a classification system. In the valuation of stock prices, Zuckerman (1999) shows how new American firms that fail to receive critical reviews from securities analysts who specialize in their product category are subject to an “illegitimacy discount”. His findings suggest that this devaluation has less to do with the actual tenor of the reviews, but simply that -- in the absence of such media coverage -- a firm’s position within the industry’s classification system remains ambiguous. Thus, by legitimating both the cultural actor or object and the category to which it belongs, media attention sustains and clarifies the classification system. Additional studies support the notion that the amount of media attention is associated with the legitimacy of firms (Bansal and Clelland 2004; Deeds et al. 2004; Pollock and Rindova 2003), organizational practices (Lamertz and Baum 1998), and management techniques (Abrahamson and Fairchild 1999). Indeed, the extent of media coverage can be a more straightforward predictor of legitimacy than the content or favorability of the coverage (Pollock and Rindova 2003; Zuckerman 1999), especially considering that negative or critical attention was found to boost the reputations of some Dutch firms (Meijer and Kleinnijenhuis 2006).

In this paper, I follow such research by focusing on the quantity of newspaper coverage about music to highlight shifts in musical classifications and the legitimacy of particular types of music. I assume that increasing attention to popular music and of particular popular music genres is an indicator of growing cultural legitimacy.
Further, I take greater attention to popular music relative to classical music to indicate a general decline in traditional musical hierarchies. In making such assumptions, I build on the work of Janssen and colleagues (Janssen 1999; Janssen et al. 2008), who use increased coverage of popular cultural forms in elite newspapers as a sign of its growing legitimacy and as an indicator of a shift in cultural hierarchies. Likewise, I look at the distribution of media attention by gender as a measure of the relative legitimacy of men and women as actors in the fields of classical and popular music.

As other scholars have argued, female musicians receive less media attention than their male counterparts and, when they do receive recognition, their physical appearance and their family lives may garner as much or more attention than their music (Johnson-Grau 2002; Macleod 2001). Yet while I expect to find female actors underrepresented in newspaper coverage of music, by looking over time, across countries, and at the broader context of the musical classification system, I seek to shed light on the relationship between social and symbolic hierarchies and the role media outlets play in maintaining their boundaries.

**Social and symbolic boundaries in music: gender and genre**

Music provides an interesting case with which to explore broader changes in cultural classification systems because it is a field of cultural production that has experienced considerable transformations during the past half-century. Among other changes, scholars suggest that this period has witnessed an increased mixing of musical styles (Erlmann 2003; Stokes 2004), a proliferation of music genres (Negus 1997), a decline in the honorific status of classical music (DiMaggio 1991, 1992; Dowd et al 2002), the widespread acceptance of jazz music as a legitimate art form (Lopes 2002), the globalization and valorization of popular musical forms like rock and rap (Regev 1994, 1997; Mitchell 2001), and a shift to online music distribution and consumption (Lee and Peterson 2004; McCourt and Burkhart, 2003; Peterson and Ryan 2004). Such changes would appear to undermine traditional sources of cultural
authority and to weaken the symbolic boundaries that separate “highbrow” culture (i.e. classical music) from “lowlbrow” culture (i.e. popular music). Regev (1994) argues that this traditional distinction was blurred, for example, by critics who successfully legitimated rock musicians as “autonomous artists”, thereby positioning them within the existing parameters of art. At the same time, however, the degree to which certain popular musical forms have become widely accepted as having artistic merit differs considerably over time and across countries (Bevers 2005; Venrooij and Schmutz, forthcoming). Further, the symbolic boundaries that sustain musical hierarchies continue to be linked to social boundaries, including gender.

The relationship between musical categories and gender has persisted for some time. In Vienna during Beethoven’s day, for example, DeNora (1991, 1995) shows how elites distinguished the aesthetic category of “serious” music from its lighter counterparts in order to secure their own cultural status. At the same time, notions of musical “genius” associated with serious music became linked to masculinity, in part due to Beethoven’s physically demanding style of piano performance, which had immediate and longstanding consequences for women’s opportunities in musical composition and performance. Whereas both male and female pianists were well represented on the Viennese concert stage around 1796 and typically played the same works, gender segregation at the piano subsequently emerged with the introduction and valorization of Beethoven’s music (DeNora 2002). Thereafter, women continued to be largely excluded as instrumentalists and conductors into the 20th century (Macleod 2001) and it remains the case that “female prevalence thins out as we progress up the [classical music] hierarchy” (Cameron 2003:915). In this case, the association of a symbolic boundary (i.e. “serious” music) with a social boundary (i.e. gender) helped to secure male domination of the most prized positions in the classical music field and its canon.

However, as new musical forms, including popular genres, have gained increasing media attention (Janssen 1999) and artistic legitimacy (Lopes 2002; Regev 1994), it seems that musical boundaries have weakened and traditional hierarchies
have declined. Of course, this is not to suggest that musical hierarchies have disappeared altogether. As the omnivore thesis suggests, hierarchies shifted in the late 20th century such that high status is associated with more “eclectic” cultural tastes rather than exclusively “high” culture preferences (Peterson and Kern 1996). Thus, elites are more likely to appreciate both classical and popular forms of music, but exclude low status genres like heavy metal, rap, and country (Bryson 1996). Yet recent research also shows that there are different types of omnivores and significant variation in the cultural tastes of elites (Berghman and Van Eijck 2009; Sonnett 2004; Peterson 2005; Peterson and Rossman 2006). Therefore, it is arguable that musical hierarchies have become less universal and weakly bounded relative to the traditional distinction between “high” and “popular” cultural forms. Whereas hierarchical systems produce stronger social boundaries and greater segregation in musical fields, Roy (2004) expects that declining cultural hierarchies and weakening symbolic boundaries lead to less potent social boundaries and greater integration in musical fields. Roy (2004) illustrates the interplay between symbolic and social boundaries through the homology between music genres (i.e. “race records” and “hillbilly music”) and racial categories (i.e. “black” and “white”) in the early American recording industry. Although the link between musical and racial categories became less overt over time, the social and symbolic distinctions, once established, had longstanding consequences for musical classifications and the careers of musicians (Dowd and Blyler 2002; Roy 2004; Negus 1999).

At the same time, Roy (2004) suggests that when aesthetic boundaries become less hierarchical, it may allow for greater integration or “fusion” across social boundaries. In other words, if symbolic boundaries weaken and become less hierarchical, it may create opportunities for greater social inclusion. While Roy (2004) focuses on social boundaries based on race, we might similarly expect greater inclusiveness of female actors in musical fields as the symbolic boundaries between classical and popular music weaken. Therefore, to the extent that an increase in media attention to popular music (relative to classical music) indicates a decline in
the traditional musical hierarchy, we might expect that it is associated with an increase in attention to female (relative to male) musical actors.

_Hypothesis 1: Greater media attention to popular music over time and across countries is associated with greater attention to female (relative to male) actors in the musical field._

While it is possible that declining musical hierarchies lead to greater opportunities for female actors in the musical field, the increasing legitimacy of popular music presents another possibility. As popular music gains recognition and ascends the aesthetic hierarchy, it may be the case that male actors begin to control a greater share of the attention given to popular music as well. As Tuchman and Fortin (1984) found in the literary field, women were “edged out” as literature professionalized and novels gained in cultural status, which led men to invade this previously “empty field”. Bielby and Bielby (1996) find a similar mechanism at work among female screenwriters who face cumulative disadvantage over the course of their careers in a field that features institutionalized male dominance. Thus, it may be the case that men maintain or even expand their privileged position in the field as popular music garners more attention and legitimacy.

Many scholars have demonstrated the lack of female representation in the music industry (Bayton 1998; Leonard 2007) and in the mainstream music market (Dowd et al. 2005; Menger 1999). Indeed, “popular musicians, writers, creators, technicians, engineers and producers are mostly men” (Frith and McRobbie, 1990: 373) and popular music critics have been said to operate within a “culture of masculinity” (Leonard 2007: 67). As Coulangeon et al. (2005) show, female musicians in France encounter obstacles in the form of both pay discrimination and segregation. Sex segregation in the male-dominated French musical field occurs vertically, with women kept out of the highest ranks and decision-making roles, as well as horizontally, as women specialize in certain roles such as singers rather than instrumentalists.
Thus, despite changes in the musical hierarchy and the legitimization of some popular music genres, men may be able to enhance their status through mechanisms of discrimination and sex segregation. In the case of arts journalism in these four countries, Janssen et al. (2008) find that -- amidst increasing globalization, considerable shifts in cultural hierarchies, and the ascendance of popular art forms -- it is art world actors from the most central countries (especially the US) that benefit most from the cultural realignment that occurred during the last half of the 20th century. In a similar way, it may be the case that increasing attention to popular music during this period will largely serve to reinforce the central position of men within the field and that women will be “edged out” of popular music as in other cultural fields.

Hypothesis 2: Greater media attention to popular music over time and across countries is associated with less attention to female (relative to male) actors in the musical field.

A related but slightly different possibility is that the social boundaries that privilege men are most potent in the most prestigious genres in the popular music field. Jazz and rock music, for example, were among the first popular genres to be valorized and remain among the most central in terms of industry resources, influence, prestigious awards, and so on (Lopes 2002; Negus 1999; Regev 1994). In addition to their cultural standing, jazz and rock music are also notable for being historically dominated by men (Green 1997; Porter 2002; Whiteley 2000; Leonard 2007). Therefore, it may be the case that strong symbolic boundaries that exclude women are concentrated within certain genres like rock and jazz. If such popular genres also receive a large proportion of the media coverage of popular music, increasing attention to popular music may be associated with greater attention to female actors, but such an association may be limited to more peripheral genres. Similarly, as traditional musical hierarchies decline and new hierarchies take shape, male actors may be most overrepresented in ascendant genres that attract the most media attention.
In the case of alternative rock in the 1990s, for instance, Clawson (1999) finds that more women were gaining acceptance in bands as bass players, which would seem to indicate the declining potency of gender boundaries in the field. At the same time, however, she notes that the space which opened up for women to play bass was primarily the result of male performers gravitating towards the more visible, prestigious positions in the band, such as lead guitar. Therefore, women’s inclusion in alternative rock bands was limited to a more peripheral position as bass players. It is possible that newspaper coverage of popular music follows a similar pattern of limited inclusion for women.

*Hypothesis 3: Greater media attention to popular music over time and across countries is associated with less attention to female (relative to male) actors in the musical field, except in peripheral genres.*

Yet despite gender inequality in the music industry, it is important to note that female representation in the mainstream music market has increased under certain conditions. In particular, Dowd and colleagues (2005) show that, although female musicians rarely accounted for more that 25% of mainstream “hits” on the American charts between 1940 and 1990, decentralized production enhanced the success of female performers and the gender diversity of the market. Some argue that cultural fields, including music, have become increasingly decentralized and even “democratized” through a shift to online music distribution and consumption (Lee and Peterson 2004; McCourt and Burkhart 2003; Peterson and Ryan 2004). To the extent that this decentralization extends to critical discourse about music, it may be the case that social and symbolic boundaries in media attention to music have weakened more rapidly in recent years. Therefore, a final possibility considered in this paper is that a decline in the musical hierarchy and its symbolic boundaries has been accelerated by the spread of internet technology between 1995 and 2005.

In the case of American film criticism between 1996 to 2006, Lupo (2007: vi) argues that “the internet engendered a democratization of film criticism by fostering a new generation of non-professional fan-critics who challenged professional critical
hierarchies, while also opening up new avenues of distribution to and communication with readers for professional critics.” Robert Christgau (2004) argues that a parallel trend emerged in rock criticism, which privileges consumer ratings above the cultural authority of the music critic. To the extent that media discourse of popular music has followed such a path in recent years, we would expect that musical hierarchies have declined and that there is growing pressure on traditional media outlets (e.g. quality papers) to cover a wider range of musical actors and genres. Without tying it to internet technology, Dickerson (1998) argues that the mid-1990s marked a turning point in women’s inclusion in the American music industry as both executives and successful performers. It could be that the decentralization of media discourse provided conditions that contributed to such a trend, particularly in countries that experienced the greatest diffusion of internet technology.

Hypothesis 4: The diffusion of internet technology between 1995 and 2005 is associated with an increase in media attention to female (relative to male) actors and with coverage of a wider range of musical styles.

Data and methods

Media attention to music was measured through detailed content analysis of newspapers in the US, France, Germany and the Netherlands in four sample years: 1955, 1975, 1995 and 2005. The newspapers selected are widely circulated at a national or supra-regional level and were in print from 1955 to 2005. In the European countries, the two newspapers with the average largest paid circulation during the study period were sampled: Le Monde and Le Figaro in France; Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung and Suddeutsche Zeitung in Germany; in the Netherlands, NRC Handelsblad and Volkskrant. For the US, the New York Times is the only paper included in this chapter. To control for seasonal variation, the sample is stratified by quarter with one edition selected at random for each day of the week in each quarter, producing four constructed weeks per sample year.
The 14 coders who participated in the project coded all articles related to many forms of arts and culture, but this paper is based on the 3,311 articles in the sample that are related specifically to music. Each article was measured in square centimeters, which is the primary indicator of newspaper space used in this paper. Table 1 displays the number of articles by country and sample year as well as the mean size of the articles (in square centimeters). The music articles were also coded as being either about “classical” or “popular” music and were classified into subgenres as well. The main actor in each article was recorded and the gender of the main actors was included. The distribution of newspaper space is measured by comparing the total space occupied by different music genres (e.g., classical vs. popular) and musical actors (e.g., male vs. female).

| Table 1. Number and size of newspaper articles about music by country and sample year |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| USA                                          | 1955 | 1975 | 1995 | 2005 | Total |
| N                                            | 331  | 224  | 211  | 243  | 1009  |
| Mean cm²                                     | 60.6 | 103.5| 323.1| 309.6| 185.0 |
| France                                       | 1975 | 1995 | 2005 | Total |
| N                                            | 82   | 116  | 326  | 738  |
| Mean cm²                                     | 85.7 | 112.3| 125.4| 135.4|
| Germany                                      | 1955 | 1975 | 1995 | 2005 | Total |
| N                                            | 80   | 116  | 197  | 240  | 633   |
| Mean cm²                                     | 119.8| 203.6| 230.4| 239.9|
| Netherlands                                  | 1955 | 1975 | 1995 | 2005 | Total |
| N                                            | 130  | 187  | 254  | 360  | 931   |
| Mean cm²                                     | 104.1| 184.1| 257.7| 230.8| 211.1 |
| TOTAL                                        | 1955 | 1975 | 1995 | 2005 | Total |
| N                                            | 623  | 643  | 988  | 1057 | 3311  |
| Mean cm²                                     | 80.6 | 146.6| 222.6| 256.0| 191.8 |

For the sake of analysis, I calculated a “gender ratio” by dividing the proportion of the total space devoted to music that features male actors by the total share of music space that features female actors. Thus, a gender ratio greater than one indicates that male actors occupy more newspaper space than female actors.

---

3 In this paper, I have combined popular music subgenre codes into the following main genres: jazz, rock, country, electronica, world/folk, pop, R&B/soul, rap, film, other.
while a gender ratio less than one means that more space is devoted to female musical actors relative to male actors. In other words, the lower the gender ratio, the greater the attention to female actors and vice versa.

Results

Musical hierarchy

In general, popular music gained considerably greater attention over time in each country relative to classical music (see Table 2). Although the four countries differ in the size and timing of the shifts towards greater attention to popular music, all give much more attention to popular music in 1995 and 2005 relative to 1955 and 1975. In the US, France and the Netherlands, popular music commands a greater share of the newspaper space in 1995 and 2005 than classical music, while classical music occupies most of the musical space in Germany for all sample years. To different degrees, each of the four countries experience a shift in the traditional musical hierarchy as the position of classical music declines and popular musical forms attract increasing attention. In the New York Times, there is a steady increase in attention to popular music from 1955 to 1975 (23.3 percentage points) and again from 1975 to 1995 (22.3 more percentage points). Although France moves back and forth somewhat, it experiences a dramatic increase in attention to popular music between 1975 and 1995 (41.5 percentage points). Germany shows the most modest shift in attention towards popular music, but between 1975 and 1995 there is a pronounced increase in space devoted to popular music (18.2 percentage points). Finally, the Netherlands also experiences a huge shift towards attention to popular music between 1975 and 1995 (up 43.8 percentage points) with very slight increases in other years.
Table 2. Distribution of newspaper attention to classical music and popular music

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>USA (NY Times)</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>% music space</td>
<td>% music space</td>
<td>% music space</td>
<td>% music space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In every sample year, Germany remains the most focused on classical music in its newspaper coverage. The *New York Times* quickly moves from giving nearly as much attention to classical music as German papers in 1955 to becoming the least focused on classical music by 1975. Whereas France begins as the most open to popular music in its newspaper coverage, its attention to popular music does not keep pace with the US in 1975 or with the Netherlands, which becomes the most oriented towards popular music in 1995 and 2005. With these relative shifts in musical hierarchies and attention to classical and popular music in mind, we next turn to the relationship between such changes and social boundaries based on gender.

**Gender**

Table 3 shows the distribution of newspaper attention to music by the gender of the main actor in each article. The main actor in each article is male, female, or a group with both male and female actors4. In every country and in each sample year, male actors occupy over 70% of the newspaper space devoted to music. As discussed above, the gender ratio is based on the total music space devoted to male actors divided by the total music space allotted to female actors. To explore the potential relationship between attention to popular music and gender, we can compare the

---

4 The main actor could also be an institution or other entity without an identifiable gender, but such cases were excluded from this analysis.
gender ratios in Table 3 with the amount of overall space devoted to popular music in Table 2.

**Table 3. Distribution of newspaper attention to music by gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USA (NY Times)</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group w/ both</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender ratio</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USA (NY Times)</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group w/ both</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender ratio</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USA (NY Times)</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group w/ both</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender ratio</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USA (NY Times)</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group w/ both</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender ratio</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the US, large increases in attention to popular music in 1975 and 1995 are not accompanied by overall changes in the gender ratio. Rather, the gender ratio is quite stable from 1955 to 1995, and then peaks in 2005 with only a slight increase in popular music coverage. The finding that the gender ratio peaks in the US at the same time attention to popular music also peaks is more compatible with hypothesis 2, but the relationship is far from clear. In France, decreases in attention to popular music in 1975 and 2005 are matched by slight increases in the gender ratio while an increase in popular music coverage in 1995 is accompanied by a slight decrease in the gender ratio. This seems to support hypothesis 1; however, when popular music coverage peaks in 1995, the gender ratio is lower than in 1975 and 2005, but not as low as in 1955 when there was much less space devoted to popular music. Germany sees its lowest gender ratio in 1995, corresponding to its biggest increase in popular music coverage (supporting hypothesis 1), but the gender ratio increases in 2005,
despite another modest increase in popular music coverage (consistent with hypothesis 2). The Netherlands sees a decline in the gender ratio in 1975 along with a modest increase in popular music coverage (supporting hypothesis 1), but subsequent increases in the gender ratio for 1995 and 2005 that accompany both large and small increases in popular music coverage (consistent with hypothesis 2).

Across countries, there is limited support for the first two hypotheses. As hypothesis 1 might predict, the country that gives the least attention to popular music (Germany) has the highest gender ratio in every year with the exception of 2005. In 1955, France gives the most space to popular music and also has the lowest gender ratio. However, as hypothesis 2 leads us to expect, the gender ratio generally increases in the US, France, and the Netherlands in 1995 and 2005 even as they devote more space to popular music than to classical music. In either case, a strong relationship does not appear by comparing these two tables. Thus, Table 4 compares the gender ratios for classical and popular music coverage for each country in the sample years.

When we look at the gender ratios for classical versus popular music, the picture becomes a bit clearer. With a few exceptions (i.e. France in 1975, Germany in 2005 and the Netherlands in 1975 and 1995), the gender ratio is lower for popular music coverage than for classical music coverage. In other words, female actors generally receive more attention relative to male actors in coverage of popular music than they do in coverage of classical music in the same year and country. Therefore, the gender ratio in popular music tends to be lower than the overall gender ratio in music coverage, which suggests that greater attention to popular music is associated with greater attention to female actors in the musical field in most cases (i.e. 12 of the 16 cases). In general, this provides some support for hypothesis 1.
Table 4. Gender ratios in newspaper coverage for both classical and popular music

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USA (NY Times)</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% space music</td>
<td>Gender ratio</td>
<td>% space music</td>
<td>Gender ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>78.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular</td>
<td></td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 49 articles featured male actors, none featured a female actor

Yet at the same time, Table 4 shows that the gender ratios for popular music coverage tend to increase in each country over the last two or three reference years. Thus, although gender ratios for popular music tend to be lower than the overall gender ratio, they appear to gradually increase over time. Hypothesis 2 suggests that, as popular music becomes increasingly legitimate, gender ratios in popular music increase as well (i.e. male actors control a greater share of the space devoted to popular music). Meanwhile, hypothesis 3 elaborates on this expectation by suggesting that female actors will be more likely to find access in peripheral popular genres. In order to further consider this possibility, Figure 1 compares gender ratios for the top two popular music genres (i.e. those that received the most newspaper space) in the four countries for each sample year and compares them with the gender ratio for all other popular genres.
Figure 1. Gender ratios in newspaper coverage for top 2 vs. other popular genres

With the exception of the Netherlands in 2005, the gender ratio for the top two popular genres is much higher than for all other popular genres combined in each year and country. In other words, the popular genres that receive the most attention in newspapers are more highly dominated by male actors than are other popular genres in 15 out of 16 cases. In a number of instances, the gender ratio for the top popular genres approaches or even exceeds the gender ratios of classical music coverage. Thus, greater attention to female actors in newspaper coverage of popular music appears to be limited to more peripheral popular genres. As a result, there appears to be considerable support for hypothesis 3 in that women appear to be “edged out” of the popular genres that receive the most media attention.

Furthermore, this finding is not driven exclusively by the male domination of rock or jazz coverage as Table 5 shows. The trend holds true regardless of which popular genres receive the most attention. As other genres gain recognition (e.g. rap in the US, world music in France, electronica in Germany and the Netherlands), they become more focused on male actors in newspaper coverage.
Table 5. Top 2 popular genres in each reference year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USA (NY Times)</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>Chanson</td>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>Jazz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R&amp;B</td>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>Pop</td>
<td>Pop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>Chanson</td>
<td>World</td>
<td>Jazz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>Rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>Rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>Pop</td>
<td>Jazz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>World</td>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>Rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rap</td>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>Electronica</td>
<td>Electronica</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rise of the internet: 1995-2005

Table 6 provides rates of internet use in the four countries from 2000 to 2005 with data from the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), which is commonly used by scholars of internet diffusion (Guillén and Suárez 2005). Most notably, France lags well behind the other three countries in the proportion of the population that uses the internet, with less than half the population online in 2005. Yet in contrast to the fluctuations between the two most recent reference years that hypothesis 4 predicts, musical hierarchies and social boundaries showed considerable resilience during this period of technological change.

Table 6. Rates of internet use, 2000-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USA % internet users</th>
<th>France % internet users</th>
<th>Germany % internet users</th>
<th>Netherlands % internet users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distribution of newspaper space between classical and popular music showed only modest changes between 1995 and 2005, with the US, Germany and the Netherlands seeing slightly more popular music coverage and less space for popular music in France. Seemingly independent of such relatively modest shifts in popular music coverage, each country saw male actors receive an increased share of
newspaper space in 2005 compared to 1995. In particular, all four countries had higher gender ratios in their popular music coverage in 2005 than they did in 1995, although the size of the increase varied considerably. Although there was an increase in space devoted to certain popular musical forms (i.e. rap in the US, world music in France, and electronica in Germany and the Netherlands), such increases were associated with higher gender ratios, which provides additional support to hypothesis 3. In general, these findings point to a strong rejection of hypothesis 4 as social boundaries privileging men appeared to gain strength in media coverage of music during a time period associated with decentralization of media discourse, declining hierarchy, and increasing diversity in cultural fields.

Discussion

As popular music has gained increasing media attention and cultural legitimacy, the relationship between symbolic and social boundaries in musical fields has also changed. Initially, the decline in musical hierarchies associated with the rising prominence of popular music may have led symbolic and social boundaries to become less tightly coupled and allowed for greater attention to female musical actors, particularly in popular music. Yet after some initial increases in attention to female musical actors, often through expanded popular music coverage, the gender ratio in popular music subsequently rises in all four countries. Thus, it appears that despite the potential for greater integration of female musical actors as the hierarchical distinction between classical and popular music diminished, social boundaries reaffirmed themselves as symbolic boundaries were realigned. Rather than creating “fusion” across gender boundaries, it appears that the increasing legitimacy of popular music is associated with greater “segregation” of male and female musical actors (Roy 2004).

Particularly telling is the finding that the popular genres that receive the most media attention are much more male-dominated relative to other popular genres and tend to become increasingly so over time, suggesting that women are particularly
excluded from the most valued spaces in both classical and popular music and are primarily represented in the coverage of more peripheral genres. Such a finding supports previous research that finds women are often “edged out” of positions that gain cultural status (Tuchman and Fortin 1984). Despite expectations regarding the impact of the internet on social and symbolic boundaries, newspaper coverage of music does not show much change between 1995 and 2005. Although the general dominance of jazz and rock in popular music coverage is somewhat disrupted by rap in the US, world music in France, and electronica in Germany and the Netherlands, this change is not associated with greater attention to female musical actors. Rather, increased attention to world music in France is associated with greater male-dominance of its newspaper coverage in 2005 relative to 19955, while increased attention to electronica in Germany and the Netherlands is also associated with a higher gender ratio6. In general, this provides additional support for the general finding that men tend to dominate coverage of the most legitimate musical forms, regardless of which genres receive the most attention in a given country or time period. Thus, symbolic boundaries in musical coverage appear to be more variable across countries and over time than do gendered social boundaries. While musical hierarchies have perhaps shifted to allow certain popular music genres to be valorized, it seems that new symbolic boundaries reproduced their coupling with social boundaries, in this case gender. To the extent that newspaper coverage plays an important mediating role in musical careers, this has troubling implications for women who appear to face institutionalized disadvantage in gaining media recognition in the popular musical field.

At the same time, the findings in this paper are more suggestive than conclusive and further research is needed to elucidate the complex relationship between social and symbolic boundaries. In particular, the question remains whether

---

5 In 1995, coverage of world music has a gender ratio of 5.5; in 2005, the gender ratio is 7.5 for world music.
6 In 1995, coverage of electronica in Germany has a gender ratio of 0.5; in 2005, the gender ratio is 13.8 for electronica. In the Netherlands, the gender ratio for coverage of electronica went from 3.7 to 4.1 from 1995 to 2005.
or not these findings with regard to newspaper coverage of music hold true across media outlets or whether they are somewhat dependent on the sources selected for this study. For instance, it may be the case that the traditional newspapers included here are less likely to reflect changes in social and symbolic boundaries that are occurring in other media outlets or in certain segments of the musical field. Amidst the decentralization of critical discourse about music, perhaps elite newspapers maintain their focus on well-established musical genres and actors. In the process, perhaps they miss some of the developments taking place outside the mainstream industry, such as the Women’s Music movement, that provide alternative opportunities for female musical actors (Dickerson 1998; Lont 1992). Indeed, the elite newspapers included in this study appear to resemble cultural omnivores who become more open to select popular genres, but continue to draw strong boundaries against certain lower status genres. In general, female musical actors appear to have best access to the genres that are least valued by the mainstream newspapers.

Furthermore, this paper focuses only on the amount of space devoted to male and female actors and to different musical forms. However, further research is needed to understand how critics maintain the discursive boundaries between genres and gender. To understand the role of media in sustaining and legitimating social and symbolic boundaries, it is important to look beyond the quantity of the discourse devoted to various styles and actors to examine the discourse itself. In addition, to produce a clearer picture of the relationship between social and symbolic boundaries in music, it is necessary to build on this research by looking at multiple forms of cultural legitimacy within the field. Thus, in the chapters that follow, I turn attention to the effects of various forms of cultural legitimacy on the cultural consecration of popular music albums and look at how such forms of legitimacy are distributed by gender. After considering the quantitative effects of cultural legitimacy and gender on the odds of consecration, I turn to the issue of how critics discursively maintain the distinction between male and female musicians. By looking beyond newspaper
attention, it may be possible to shed further light on the complicated relationship between symbolic boundaries and social boundaries based on gender.
Chapter 4

Retrospective cultural consecration in popular music:
Rolling Stone’s greatest albums of all time

Introduction

Many sociologists have addressed the ways in which cultural producers and products achieve and maintain a celebrated status. In his seminal book, *Art Worlds*, Becker (1982) discusses a variety of collective activities that help establish and reinforce the reputations of artists and art works. DiMaggio (1982, 1987, 1992) focuses on the organizational efforts of urban elites to sacralize certain forms of visual art, music, theater, opera and dance by setting them apart from purportedly “lower” cultural forms. Dowd and colleagues (2002) emphasize field-level factors – such as the role of performance capabilities, resources for new music, and college music programs – that shape the canonization of certain works among US symphony orchestras. Baumann (2001) outlines occurrences within and beyond the field of film production that contributed to the valorization of American cinema, paying particular attention to the role of film critics in supplying the discourse that legitimated film as a form of art.

Such research deals with the means by which certain types of cultural products, particular artists, or individual works are distinguished from others. Bourdieu (1984, p. 6) uses the term “consecration” to describe the same phenomena, whereby a “magical division” is constructed between the “pure” and “sacred” artistic offerings, on the one hand, and the “facile” or “profane” products on the other. Acts of cultural consecration identify a select few cultural producers and products that are deserving of particular esteem and approbation in contrast with the many that are not. Some acts of consecration occur retrospectively as individuals and institutions seek to elevate the status of their art world by emphasizing “elements of their pasts which are most clearly artistic, while suppressing less desirable ancestors” (Becker 1982, 339).
Becker (1982, 346) further suggests that art worlds construct histories of their field to demonstrate that they have always produced work of artistic merit and that they continue to do so, which they typically accomplish by “concentrating on a few workers and works which embody the aesthetic now regarded as appropriate.” A common assumption that underlies instances of retrospective consecration is that the greatest cultural products are those that “last” and maintain their reputations over time. It is possible that works often last “not because large numbers of people actively appreciate them, but rather because they are historically important” (Becker, 1982, 367). Thus, retrospective cultural consecration is a means of recognizing the greatest individual works or artists in an art world as well as a way of lending legitimacy to the entire field of artistic production.

Recently, Allen and Lincoln (2004) examined the retrospective cultural consecration of American films by two cultural institutions – the National Film Registry and the American Film Institute. Drawing on Bourdieu’s (1993) ideas regarding the primary forms of cultural legitimacy, Allen and Lincoln (2004, p. 871) explored the effects of “contemporaneous critical, professional, and popular recognition” on the likelihood that a film was retrospectively consecrated by one of these two institutions. In this chapter, I seek to extend their findings by examining an instance of retrospective cultural consecration in the field of popular music. To do so, I likewise consider the effects of popular, professional, and critical reception on the likelihood that a popular music album was retrospectively consecrated by *Rolling Stone* magazine. Before addressing the retrospective consecration project undertaken by *Rolling Stone*, I turn to factors that could shape this outcome.

**Popular recognition**

One of the primary forms of cultural legitimacy proposed by Bourdieu (1993) is “popular legitimacy,” which is bestowed on cultural products through public acclaim. In their study, Allen and Lincoln (2004) use box office receipts as their measure of popular recognition for films. In popular music, the *Billboard* charts have
long been the dominant source of information about the popular reception of music albums in the United States. Since 1955, Billboard has published a weekly album chart based on sales, which has become the primary measure of market success as well as a powerful sensemaking device in the popular music industry (Anand & Peterson 2000). Thus, I expect popular music albums that appeared on the *Billboard* album charts are more likely to be retrospectively consecrated than those that did not.

Yet chart success can be a fleeting indicator of popular recognition and Anand and Peterson (2000) show that the *Billboard* charts have become even more capricious since the advent of SoundScan technology in 1991, which uses bar codes to track album sales more precisely than was possible in the past. Due to the importance of works that “last” in projects of retrospective consecration, popular recognition that is sustained over longer periods of time may be more relevant than short-term chart success. The Recording Industry Association of America (RIAA) recognizes such sustained success by certifying albums that have sold over 500,000 copies as “Gold” and albums that have sold over 1,000,000 copies as “Platinum.”7 Thus, Gold and Platinum Awards from the RIAA may indicate a level of popular recognition that is more lasting than chart success. To the extent that this is true, I expect RIAA Gold and RIAA Platinum certification to enhance the likelihood of retrospective consecration more than does chart success.

**Professional recognition**

“Specific” legitimacy is another primary form of legitimacy that Bourdieu (1993) identifies. This type of legitimacy is achieved through professional recognition and it is conferred on artists or their works by other creative personnel in their field of cultural production. In the case of film, Allen and Lincoln (2004) consider the

---

7 The RIAA began making Gold Awards in 1958 and Platinum Awards in 1976. In its earliest years, Gold certification was based on sales in dollars but was soon changed to reflect units sold (see RIAA, 2005). It should also be noted that certification does not occur automatically, but typically requires the recording label to apply for such recognition on behalf of musicians.
impact of a variety of Academy Awards on the chances of retrospective consecration. In music, the Grammy Awards represent a form of professional recognition akin to the Academy Awards in film, since only members who are actively involved in the creative aspects of recording are allowed to vote in the award process.

The Grammy Awards were initiated by the National Academy of Recording Arts and Sciences, which was established in 1957 after record executives realized that “recognition was needed which was based on excellence rather than merely on popular recognition” (Franks 1996, 167). Subsequently, the first Grammy Awards, which are named for the gramophone statuettes winners receive, were granted for recording achievements that took place in 1958. Anand and Watson (2004) discuss the role of the Grammy Awards in the popular music field and suggest that its ceremonial form contributes to its ability to distribute prestige and to draw the attention of disparate actors within the field. Thus, I expect that albums nominated for Album of the Year are more likely to be retrospectively consecrated than those that are not nominated.

It is also important to consider that the Grammy Awards arguably changed over the years. The Recording Academy was often criticized in its early years for focusing on “easy listening” artists like Frank Sinatra and Perry Como, while overlooking the rising popularity of youth-oriented genres like rock n’ roll (Sheward 1997). Yet Anand and Watson (2004) suggest that Grammy Awards and popular success became more tightly coupled in the early 1980s. Also, the Recording Academy began giving Grammy Hall of Fame Awards in 1973 to “honor recordings of lasting qualitative or historical significance that are at least 25 years old” (Grammy Awards 2005). Consequently, as of 2003 – the year in which Rolling Stone published its list of top albums – the Academy has had the chance to recognize albums released before 1978 that it may have overlooked previously. Therefore, for albums released before 1978, I expect that receiving a nomination for Album of the Year will have less of an impact than in later years and that receiving a Grammy Hall of Fame Award will increase the likelihood an album is retrospectively consecrated. It is also possible
that an award recognizing an individual song on an album (e.g., Record of the Year, Song of the Year) enhances the odds of consecration, but I offer no formal hypotheses.

Critical recognition

For Bourdieu (1993), the agents of the dominant class are able to bestow “bourgeois” legitimacy on cultural products. As “reputational entrepreneurs,” critics possess the institutional resources necessary to generate discourse that can influence the status of individuals and their works (Bromberg & Fine 2002; Fine 1996). In the case of American film, Baumann (2001) shows how critical discourse provided a “legitimating ideology” for viewing film as art. Allen and Lincoln (2004) considered the impact of receiving an award from the New York Film Critics or being among the year’s top ten films in *The New York Times* or the National Board of Review on the likelihood of being retrospectively consecrated.

In music, Regev (1997; Regev & Seroussi 2004) discusses how critics helped elevate the artistic status of popular music in Israel through their reviews of Hebrew music videos and Israeli performers. Popular music critics were largely absent in the US until the mid 1960s when they began to figure prominently in underground or specialty music publications like *Creem, Crawdaddy, Circus,* and *Rolling Stone,* with the latter founded in 1967 (Macan 1997). In 1971, *Village Voice,* an alternative weekly publication based in New York City, published what is perhaps the first year-end list of the “best” albums based on a polling of “recognized” popular music critics. With the exception of 1972 and 1973, *Village Voice* has since continued to publish a critics’ list every year by polling an increasing number of popular music critics. I expect that being listed among the top ten albums of the year on the *Village Voice* critics’ list increases the likelihood that an album is retrospectively consecrated.

---

8 Jazz critics were already well established by this time (Lopes 2002), but pop and rock music reviews were much less common before these publications appeared (see Macan 1997).
Many of the albums that were retrospectively consecrated by *Rolling Stone*, however, were released before 1974 when the *Village Voice* poll was permanently established. In fact, about half of the 500 consecrated albums were released in years the *Village Voice* list was not published. Macan (1997) argues that this early group of pop and rock critics of the 1960s were highly influential in establishing what constituted “great” and “authentic” popular music. Therefore, it is also useful to consider retrospective reviews of albums that this initial group of critics published. In 1978, Dave Marsh assembled a group of 50 critics to review and rate thousands of rock, pop, soul, country, blues, folk and gospel albums released in the 25 preceding years. All of the critics selected were contributors to popular music publications in the late 1960s and 1970s and most likely to *Village Voice’s* year-end polls. An updated version of these ratings that awarded each album zero to five stars was edited by Dave Marsh and John Swenson (1983) and published by *Rolling Stone*. Five-star ratings were reserved for the “indispensable” and “essential” albums in the popular music canon. To the extent that these early critics were particularly influential, I expect that among albums released before 1983, five-star albums are more likely to be retrospectively consecrated than all other albums.

**Consecrating institutions**

In their study, Allen and Lincoln (2004) examined the retrospective cultural consecration of American films by the National Film Registry and the American Film Institute. Congress established the National Film Registry in 1988 and the American Film Institute in 1965. The Librarian of Congress is required to choose 25 films of “cultural, historical, or aesthetic significance” for addition to the National Film Registry each year (Allen & Lincoln 2004, 5). Eighteen staff members at the Library of Congress and the National Film Preservation Board consult with the Librarian to select the films, which must be at least ten years old to be eligible. In 1995, the American Film Institute surveyed 1,500 film professionals, critics, and scholars to identify the 100 greatest American films of all time. The Institute recommended that
“critical recognition, historical significance, and cultural impact” were key criteria for selection to the list (Allen & Lincoln 2004, 6).

In popular music there are perhaps no institutions perfectly analogous to the National Film Registry or the American Film Institute. However, the project of retrospective cultural consecration in Rolling Stone magazine resembles the film institutions in a number of ways. For one, Rolling Stone’s list of consecrated albums was determined by an expert panel of nearly 300 professional musicians, managers, producers, critics, historians, and prominent industry figures – representing a wide range of genres and generations. Each was asked to identify the 50 best albums of all time and a weighted point system, developed by the accounting firm Ernst & Young, was then used to calculate the rankings. As a result, Rolling Stone claims to offer the 500 albums that “represent the finest in popular music, selected by the best in the business,” a compilation that captures everything from the “pioneer spirit” of early artists to the contemporary “hip-hop artistry” of rap musicians (Rolling Stone 2003, 38). It claims to be a “celebration of the most exciting and vital albums ever recorded,” highlighting the albums that have been “crucial to the history” of popular music (Rolling Stone 2003, 38).

As with the film institutions, Rolling Stone clearly sees itself as a preserver and celebrator of the best its art world has to offer and often refers to the historical significance of the albums it consecrates. Although there are no restrictions on the age of the albums selected, there is clearly a preference for older albums. The median age of the 500 albums on Rolling Stone’s list is 28 years, and among the top 100 albums on the list, none were originally recorded fewer than ten years prior to the publication of the issue and only eight were originally recorded fewer than twenty years earlier. To emphasize the influence and import of the consecrated albums, Rolling Stone reminds readers that its compilation “does not reflect sales or chart positions” as evidenced by the fact that the top-selling album of all time (Eagles: Their Greatest Hits, 1971-1975 at 28 million copies sold) does not appear on the list (Rolling Stone 2003, 38).
The top album on *Rolling Stone*’s list is The Beatles’ *Sgt. Pepper’s Lonely Hearts Club Band*. Although their album *Abbey Road* sold more copies and some commentators suggest *Revolver* has better songs, *Sgt. Pepper’s* is deemed the “most important” album ever made due to its innovative use of “concept, sound, songwriting, cover art and studio technology” (*Rolling Stone* 2003, 85). By focusing on historical importance, technical significance, as well as social and cultural impact, *Rolling Stone* seeks to establish the legitimacy of its project and invoke the weight of consecration. By appealing to experts and by rationalizing the rankings through a sophisticated accounting procedure, *Rolling Stone* aims to bring legitimacy to its project of consecration.

**Data and Methods**

*Constructing the sample*

In order to compare the effects of popular, professional, and critical reception on the likelihood that a popular music album was retrospectively consecrated, I constructed a sample of albums that received at least one such form of recognition at the time of their release. It would be impractical, of course, to analyze all popular music albums ever released, but it is possible to examine the characteristics that are associated with retrospective consecration for albums that received either professional, popular, or critical recognition. Because the sample focuses on popular music, I exclude classical, choral, comedy, and original cast albums.

To begin, I introduced each of *Rolling Stone*’s 500 “greatest albums of all time” into the sample. For popular recognition, I included all 595 popular music albums that reached the number one position on the *Billboard* album charts from its inception in 1955 through 2003. In terms of professional recognition, I added all albums that either received a Grammy nomination for Album of the Year or that had a track from the album nominated for Record or Song of the Year from 1958 to 2003; typically, there are five nominees in each category in any given year. I also included albums that received a Grammy Hall of Fame Award from 1973 to 2003. In total, 506 different
popular music albums received at least one such form of professional recognition. Finally, for 1971 and for each year from 1974 to 2003, the top 20 albums on the *Village Voice* critics’ list were included in the sample, which contributes 618 additional albums. As shown in Table 1, constructing the sample in this way could have potentially generated 2,219 different albums for analysis. However, due to overlap between albums that received more than one form of recognition, the final sample size is 1,687 albums.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of album</th>
<th>Total number of albums</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rolling Stone’s “Greatest Albums”</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number one on Billboard album charts</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammy nominee/Hall of Fame Award winner</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Voice critics’ list top 20</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential number of different albums in sample</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,219</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actual number of different albums in sample</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,687</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Descriptive Statistics and Measures**

Table 2 provides descriptive statistics for the 500 consecrated albums and for the full sample. The median age for the *Rolling Stone* albums is 28 years, while the median for the entire sample is 20. Thus, age is included as a control variable in all analyses and is expected to have a positive impact on the likelihood of consecration. A variable identifying soundtrack and compilation albums is also included in the analyses. Because such albums are not directly associated with a specific performer or group, I expect soundtracks and compilation albums are less likely to be retrospectively consecrated.

Measures of popular recognition in the analyses include whether an album appeared on the *Billboard* album charts and whether the album is certified Gold or Platinum by the RIAA. Professional recognition variables measure whether an album has been nominated for Album of the Year, whether a track from the album has been nominated for Song or Record of the Year, and whether an album has
received a Hall of Fame Award. Critical recognition measures determine if an album was among the top ten albums on a *Village Voice* poll or if an album received a five-star rating from critics in the Marsh and Swenson (1983) volume.

**Table 2.** Descriptive Statistics for Rolling Stone’s 500 Greatest Albums and for Full Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Rolling Stone 500</th>
<th>Full Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soundtrack or compilation albums</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Popular recognition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Billboard</em> charted albums</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIAA Gold certified</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIAA Platinum certified</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional recognition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Album of the Year nominee</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record of the Year nominee</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song of the Year nominee</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall of Fame Award recipient</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical recognition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top ten <em>Village Voice</em> critics poll</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-star album</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1687</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Logistic Regression Analysis**

Because the dependent variable in my analysis is whether or not an album has been retrospectively consecrated, logistic regression is the most appropriate technique for statistical analysis. In the analysis, I report the exponentiated coefficients of the regression models, which are referred to as odds ratios. Odds ratios greater than one indicate a positive relationship between an independent variable and the likelihood of consecration, while odds ratios less than one indicate a negative relationship between an independent variable and the odds of consecration. Analyses are based on the 1,677 albums in the sample that were released between 1955 and 2003.⁹

---

⁹ Restricting analyses to albums released between 1955 and 2003 excludes 10 sample albums released before 1955 – 1 that appears on the *Rolling Stone* list and 9 Grammy Hall of Fame Award winners – but does not substantively change the results in analyses that include these early albums.
Results

The analyses in Table 3 consider the effects of age, soundtrack and compilation albums, as well as various measures of popular, professional and critical recognition on the likelihood that an album is retrospectively consecrated. Model 1 includes the age of the album, whether it is a soundtrack or compilation, and the measures of popular recognition. It suggests that charted albums are less likely to be consecrated than uncharted albums, but that Platinum certified albums are about 1.5 times more likely to be consecrated than albums that are neither Gold nor Platinum. Model 2 introduces measures of professional recognition and suggests that receiving a Song of the Year nomination actually decreases the odds of retrospective consecration, while Album and Record of the Year nominations have no significant impact. Model 3 focuses on critical recognition and shows that appearing in the top ten of the Village Voice critics’ list enhances the likelihood of being retrospectively consecrated. As expected, age enhances the odds of retrospective consecration, while soundtrack and compilation albums are less likely to be consecrated in each of the first three models.

Table 3. Odds ratios for the effects of popular, professional, and critical recognition on the likelihood of selection for Rolling Stone’s 500 greatest albums of all time, 1955-2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age of album</td>
<td>1.045**</td>
<td>1.042**</td>
<td>1.046**</td>
<td>1.056**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soundtrack or compilation</td>
<td>.199**</td>
<td>.188**</td>
<td>.212**</td>
<td>.210**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billboard charted album</td>
<td>.623*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.656*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold certified album</td>
<td>.884</td>
<td></td>
<td>.948</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platinum certified album</td>
<td>1.539**</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.900**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Album of the Year nominee</td>
<td>1.236</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.085</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song of the Year nominee</td>
<td>.309††</td>
<td></td>
<td>.331††</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record of the Year nominee</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td></td>
<td>.663</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Ten on Critics’ List</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.235**</td>
<td>2.270**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ²           125.4  162.6  139.6  211.3
Pseudo R-square .102  .131  .113  .168
N                1677  1677  1677  1677

**p< .01, *p< .05 (one-tailed test)
††p< .01, †p< .05 (two-tailed test)
Model 4 includes all measures of popular, professional, and critical recognition from the first three models, as well as age and soundtrack or compilation albums. When these variables are analyzed simultaneously, the effects remain consistent with the first three models. Age continues to have a positive effect on the odds of consecration, while being a soundtrack or compilation album has a negative effect. In terms of popular recognition, appearing on the *Billboard* album charts decreases the likelihood of consecration, while a Platinum certified album is nearly two times more likely to be consecrated than an album that is neither Gold nor Platinum certified. Being nominated for Song of the Year hinders the odds of consecration, but being in the top ten of the *Village Voice* critics’ poll increases the likelihood of consecration by about 2.3 times.

Table 4 presents the results of analyses of albums released during delimited time spans. Model 5 focuses on the effects of professional recognition on the odds of consecration for albums released before 1978 – the latest year for which sample records can be considered for a Grammy Hall of Fame Award (i.e., 25 years prior to the 2003 publication of the *Rolling Stone* list).10 For albums released before 1978, age decreases the odds of retrospective consecration, as does being a soundtrack or compilation album or a Gold certified album. In terms of professional recognition, Model 5 suggests that nominations for Album, Song, or Record of the Year prior to 1978 all significantly diminish the likelihood of retrospective consecration, but a Grammy Hall of Fame Award increases the odds of consecration nearly 2.5 times.

Model 6 focuses on the impact of an early group of pop and rock critics on retrospective consecration by considering albums released before 1983 when the volume of retrospective reviews by early critics was published (see Marsh & Swenson 1983). In this model, soundtrack and compilation albums as well as Grammy nominees remain significantly less likely to be retrospectively consecrated. Albums that received a five-star rating from an early group of pop and rock critics

---

10 The *Village Voice* critics’ poll measure is not included in model 5 because it had only operated in four years prior to 1978.
during this time period are over 6 times more likely to be retrospectively consecrated than albums that received fewer than five stars.

Table 4. Odds ratios for the effects of popular, professional, and critical recognition on the likelihood of selection for *Rolling Stone*’s 500 greatest albums of all time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 5 Pre-1978</th>
<th>Model 6 Pre-1983</th>
<th>Model 7 1974 to 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age of album</td>
<td>.922**</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>1.064**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soundtrack or compilation</td>
<td>.280*</td>
<td>.335*</td>
<td>.390*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Popular recognition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billboard charted album</td>
<td>1.146</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>.338**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold certified album</td>
<td>.557*</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>1.999*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platinum certified album</td>
<td>1.080</td>
<td>1.389</td>
<td>2.469**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional recognition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Album of the Year nominee</td>
<td>.555*</td>
<td>.535*</td>
<td>1.794**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song of the Year nominee</td>
<td>.227††</td>
<td>.279††</td>
<td>.327††</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record of the Year nominee</td>
<td>.480†</td>
<td>.418††</td>
<td>1.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall of Fame inductee</td>
<td>2.364**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical recognition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top ten on critics’ list</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.826**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-star critics’ ranking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.251**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χ²</td>
<td>130.3</td>
<td>181.2</td>
<td>142.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R-square</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>1192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01, *p<.05 (one-tailed tests) ††p<.01, †p<.05 (two-tailed test)**

The final model in Table 4 uses the same measures of popular, professional, and critical recognition as Model 4 in Table 3, but focuses on albums released between 1974 and 2003. By 1974, the *Village Voice* poll had been permanently established and the Grammy Awards are thought to have fallen more in line with public opinion during the past 30 years, thus providing an interesting basis for comparison. In model 7, age maintains its positive impact on the odds of consecration. *Billboard* charted albums are less likely to be consecrated, but Gold certified albums are about 2 times more likely and Platinum certified albums are nearly 2.5 times more likely to be retrospectively consecrated than are uncertified albums. For albums released in the past 30 years, Album of the Year nominees are nearly 80% more likely to be consecrated, although Song of the Year nominees are
still less likely to be retrospectively consecrated. Appearing among the top ten albums on a *Village Voice* critics’ poll increases the odds of retrospective consecration about 2.8 times.

**Conclusion**

The present chapter suggests that albums of historical import and that stand the test of time are indeed more likely to be counted among the “greatest” albums and be retrospectively consecrated. With the exception of the models that analyze only albums released before 1978 or 1983, the age of an album enhances the likelihood of being retrospectively consecrated. This preference for albums that “last” might also help explain the results of the popular recognition measures. Platinum and, in some cases, Gold certified albums are considerably more likely to have been retrospectively consecrated than other albums. For most of the years covered by this study, selling 1,000,000 or even 500,000 copies of an album would generally indicate that an album remained in print for an extended period of time or that it was reissued at some point. Thus, Platinum and Gold albums likely maintained their popularity over a longer period of time than did albums that charted but did not achieve RIAA certification.

In most models, appearing on the *Billboard* album charts has a negative impact on the odds of consecration, but such results should be interpreted with caution. As shown in Table 2, nearly 83% of the albums consecrated by *Rolling Stone* appeared on the album charts, which suggests that the consecrated albums are far more likely to have been on the *Billboard* charts relative to all albums ever released. However, the negative effect implies that the *Rolling Stone* albums are less likely to have charted than the other albums in the sample when we control for other factors. Thus, the consecrated albums appear to be less associated with pop chart success compared to albums that received some other form of recognition.

Soundtracks and compilation albums are consistently less likely to be retrospectively consecrated. I suppose that this can largely be explained by the fact
that nearly all soundtracks and compilations are the products of various artists and cannot be linked to any one performer or group. Such an explanation can also help account for the consistently negative impact of Song of the Year nominations on the odds of retrospective consecration. While Album of the Year and Record of the Year awards go to performers, awards for Song of the Year recognize songwriters. Thus, it appears that when the recognition for a recording is not clearly linked to the performer or group, whether in the case of soundtracks, compilations or Song of the Year awards, an album is far less likely to be retrospectively consecrated.

In terms of other measures of professional recognition, the analyses suggest that it can enhance the odds of retrospective consecration. However, during the first 25 years of the Grammy Awards, nominees for Album, Record, or Song of the Year are all significantly less likely to appear on the *Rolling Stone* list. Hall of Fame Award winners during these early years, on the other hand, are more likely to have been consecrated. Over the last 30 years, being nominated for Album of the Year increases the odds of consecration by nearly 80%, but recognition of individual tracks (e.g., Song of the Year, Record of the Year) does not enhance the likelihood of consecration.

Critical recognition consistently shows a positive impact on the odds of consecration. Albums that appeared on the top ten of the *Village Voice* critics’ poll were two to three times more likely to be on the *Rolling Stone* list as well. It is particularly striking how early popular music critics were apparently able to establish a notion of the most “essential” or “greatest” albums that continues to prevail today. Albums receiving five stars from such critics were over six times more likely to be retrospectively consecrated than those that did not.

In addition to the direct influence of measures of critical recognition, the results may suggest that critics also have an indirect impact on consecration through other forms of recognition. For instance, critical reception may not determine whether or not an album appears on the *Billboard* charts, but it may exert some influence on what albums generate a sustained level of public interest and sales.
Future research could more carefully address the impact critics have on popular success.

Likewise, the Recording Academy introduced Hall of Fame Awards in 1973, around the time popular music critics were becoming well established. By the late 1970s, the Recording Academy was granting awards to albums that had already received considerable recognition from an early group of critics. Also, in the time period after the *Village Voice* critics’ poll became permanent in 1974, Album of the Year nominations display a positive impact on the odds of retrospective consecration, which suggests that professional recognition became more similar to critical reception. Due to the apparently powerful influence of the initial group of recognized pop and rock critics, it is important to explore further the criteria for consecration they helped establish.

In this chapter, I have attempted to extend research on the role of popular, professional, and critical recognition in projects of retrospective consecration to the field of popular music in the US. My findings support the notion that critics influence the valorization and consecration of cultural products in the United States. However, it is important to broaden the focus of this chapter to include other factors that are likely to influence the odds of consecration. Given the interplay between social and symbolic boundaries demonstrated in the preceding chapter, it seems likely that social characteristics, including gender, would shape the likelihood of consecration. The lack of attention newspaper critics give to female performers is one mechanism that may contribute to the gendered distribution of cultural legitimacy and consecration. Thus, in the next chapter I address the relationship between gender and cultural consecration in the popular music field.
Chapter 5
Gender and cultural consecration in music

Introduction

As described in the previous chapter, *Rolling Stone* magazine published a special issue in 2003 to recognize the “greatest albums of all time” as selected by an “electorate of experts”, including nearly 300 professional musicians, managers, producers, critics, historians, label executives and other prominent industry figures (“Inside the RS 500”, 2003: 38). The top-ranked album -- *Sgt. Pepper’s Lonely Hearts Club Band* by the Beatles – was proclaimed the “most important rock & roll album ever made”, with no other pop record ever having had “such an immediate, titanic impact”, while the Beatles are described as devoted “artists” and “pioneers” who achieved “magic and transcendence” (“The 500 greatest albums of all time”, 2003: 85). The highest ranking album by a female artist (ranked 30th), Joni Mitchell’s *Blue*, is praised for its emotional honesty and described as her “greatest musical achievement”; although “Stephen Stills and James Taylor lend an occasional hand”, she is described as sounding “utterly alone in her melancholy” as she turns her “sadness into tender art” (“The 500 greatest albums of all time”, 2003: xx). The inclusion of such albums among the greats and the laudatory discourse with which their status is justified offers insights into dimensions of cultural consecration, including the gender dynamics at play.

Sociologists have addressed the ways in which certain cultural genres, particular artists, and individual art works are celebrated and set apart from others. Bourdieu (1984) used the term “consecration” to describe the distinction constructed between “sacred” artistic offerings and their “profane” counterparts. Acts of cultural consecration venerate a select few cultural creators or works that are worthy of particular admiration in contrast to the multitude that are not. Often such acts occur retrospectively as cultural fields seek to highlight “elements of their pasts which are most clearly artistic, while suppressing less desirable ancestors” (Becker 1982: 339). By focusing on a relative few exemplars that represent the aesthetic currently
deemed appropriate, art worlds construct histories that lend legitimacy to the field by showing they have always produced work of artistic merit (Becker 1982). In addition to enhancing the legitimacy of the field, such histories secure the reputation of certain performers within the field. Because cultural producers strive for legitimacy rather than profits alone (Bourdieu 1993), consecration is of great consequence in fields of cultural production. Yet as Allen and Lincoln (2004) note in their study of consecration in American film, studies of artistic reputation are generally descriptive, atheoretical, and do not examine the formal process of retrospective cultural consecration. Thus, we seek to build on the previous chapter and to contribute to recent studies that seek to empirically evaluate predictors of consecration.

Bourdieu (1993) argued that there are three competing forms of legitimacy in any field of cultural production. First, public acclaim bestows “popular legitimacy” on cultural products and their creators. Second, “specific” legitimacy is achieved through professional recognition, conferred by other creative personnel within a cultural field. Third, “bourgeois” legitimacy is imparted by agents of the dominant class to artists and their works. Drawing on Bourdieu’s three competing forms of cultural legitimacy, sociologists have considered the role that popular acclaim (e.g. sales), professional recognition (e.g. Oscar or Grammy Awards), and critical attention (e.g. awards from critics) play in shaping which films (Allen and Lincoln 2004; Hicks and Petrova 2006) and popular music albums (Schmutz 2005) are retrospectively consecrated by influential institutions in their respective fields. In both film and popular music, such research has highlighted the significant role that the evaluations of critics play in shaping processes of consecration. However, such studies have not considered how social characteristics, such as gender, impact the distribution of these forms of cultural legitimacy and thereby shape the odds of consecration for female and male artists.

Other scholars have focused on the content of critical discourse to identify legitimating strategies critics use to elevate the status of the cultural products to
which they give attention. Such research shows how critics draw on existing cultural frameworks about art to legitimate cultural fields and particular works. In the case of American film, Baumann (2001, 2007) finds that critics used “intellectualizing” discourse and critical techniques associated with high status cultural fields to provide a legitimating ideology for perceiving film as art rather than mere entertainment. Van Venrooij and Schmutz (forthcoming) show that such “high art” criteria are often used in popular music reviews as well, and Regev (1994) argues that early rock critics positioned rock music within the existing parameters of art by emphasizing the artistic autonomy of certain musicians. Such research further highlights the key role of critical evaluations in fields of cultural production, but does not systematically consider how such legitimating strategies are distributed by gender or how critical discourse is itself gendered.

Building on the insights of such studies and, in concert with a growing body of research on the formation of a popular music canon (Jones 2008), we aim to show how processes of cultural legitimacy and retrospective consecration in popular music are shaped by gender. While previous studies have tended to focus on the actual careers of female artists, we examine the factors affecting reputational careers, measuring whether and how the distribution of cultural legitimacy affects female musicians’ likelihood of retrospective cultural consecration. Moreover, in addition to highlighting why some cultural works are set apart from others, we also consider how the inclusion of those works is justified.

To do so, we employ a mixed-method approach that proceeds in two main parts. First, we measure how various forms of cultural legitimacy are distributed in the field of popular music by gender and how this distribution impacts the likelihood that female musicians are retrospectively consecrated. In logistic regression analyses, we estimate the degree to which gender directly and indirectly shapes the odds that a popular music album is counted among the all-time greats in Rolling Stone magazine. Second, we focus on the discursive strategies used to justify the inclusion of certain musical works among the “greatest” of all time by analyzing the content of the 500
Gender, cultural legitimacy, and consecration

Opportunities for women in the mainstream popular music market have long been limited (for an overview, see Dowd et al 2005). Although scholars have shown that women continued to make music in the face of various obstacles (Citron 1993), they have generally been confined to the margins of the music industry, while men occupy a more central location, including most production roles and decision-making positions (Bayton 1998, Gaar 1992). As a result, female musicians have garnered fewer industry resources (Bayton 1998), less radio airplay (Childerhose 1998), limited mainstream success in male-dominated genres such as rock music (Schippers 2002), and lower earnings and less stable employment relative to men (Coulangeon et al. 2005). As Frith and McRobbie put it, the “music business is male-run; popular musicians, writers, creators, technicians, engineers and producers are mostly men. Female creative roles are limited and mediated through male notions of female ability” (1990, 373). Even when certain opportunities open to women, they are often on the periphery of the popular music field. For example, Clawson (1999) shows that opportunities opened up for women to play in alternative rock bands primarily because men moved towards more visible instruments, such as electric guitar, opening some peripheral space for female musicians to play the bass. In short, women face a variety of barriers in securing stable careers and mainstream success in the popular music field.

While most scholarship has focused on women’s actual careers, some studies offer insights into how gender discrimination and segregation can have longstanding implications for women’s reputational careers as well. Tuchman and Fortin (1980),
for instance, find that as the Victorian literary field professionalized and the novel became associated with “high culture,” male writers edged female writers out of the profession. As a result, the fame and recognition that accompanied the rising professional and cultural status of literature disproportionately accrued to male writers. Likewise, DeNora (1995, 2002) describes a similar phenomenon in the 19th century music scene of Vienna. Although women had historically been well represented among pianists and performed the same works as men, the Viennese musical field became segregated as Beethoven gained in popularity and notoriety. Because the physical demands of Beethoven’s compositions violated norms of feminine comportment, women rarely performed his works. Meanwhile, Beethoven became the masculine model of musical “genius” from which women became excluded. Such examples illustrate the gender dynamics that are often at play in processes of cultural legitimacy. The male domination of both Victorian literature and Viennese music had longstanding consequences for the gendered distribution of cultural legitimacy and consecration, placing limits on the opportunities available to female writers and musicians as well as diminishing the likelihood they were included in the canons of their respective fields.

In some fields, however, opportunities have opened and cultural canons expanded to include women and others who were previously excluded. In the case of literature, for instance, Sarah Corse and colleagues have examined the mechanisms whereby African American and female authors entered the American literary canon (Corse and Griffin 1997, Corse and Westervelt 2002). Among other things, they call attention to the different discursive strategies employed by literary critics and other intermediaries over time, which allowed authors who were previously overlooked or even derided to be favorably reassessed and canonized. In the case of popular music, however, critics have often been accused of reinforcing the male domination of the music industry. Leonard argues that critics operate within a “culture of masculinity” (2007, 67), and Evans characterizes it as “a tightly woven old-boy network (1997, xvi). As Kruse pointedly argues, “popular rock and pop criticism has traditionally
presented its subject matter in a way that assumes writer and reader coexist in a phallocentric world in which women are peripheral” (2002, 138). Female popular musicians receive much less media coverage than their male counterparts and critical attention to female performers is often limited to peripheral genres, while the genres that garner the most media attention typically remain the most male-dominated (Schmutz 2009). Furthermore, when women do receive coverage, Johnson-Grau (2002) suggests that their physical appearance and their home lives may receive more attention than their music. The lack of critical attention and acclaim for female performers is particularly troubling given the role critics play in fields of cultural production and in processes of consecration.

We build on these insights by investigating how processes of cultural legitimacy and retrospective consecration in popular music are shaped by gender. While previous studies have tended to focus on the disadvantage female artists face in their actual careers, we extend this work by examining whether women are doubly disadvantaged in their reputational careers as well. Moving beyond the historical and descriptive evidence of women’s exclusion from processes of cultural consecration, we systematically analyze the factors affecting retrospective cultural consecration, and their implications for female musicians’ reputational careers. Moreover, in addition to highlighting why some cultural works are set apart from others, we also consider how the inclusion of those works is justified. Others have shown how critics draw on existing cultural frameworks about art to legitimate cultural fields and particular works (Baumann 2007; Regev 1994), but we explore the ways in which such frameworks are gendered. By comparing how critics legitimate the consecrated albums of male and female performers, we aim to show how gender dynamics shape the discursive strategies critics employ. Below we describe some of the potential strategies critics use to legitimate particular albums and offer expectations as to how these discursive frames vary by gender.
Critical discourse and cultural consecration

*Historical importance*

Often, it is assumed that the greatest works are those that “last” and maintain their reputations with the passage of time. Thus, it is possible that such works endure “not because large numbers of people actively appreciate them, but rather because they are historically important” (Becker 1982, 367). Indeed, *Rolling Stone* seeks to legitimize its project of consecration by appealing to this assumption by stating that its list includes albums that have been “crucial to the history” of popular music (“Inside the RS 500” 2003, 38). The historical importance of an album can be highlighted in a number of ways, such as by discussing its impact on the field, other artists, or even the broader society. Yet some scholars argue that critics have created histories of the field that systematically exclude female musicians. Johnson-Grau (2002) argues, for instance, that during the process of historicizing rock in the late 1960s, female artists were marginalized or simply excluded from the record. O’Brien (2002) contends that little changed in the decades that followed, maintaining that female artists continue to be “an addendum in the history of pop” (2). Given this tendency to exclude women from the history of popular music, we expect that male musicians are more likely to be portrayed by critics as being historically important.

*Intellectualizing discourse and high art criteria*

In his work, Bourdieu (1984) contrasts the “aesthetic disposition”, a cerebral or intellectual way of perceiving cultural content, with the “popular aesthetic”, a mode of cultural reception that favors entertainment and easy enjoyment. The “aesthetic disposition” is characteristic of legitimate, “high culture” fields and is, for Bourdieu (1984), the dominant mode of cultural reception. In the case of American film, Baumann (2001, 2007) shows how critics drew upon “intellectualizing” discourse and critical techniques associated with high status cultural fields to provide a legitimating ideology for perceiving film as art. Over time, film reviewers used more terminology and reviewing techniques reminiscent of those used in evaluating literature and
classical music. Terms like “brilliant”, “genius” or “masterpiece” were relatively rare in film reviews prior to 1960, but became increasingly common thereafter, which brought legitimacy to the film world and enabled some films to be valorized as works of art rather than mere entertainment.

Similar arguments have been made about the role of intellectualizing discourse and high art criteria in enhancing the status of popular music (Regev 1994; Frith 1996). In addition to certain high art terms employed by critics, other dimensions of the “aesthetic disposition” are evident in popular music reviews. For one, in contrast with the “popular aesthetic,” Bourdieu argues that the “high art” aesthetic values originality, innovation and invention while it derides cultural products that are seen as derivative, unoriginal and formulaic. Second, the high art aesthetic distances itself from simple and “facile” cultural content in favor of works that are seen as serious and intelligent. Third, whereas the “popular aesthetic” prefers superficial and straightforward cultural fare that is easily enjoyed, the “aesthetic disposition” seeks works of art that are complex and ambiguous. Finally, in contrast to the fleeting offerings of popular culture, true works of art are timeless and have longstanding cultural value (Bourdieu 1984; Becker 1982).

In their study of popular music reviews, Van Venrooij and Schmutz (forthcoming) find these elements of the high art aesthetic in American, German and Dutch newspapers. Although the prevalence of such criteria varies across countries, they find elements of the high art aesthetic are often used to evaluate and legitimate popular music albums. Likewise, McLeod (2002) argues that critics write favorably of albums that are “original,” “serious,” and “intelligent” while dismissing albums they find guilty of “formulaic unoriginality” and “vapidity.” However, such critical evaluations often take on gendered overtones. In particular, McLeod (2002) suggests that despite increasing critical attention to female artists in the past two decades, they continue to be devalued in implicit—and at times explicit—ways. For instance, the

---

11 It should be noted that Frith sees “high art” discourse as only one type of discourse that popular music critics use to legitimate music.
“intensity,” “rawness,” and “seriousness” that characterizes “good” music holds certain masculine connotations. Such descriptors stand in stark contrast to the “softness” and “sentimentalism” often used to pejoratively describe women’s music. Thus, given the gendered overtones of this rhetoric, we expect that intellectualizing discourse and high art aesthetic criteria are more often invoked to legitimate male musicians relative to female musicians.

**Ideology of the autonomous artist**

In addition to legitimating popular music through intellectualizing discourse, Regev (1994) points to another discursive strategy critics use to articulate popular music’s artistic potential. Beginning with 1960s rock critics, Regev (1994) argues that an “ideology of the autonomous artist” was employed to cast certain rock musicians as deserving of the title “artist.” According to this ideology, the artist produces art for its own sake as a pure creative expression and maintains artistic integrity by shunning external influences, including commercial interests. By setting apart certain “masterpieces” of rock and by identifying individual rock musicians and groups as the sole creative source of their music, Regev (1994, 1997) argues that critics positioned rock music within the existing parameters of art and established an aesthetic hierarchy that diffused to other popular music genres.

The legitimacy associated with the autonomous artist in popular music parallels auteur theory in the film world, which recognizes the director as the creative force behind a film. Viewing directors as auteurs helped to elevate the status of film in the US (Baumann 2007). Thus, just as directors became seen as “artists” in American cinema, rock musicians could also be viewed as the “artists” behind their form of cultural expression. Regev (1997) argues that this ideology became one of the dominant standards by which other popular musical forms and musicians are

---

12 At least, certain “canonical” rock musicians or groups whose “greatness” is, according to Regev (1994), beyond dispute: The Beatles, Rolling Stones, Beach Boys, The Who, Velvet Underground, The Band, Bob Dylan, Jimi Hendrix and Van Morrison. It is notable that all are male musicians or all-male groups.
evaluated. As a result, being seen as too “slick” or overproduced, too commercial, or even too popular could potentially disqualify popular musicians from being viewed as genuine auteurs and autonomous artists (McLeod 2002). As feminist scholars have long pointed out, however, traditional notions of autonomy and agency have been grounded in masculine stereotypes, and stand in stark contrast to stereotypical notions of female dependency (see e.g., Butler 1990, Nedelsky 1989). Moreover, in discussions of “authorship” in popular music, Whiteley (2000) argues that critics routinely privilege male performers and male-dominated musical styles. Consequently, we expect that male musicians will more often be portrayed as autonomous artists than their female counterparts.

**Social networks**

In contrast to being legitimated through artistic autonomy, artists might also be legitimated through their connections to others. Sociological research has called attention to the many benefits of social networks (for a review, see Lin 1999). The insights generated from such research have been applied to artistic fields with similar results. Among art photographers in New York City, for example, Giuffre (1999) found that artists with extensive, weak ties to other photographers are most likely to achieve success in their art world, while those who have fewer strong ties within a dense clique of artists are also able to maintain viable careers. However, those without such networks generally struggle to achieve success. Likewise, Lang and Lang (1990) show that etchers who belonged to “circles” of artists were more likely to have a longstanding reputation than those without such networks. Because female etchers were less likely to have ties to recognized etchers, they were less likely to maintain their reputations over time relative to male etchers. Bayton’s (1990) research with female musicians reveals a variety of mechanisms that perpetuate women’s exclusion from male bands, often leading them to form groups with other women. The general tendency towards homophily in social networks (McPherson, Smith-Lovin and Cook 2001) is a likely mechanism that has perpetuated male
dominance of the popular music field and hampered the reputations of female performers.

However, the role of social networks in enhancing the legitimacy of an artist is mediated by critics who choose whether or not to highlight the connections an artist has to others. In other words, if the social network and personal relationships of an artist are a way to elevate an artist’s reputation, it often requires an intermediary to call attention to that connection. There are several ways in which critics establish or highlight the social networks of artists they review. For one, they may simply compare one artist or group with another, creating an “imagined network”. Such networks do not involve actual relationships between artists, but may still serve to create a connection that can enhance the reputation of a musician under review. It has been argued that social homophily extends even to “imagined networks” in that female musicians are typically only compared to other female musicians (Johnson-Grau 2002), but connecting a musician to a legitimate artist is one way critics can elevate the status of the musician under consideration.

Another way critics can legitimate an artist is by highlighting their actual networks with renowned artists in the field. Such connections, particularly with other consecrated figures, can serve to justify the inclusion of an artist among the “greatest.” In other instances, critics may emphasize networks with individuals who are outside the field altogether, perhaps focusing more on personal rather than professional relationships. Johnson-Grau (2002) argues that female musicians are much more likely than male musicians to have their personal relationships – with lovers or family members, for example – discussed in media outlets. Whether such networks are “imagined” by the critic, involve actual professional relationships to other artists in the field, or focus on connections to non-artists or on personal relationships, such networks can be a source of legitimacy. At the same time, attributing credit to others in an artist’s social network can undermine claims to artistic autonomy. Therefore, we expect that female musicians are more often
portrayed and legitimated through their connections to others rather than through their artistic autonomy.

**Authenticity**

As noted by Peterson (1997), authenticity is a widely used concept in popular music studies with a variety of meanings. While it is beyond the scope of this article to address the varied uses of the concept in the literature, it is important to note that authenticity can be a key source of symbolic value in various popular musics (e.g. Grazian 2004 on blues; Peterson 1997 on country; Walser 1993 on metal; Negus 1999 on rap; Frith 1987, 1996 on rock). As a result, claims to authenticity can be potent claims to legitimacy. Although some of the criteria that constitute authenticity vary from one popular music genre to another, such claims often revolve around establishing that a musician or the music is “genuine”, “natural”, and without “artifice” (Peterson 1997, 211). From this perspective, authenticity can be conceived as a form of self-expression whereby popular music is seen as “fundamentally a release of feelings” (Jones and Featherly 2002, 33). In other words, legitimating claims to authenticity may focus on music as a genuine expression of the personality or emotions of the artist. If such self-expression is claimed by critics to occur without “artifice,” it can be a powerful legitimating claim. As Hochschild (1983) shows, women tend to be clustered in jobs that require emotional labor because it is generally assumed that women feel and manage their emotions better than men. Likewise, the expressiveness associated with authentic musical performance is a type of emotional labor that women may be perceived as better able to produce. Therefore, we expect that female artists are more likely to be portrayed as emotionally authentic than male performers.

A second form of authenticity centers on the relationship between the music and the social background of the musician. From this perspective, authenticity involves displaying a seemingly “natural” link between a performer’s roots and the musical style they create. In Chicago blues clubs, for example, Grazian (2004)
describes the desire among audience members for an “authentic” cultural experience in which a blues musician conforms to expectations about the “local dialect, styles of interaction, dress and so forth” (138). Likewise, Peterson (1997) describes the link that must be established between a country musician’s background to the tradition and history of country music in order to “fabricate” authenticity. When producing rap music, executives at large recording firms often refer to the “street” to indicate a “natural” connection between an authentic rap artist’s social background and his or her music (Negus 1999). Thus, authenticity based on social background may be used to legitimate popular musicians. Yet the relationship between social background and musical style varies by genre, so it is difficult to predict whether male or female performers are more likely to be legitimated as authentic in this way.

Data and Methods

Rolling Stone as a consecrating institution

As mentioned, Rolling Stone polled an “electorate of experts”, including nearly 300 professional musicians, managers, producers, critics, historians, label executives and other prominent industry figures to determine the “greatest albums of all time” (“Inside the RS 500” 2003, 38). The accounting firm Ernst & Young was employed to develop a sophisticated method for tabulating the ballots to help Rolling Stone identify and rank the 500 “most exciting and vital albums ever recorded” and the most “crucial” to popular music history. In its appeal to the cultural authority of “experts”, its focus on historical importance and impact, and its rationalized ranking procedure, Rolling Stone clearly aims to enhance the legitimacy of its project and to invoke the weight of consecration. As Jones and Featherly (2002) suggest, Rolling Stone is an institution that clearly seeks to “legitimate specific musics and musicians” and is the one periodical that has “the power to ‘consecrate’ popular music in Bourdieu’s terms” (20). Thus, we consider this instance of retrospective cultural consecration an ideal case for addressing unanswered questions about the extent to which gender shapes the process.
Predictors of consecration

We employ a mixed-methods research design in order to quantitatively analyze the predictors of consecration, as well as qualitatively analyze the discursive strategies employed by critics to legitimate consecrated albums. In addressing our first question regarding the effect of gender on the likelihood that a popular music album achieves consecrated status, we use the same dataset from the preceding chapter, supplemented with data on gender. In their study, Allen and Lincoln (2004) used measures of popular, professional, and critical acclaim to generate a large sample of films and to estimate which of these competing forms of cultural legitimacy were associated with retrospective consecration by the National Film Registry and the American Film Institute. Similarly, I constructed a sample of popular music albums that received popular, professional, and/or critical recognition at the time of their release. Albums receiving popular recognition include those that reached the top position on the Billboard album charts from 1955 through 2003 (n=595). Albums receiving professional legitimacy include those nominated for an Album of the Year Grammy or that had a track from the album nominated for Record or Song of the Year between 1958 and 2003, or those that received a Grammy Hall of Fame Award from 1973 to 2003 (n=506). Albums receiving critical recognition include the top 20 albums on the Village Voice critics’ lists for 1971 and 1974-2003 (n=618). After removing duplicate entries, this produced a sample of 1,687 albums, but the sample is restricted in certain ways for this chapter. First, the Rolling Stone 500 list includes ten albums released prior to 1955, but because none of our measures of popular, professional, or critical legitimacy exist before this point, we exclude these albums from the sample. Second, the sample originally included 174 albums that featured both male and female performers. However, our focus in this paper is the difference between male and female performers, and to reduce the ambiguity caused by the wide variety of mixed-gender groups (e.g., predominantly male...
groups with a female lead singer), we dropped these albums from our analysis. Thus, the final sample in this chapter includes 1,503 albums.

The outcome of interest is whether an album achieves consecrated status, measured as whether it appears on the *Rolling Stone*’s 500 “greatest albums of all time” (2003). Although the dataset includes multiple variables measuring various forms of legitimacy for each album, this chapter focuses on the significant explanatory variables from the previous chapter in order to draw attention to the effects of gender on consecration. Artists’ gender is measured dichotomously with female artists and all-female groups coded 1 and male artist and all-male groups coded 0. We employ several measures of popular, professional, and critical legitimacy, adapted from Allen and Lincoln’s (2004) study of film. Measures of popular legitimacy include whether an album appeared on the *Billboard* charts and whether the album is certified platinum by the RIAA (i.e. sold 1,000,000 copies). Indicators of professional legitimacy include nominations for Grammy Awards in the categories Album of the Year and Song of the Year. Finally, critical recognition measures include whether an album was among the top 10 albums on a year-end *Village Voice* poll, or if an album received a five-star rating from critics in the *New Rolling Stone Record Guide*, edited by Marsh and Swenson (1983). The year-end *Village Voice* poll, conducted in 1971 and then every year since 1974, is based on a wide polling of popular music critics. The Marsh and Swenson (1983) volume contains the ratings of an influential group of early rock critics who reviewed and rated tens of thousands of albums. We use logistic regression to evaluate the likelihood that an album achieves consecration. Our regression models report odds ratios, with numbers greater than 1 indicating a positive effect on the likelihood of consecration, and ratios smaller than 1 indicating a negative effect.

*Consecrating discourse*

Although the expert panel polled by *Rolling Stone* included “authorities” from every genre of popular music and from each decade since the 1950s, it was the task of
contemporary writers at the magazine to produce a short review of each album that emphasized its worthiness to be included among the all-time greats. Our second question concerns the discourse critics use to justify the inclusion of men and women among the consecrated artists of popular music, so to that end we analyze the discourse of the reviews accompanying the 500 albums. The list included albums by 38 female artists or all-female groups, 415 male artists or all-male groups, and 47 mixed-gender groups. As we are primarily interested in comparing male and female musicians, we exclude mixed-gender groups from the analysis, creating a population of 453 reviews of male or female artists/groups. Because our study concerns a population rather than sample, we use descriptive statistics to provide an overview of general trends, supplemented with qualitative data to offer more context and insight into the meaning behind those trends (Altheide 1996).

We took several steps to ensure coding consistency among three evaluators. First, we coded a small sample of our population of reviews to refine our initial coding scheme and devised specific rules for coding. Following several group discussions, we repeated this process again and agreed on a final coding scheme. We then assessed intercoder reliability by overlapping 10% of the reviews (n=50). Using Holsti’s formula, intercoder reliability was 89.7%, indicating a relatively high rate of agreement (Holst 1969). The coding categories are listed below.

**Historical Importance.** We measure three types of historical importance: (1) general discussion of the album’s importance; (2) discussion of the album’s influence on other artists; and (3) discussion of the album’s impact on the broader society.

**Intellectualizing Discourse and High Art Criteria.** We include four measures of high art criteria: (1) the album is lauded for its originality and innovativeness, (2) the album is considered serious or intelligent, (3) the album’s complexity or ambiguousness is emphasized, and (4) the album is considered timeless. We also borrow Baumann’s
(2001) measures of intellectualizing discourse by conducting word counts of terms commonly found in traditional high art fields.

**Ideology of the Autonomous Artist.** Drawing on Regev’s (1994) notion of the autonomous artist, we coded for mentions of anyone identified as contributing creatively to the album. Those identified generally fell into one of two categories: an artist or band member, or those outside the band, such as producers, backing musicians, or friends.

**Social Networks.** We coded for mentions of three types of social networks: (1) “imagined” networks with similar artists (i.e., networks invoked solely by the critic); (2) real networks with other artists and music professionals; and (3) real networks with others outside the music field (e.g. friends, family members).

**Authenticity.** We use two indicators to capture authenticity: (1) the music is a genuine expression of the artist’s personality or emotions, and (2) the artist’s social background is mentioned as relevant to the musical product.

**Results**

**Predictors of Consecration**

To reiterate, our first question concerns how various types of cultural legitimacy are distributed by gender, and whether and how this distribution impacts the likelihood that female performers are consecrated. The distribution of these forms of cultural legitimacy by gender is presented in Table 1. In total, about 15% of the albums in the sample feature solo female performers or all-female performing groups, while less than 8% of the 500 consecrated albums are by female musicians.

---

14 The complete list of terms includes: “achievement, amazing, art, beauty, bold, brilliant, composition, delicate, distinction, distinguished, genius, genre, the greatest, important, inspired, intelligent, irony, magnificent, master, masterpiece, metaphor, powerful, remarkable, reveal, satire, school, simple, strength, striking, subtle, suggest, symbol, technique, tone, work, ian/esque”.
Among the sample of albums, there is considerable variation in the distribution of different types of cultural legitimacy by gender. In terms of popular legitimacy,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Male performers</th>
<th>Female performers</th>
<th>Percent Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Popular legitimacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1 Billboard album</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billboard charts</td>
<td>1438</td>
<td>1069</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIAA gold album</td>
<td>1016</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIAA platinum album</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional legitimacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Album of the Year</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song of the Year</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record of the Year</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall of Fame Award</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical legitimacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 20 Village Voice</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-star album (1983)</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1687</td>
<td>1259</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

albums by female performers comprise about 16 to 18% of those that appeared on the Billboard charts or sold over a million copies. Professional legitimacy, by comparison, appears more likely to accrue to female performers as nearly one-fourth of Album of the Year Grammy nominees and nearly one-third of Song and Record of the Year nominees are female. However, this does not extend to Grammy Hall of Fame Awards, where less than 7% of the albums to receive such an award feature female performers. Finally, critical legitimacy is the most elusive form of recognition for female performers in the sample to achieve. Fewer than 14% of the albums to make the top twenty of the Village Voice end-of-year critics’ polls and less than 5% of the albums awarded “five stars” by an influential group of early rock critics are by female performers.
The regression analyses show the extent to which various forms of cultural legitimacy and gender impact the likelihood that an album is consecrated and included among the ‘greatest’. As expected, model 1 in Table 2 shows that critical recognition is the strongest predictor of consecration, with Village Voice top ten albums over two times more likely and albums receiving a “five-star” rating from an early group of critics over 6 times more likely to make the list. Billboard chart success hinders the odds of consecration, but RIAA platinum certification boosts the likelihood of being included among the all-time greats. In terms of professional legitimacy, a Song of the Year nomination actually decreases the likelihood of consecration by over 70 percent. After controlling for such measures of cultural legitimacy, albums by female performers are over 40% less likely to achieve consecration. Thus, there is a significant direct effect of gender on consecration, as well as an indirect effect that works through the three competing forms of cultural legitimacy, given that these types of legitimacy are unevenly distributed among male and female performers.
Figure 1. Direct and indirect effects (odds ratios) of gender on consecration, 1955-2003

In a second model (see Table 2), we explore the shifting dimensions of cultural legitimacy in the popular music field by looking only at albums released from 1983 through 2003. Model 2 focuses on the time period after the permanent establishment of the *Village Voice* year-end critics’ polls and the publication of the Marsh and Swenson (1983) volume, which features ratings from a select group of influential rock critics. As Table 1 shows, this early group of rock critics was particularly unreceptive to female musicians. By looking at the time period after 1983, we can see if the gender effect changes after these critics’ influence has declined. During this period, albums appearing on the *Billboard* charts or receiving Song of the Year nominations
are still much less likely to achieve consecration, while Album of the Year nominees become 2.5 times more likely to be included on *Rolling Stone’s* list. The impact of the *Village Voice* poll becomes slightly stronger, with critics’ year-end picks nearly 2.9 times more likely to achieve consecration. Interestingly, the direct effect of gender becomes insignificant in this model. However, Figure 2 shows that the effect of gender on consecration remains mediated by the measures of cultural legitimacy. In terms of popular recognition, platinum certification is a potential path to consecration, but female performers are even more likely to appear on the *Billboard* charts, which decreases the likelihood of consecration. Likewise, Album of the Year nominations may enhance the odds of consecration, but female performers are more likely to receive Song of the Year nominations, which greatly reduce those odds. Finally, critical recognition remains the least likely form of recognition that women in our sample receive, but it continues to have a large impact on what albums are deemed the “greatest”.

In sum, these findings indicate that there are strong effects – direct and indirect – of gender on the likelihood of consecration. Female performers are less likely than male performers to receive cultural legitimacy of any type – popular, professional, or critical – and moreover, gender has a significant negative effect on the odds of consecration even when controlling for forms of legitimacy. Yet after 1983, the direct effect of gender becomes insignificant, suggesting that contemporary barriers to female consecration more often work indirectly through other forms of cultural legitimacy. In particular, critical legitimacy has a large impact on whether an album will be consecrated, and this form of legitimacy is the least available to female performers. Given the importance of critics in processes of cultural consecration, we turn our attention to the discursive strategies critics use to legitimate artists, paying particular attention to whether and how they differ by gender.
Patterns of Consecrating Discourse

*Historical Importance and Influence*

Because women have often been excluded from the history of popular music, we expect critics to be less likely to draw on notions of historical importance in legitimating albums by female musicians. As noted in Table 3, while discussions of historical importance are relatively rare overall, albums by male artists are indeed more often marked by critics as having historical importance for all three measures. Overall, 17.8% of reviews for male artists contain at least one type of reference to the album’s historical importance and influence, compared to 10.5% of female artists. Critics, for instance, invoke terms such as “landmark,” “watershed,” and
“monument” to describe albums by male artists. Reviews of male artists are also slightly more likely to include discussions of the artists’ impact on society.

Table 3. Selected Categories from Cross-Tabulations of Legitimating Criteria by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Male artists</th>
<th>Female artists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historical Importance and Influence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General importance of album</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence on other artists</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence on broader society</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combined</strong></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>17.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Art Criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originality/innovation/invention</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>33.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity/Ambiguity</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seriousness/Intelligence</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>14.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timelessness</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combined</strong></td>
<td>232</td>
<td>55.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Networks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagined networks w/ similar artists</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real networks w/ artists, professionals</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>26.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real networks w/ non-artists</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>13.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combined</strong></td>
<td>184</td>
<td>44.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Professional Networks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ties to significant others</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienation (lack of ties)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autonomous Artist</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist or group as creative source</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>89.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist as exclusive creative source</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>67.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others as creative source</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>23.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authenticity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True to self</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>20.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social background of artist</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combined</strong></td>
<td>131</td>
<td>31.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average rank on Rolling Stone list</strong></td>
<td>245</td>
<td>58.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>415</td>
<td>83.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interestingly, the only review of a female artist that does discuss the music’s socio-cultural importance is Aretha Franklin’s *I Never Loved a Man the Way I Love You*, whose song “‘Respect’…became the marching song for the women's and civil-rights movements.” In other words, the historical importance attributed to Franklin’s album is gender-specific.

*Intellectualizing discourse and high art criteria*

In addition to historical importance, we examine how likely critics are to use high art criteria to describe male and female artists. To reiterate, we coded for mentions of the album’s originality and innovativeness, complexity and ambiguity, seriousness and intelligence, and timelessness. Here again, male artists are more often legitimated through high art criteria than their female counterparts. Among reviews of male artists, over 55% contain reference to at least one of the above criteria, compared to 36.8% of women. Typical descriptives include “pioneering” (e.g., Beatles, Bob Dylan, The Byrds), “genius” (e.g., Bob Marley and the Wailers, Beatles, Jackson Browne), “invented” (Sam Cooke), “revolutionary” (Beastie Boys), “eccentric” (Brian Eno), “weighty” (Jackson Browne), “sophisticated” (Beatles), “enigmatic” (Van Morrison), “cryptic” (Bob Dylan, Jimi Hendrix), and “esoteric” (Radiohead).

In addition to such uses of high art criteria, we use an enumerative measure of high art terms by conducting a word count of 35 terms associated with high status artistic fields such as classical music and literature. As expected, such terms more frequently appear in reviews of male artists after controlling for word count (see Table 4). Beyond the finding that such terms are used more frequently when reviewers are discussing male artists, it is interesting to consider the distribution of certain terms by gender. The most commonly used “high art” terms are disproportionately used when discussing the albums of male musicians or groups. For example, the term “art” is used 38 times – 35 in reviews of male musicians, 3 in reviews of female musicians (Joni Mitchell, Carole King, Madonna). The terms
“master” or “masterpiece” appear 25 times, but only once used to describe the work of a female musician (Lucinda Williams). “Beauty” is used to describe 19 different albums, none of which were made by female musicians. Eighteen musicians or their albums are referred to as “the greatest”, only one of which is a female musician (Joni Mitchell). Especially telling is the fact that the term “genius” is used 13 times and “brilliant” 10 times, but both terms are used only to describe male artists.

Table 4. Results of “high art” and “critical” terms in *Rolling Stone* reviews*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Male artists</strong></th>
<th><strong>Female artists</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>N</em></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or more “high art” term</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word count and “high art” terms</td>
<td>34,373</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms per 1,000 words</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*see Baumann (2007), p. 194

**Ideology of the autonomous artist**

An additional legitimating strategy we expected to find more often used to describe male artists draws on the ideology of the autonomous artist, whereby musicians are cast as the sole creative force behind their music. To reiterate, we coded for both mentions of the artist or band members as the creative force behind the album, and mentions of others in connection with the album (such as producers, friends, and backing musicians). As expected, men are more likely named as the creative force behind the album (89.2%, compared to 73.7% of women), and others are more often identified as creative influences in the albums of female musicians (34.2%, compared to 23.4% of men). Among cases in which the artist is named as the exclusive creative force behind the music, the gender differences are even more striking: more than two-thirds (67.5%) of male artists, compared to fewer than half (42.1%) of female artists.

The ways in which artists are cast as autonomous range from acknowledging their overarching artistic vision (such as Bruce Springsteen’s assertion: “When I was
making this particular album, I just had a specific thing in mind”) to pointing out the artist’s involvement in all aspects of the process (e.g., Prince playing every instrument on his album 1999). In other cases, critics lauded artists who stood up to commercial interests, such as Marvin Gaye on his album What’s Goin’ On:

The last thing Motown wanted its fans to think about, however, was ‘what was happening in the world.’ So with Gaye determined to shatter the label’s hugely successful pop formula and address issues such as the Vietnam War, civil rights and the environment, Motown founder Berry Gordy was not pleased, to say the least.

Reviews of female artists, by contrast, often attribute their success to the paternal guidance of others in the field. One reviewer, for instance, asserts: “[Etta] James was a self-described ‘juvenile delinquent’ when R&B band boss Johnny Otis took her under his wing and made her a precociously sexual teenage star.” Another critic suggests that Aretha Franklin owed her success to her producer, noting: “The Detroit-born preacher’s daughter was about $80,000 in debt to her previous label, Columbia, when Atlantic producer Jerry Wexler signed her in 1966. ‘I took her to church,’ Wexler said, ‘sat her down at the piano and let her be herself.’”

Social Networks

Given that women are less likely to be legitimated through traditional high art criteria than their male counterparts, what strategies do critics draw upon to legitimate female artists? Our findings indicate that one alternative strategy is tying female artists to more established figures in the field. Among reviews of female artists, 65.8% contain at least one type of reference to social or professional networks, compared to only 44.3% of male reviews.

Imagined networks are present in relatively equal numbers for female and male artists, yet critics are much more likely to discuss female artists’ real networks with others inside and outside of the music field. Female artists are tied to other artists and professionals in 34.2% of cases (versus 26.8% of male artists), often being linked to more established male artists. One critic, for instance, labels Ronettes lead singer Ronnie Bennett the “teen protégé” of renowned producer Phil Spector.
In addition to linking female artists to others in the field, critics are also much more likely to discuss their links to others outside the field. Female artists’ networks with musical outsiders are mentioned in 28.9% of cases, while only 13.7% of reviews of male artists contain such mentions. Most often such discussions deal with artists’ personal relationships with spouses, partners, or families.

**Authenticity**

Female musicians also tend to be more often legitimated through their perceived authenticity (40% of female reviews compared to 31.6% of male reviews). Among the two types of authenticity investigated here – the artist remaining true to her or his personality and emotions, and mentions of the artist’s social background – we find that critics are more likely to draw on this strategy for female musicians in both categories. In terms of emotional authenticity, critics use this legitimating strategy in 26.3% of reviews for female artists, compared to 21.0% for male artists. For instance, Liz Phair’s *Exile in Guyville* is described as having “lacerating honesty.” The review of Joni Mitchell’s *Blue* similarly underscores the honesty of her music:

> The ‘Blue’ album, there’s hardly a dishonest note in the vocals,” Mitchell told Rolling Stone in 1979. “At that period of my life, I had no personal defenses. I felt like a cellophane wrapper on a pack of cigarettes. I felt like I had absolutely no secrets from the world, and I couldn’t pretend in my life to be strong. Or to be happy.

In a similar vein, “Madonna aimed for ‘naked emotion’ with this album [Music], declaring, ‘This time, I’ve removed all the layers.’” Elsewhere, critics describe Mary J. Blige’s album *My Life* as “autobiographical,” noting “Upbeat jams such as ‘Be Happy’ were created during her struggle with substance abuse and a tumultuous relationship. ‘There’s a real bad suicide spirit on there,’ she admitted.”

In addition to the emotional “honesty” of women’s music, critics discuss the social background of female artists in 15.8% of cases, while they are slightly less likely to do so in the case of male artists (12.3%). Among both male and female artists, however, discussions of social background are found disproportionately in reviews of country and rap music. In particular, these reviews emphasize the
working or lower class backgrounds of artists, or racial/ethnic identity, suggesting that other social characteristics may have a greater influence than gender on whether this particular legitimating strategy is used for certain genres of music. While a fuller discussion of these differences in legitimating strategies among racial, class, and genre groups is beyond the scope of this paper, such issues would be fruitful areas of analysis in future research.

Extended Examples

To demonstrate how gendered legitimating strategies are manifest, we explore two of the reviews in depth – Carole King’s *Tapestry* and the Beatles’ *Please Please Me*. We selected these two examples because they each highlight important types of gendered legitimating strategies, and they fall in relatively similar positions on the *Rolling Stone* list (ranked 36 and 39, respectively).

King’s *Tapestry* is one of the most highly ranked albums by a female artist on the *Rolling Stone* list, yet rather than discussing the significance of the album, the review begins by noting King’s various personal and professional networks: “For a decade, King wrote pop songs with her then-husband, Gerry Goffin: hits such as Little Eva’s ‘The Loco-Motion’ (Eva Boyd was the couple’s baby sitter) and the Monkees’ ‘Pleasant Valley Sunday.’ Then King’s friend James Taylor encouraged her to sing her own tunes.” Here the critic situates King as a wife and mother, remarking on her ties to her husband and even her babysitter. The reviewer also suggests that her success is partly due to the influence of her friend and fellow artist, James Taylor, implying that King was not the sole creative source behind her music. The review then turns to the emotional authenticity underlying the album, explaining: “She slowed down ‘Will You Love Me Tomorrow?’ (originally a hit for the Shirelles in 1961), heightening the melancholy inside, while her warm, earnest singing brought out the sadness in ‘It's Too Late’ and the earthy joy on ‘I Feel the Earth Move.’” By noting the “melancholy,” “sadness,” and “joy” in King’s music, the critic draws on notions of authenticity, arguing that King remains true to herself by injecting her
emotions into her music. Finally, the review ends by declaring: “On *Tapestry*, King remade herself as an artist and created the reigning model for the 1970s female singer-songwriter.” The album’s implied significance is its model for female artists.

The review of the Beatles’ *Please Please Me* stands out in rather stark contrast to King’s *Tapestry*. Here, the review begins by noting that the album was recorded in twelve hours, proclaiming: “For productivity alone, it is one of the greatest first albums in rock.” The remark indicates the historical importance of the album, a legitimating strategy more often used with male artists. Also, as discussed above, several albums are denoted “the greatest,” but this term has been disproportionately applied to men. The critic also points to the innovation of the Beatles’ music, arguing: “even at this early stage, the Beatles had invented a bracing new sound for a rock band,” and goes on to describe the vocal harmonies as “impeccable.” Finally, the review paints John Lennon as an artist truly dedicated to his music, by highlighting that he “appropriately finished the sessions by shredding what was left of his vocal cords on two takes of ‘Twist and Shout.’” Again, emphasizing the strenuousness and virtuosity required to produce “great” music is a legitimating strategy employed more often for male artists (Clawson 1999, DeNora 1991, 1995).

In sum, the emotionality and the personal and professional networks that marked Carole King’s review are absent in the review of the Beatles. Instead, the Beatles are described as an innovative band, dedicated to the artistic cause and producing “impeccable” music – all characteristics of “high art.” And *Please Please Me* is labeled one of the “greatest” in the field, marking its broad historical importance in contrast with the narrower, gender-specific importance attributed to *Tapestry*.

**Discussion and Conclusion**

Our overall concern in this study centers on how gender dynamics shape processes of cultural legitimacy and consecration. We direct our focus on two related questions: why are some musicians more likely to be included among the all-time
greats?, and how do critics discursively justify the inclusion of such artists in this canon? Our regression analyses indicate that in both direct and indirect ways, gender significantly impacts a performer’s likelihood of consecration, which leaves female artists significantly underrepresented in the popular music canon. Despite this, the direct impact of gender appears to be lessening over time. For example, among albums released during the last twenty years of our sample period (1983-2003), the direct impact of gender on consecration is small and nonsignificant. However, the odds of consecration for female musicians appear to be indirectly limited by the continued importance of critical recognition. Indeed, critical recognition is one of the most important predictors of consecration, but the type of legitimacy least available to female artists. Consequently, despite the lessened direct effect of gender on likelihood of consecration, women continue to face formidable barriers to consecration through the mediating role occupied by critics.

Given the importance of critics, we draw on reviews of canonized artists to examine the explanatory discourse critics use to justify the inclusion of certain artists in the canon of popular music, and whether and how these strategies differ by gender. While others have highlighted the existing cultural frameworks about art that critics draw on to legitimate ascendant art forms (Regev 1994, Baumann 2001), less attention has been given to how gender structures such frameworks. Simply put, we find that these legitimating strategies are, in fact, gendered. Specifically, critics more often draw on notions of historical importance, artistic autonomy, and high art criteria for male performers, while female performers are more often legitimated through their personal and professional ties with others and their perceived emotional authenticity. Not only are these sets of legitimating strategies different, they often draw on traditional notions of femininity and masculinity. The strategies more often employed for male artists – emphasizing, for instance, their autonomy in the creative process, and the originality and complexity of their music – attribute a certain degree of agency to male musicians. By contrast, in legitimating female artists through their ties to other (often male) artists and professionals, critics deny or
downplay the agency of female artists and imply a certain degree of dependency on others for their success. Feminist scholars have long pointed out the tendency to characterize men as agentic and women as passive, and in subtle ways this distinction has given rise to two sets of legitimating discourses.

Beyond adding a gendered understanding of the processes of cultural legitimacy and consecration, we also seek to contribute to the literature on gender segregation and discrimination in the music industry by moving beyond the focus on women’s contemporaneous careers to examine their longstanding effects on women’s reputational careers. This distinction is an important one to make, as musicians’ reputational careers are not necessarily subject to the same forces affecting contemporary careers. Indeed, studies of women’s career opportunities in fields of cultural production tend to focus on direct forms of gender discrimination and segregation. By contrast, our findings highlight the increasingly important indirect forms of exclusion faced by female musicians—particularly through the mediating role occupied by critics—which have created and sustained a male-dominated popular music canon. Because reputational careers lay the foundation for canon formation and preservation, they are more institutionalized than actual careers, and thus more stable and difficult to change. In short, female performers are doubly disadvantaged. While previous studies have documented the discrimination faced by women at the front end of their careers, our findings point to the disadvantage they face in securing their long-term reputations, a disadvantage that has profound and long-standing consequences, far beyond their contemporaneous careers.

Finally, while a substantial body of scholarship has documented the ways in which cultural fields close to women, less attention has been paid to the ways in which cultural fields have opened to women, and the implications of these openings. We show here that the direct impact of gender on the likelihood of consecration has lessened over time, suggesting that in some ways, the field of popular music has opened to female artists. Nevertheless, a focus on numerical increases of consecrated female artists overlooks the equally important process of how women are included in
this canon. Even where women have achieved consecration in popular music, the ways in which their inclusion is legitimated draws on existing frameworks about gender that emphasize female dependency in contrast with male agency. In subtle ways, this gendered discourse limits the amount and types of critical legitimacy female artists can accrue. While consecration is often thought of as a discrete category, our study reveals gendered variations among the consecrated. Even when consecrated, female musicians are not fully legitimated.
Chapter 6
Conclusion

Below, I provide a brief restatement of the primary questions addressed in this dissertation and summary of the basic findings. For each chapter, I raise additional questions that remain unanswered and propose some potentially fruitful areas for future research. Finally, I explore implications of the dissertation by considering the general findings in concert and offer suggestions for further investigation.

Change and continuity in newspaper coverage

The substantive chapters of the dissertation each addressed a set of questions presented in the introduction. Chapter two asked several related questions. To what degree has popular music, in general, gained cultural status and what musical categories, in particular, have become more or less legitimate over time and across countries? What role has critical discourse (e.g. newspaper coverage) played in formalizing, diffusing, and legitimating musical categories in the four countries? Data on newspaper coverage in the four countries is used as the indicator of cultural legitimacy for popular music and its various genres.

In sum, the evidence presented supports the idea that popular music has gained considerable cultural legitimacy since 1955 in each of the four countries as indicated by its greater share of attention in elite newspapers. Increasing variety in the popular genres covered and in the types of articles written about popular music further suggest that a fairly broad and general validation of popular music has occurred. On the other hand, the evidence provides insights into ways in which this process of legitimation varies across countries. It seems clear that elite newspapers in all three European countries are somewhat slower to embrace popular music and that Germany remains the least open to popular music. Meanwhile, the US and the Netherlands are evidently the most inclusive of popular music. Yet even in the countries in which the cultural legitimacy of popular music appears to be relatively high, there are apparent patterns to such acceptance as certain popular genres
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continue to be largely excluded from critical attention. Such patterns of exclusion seem to resemble the preferences of the newspapers’ elite readerships and further research might better elucidate this relationship. In particular, it raises questions about why certain genres (e.g. heavy metal, rap) struggle to achieve “general” validation in the elite press even as critical discourse about such genres proliferates in specialty periodicals that contribute to a “local” validation.

As for the general question regarding the role of critical discourse in formalizing, diffusing and legitimating popular music categories, the findings support the idea that the emergence of rock criticism in the 1960s had a profound effect on subsequent media discourse about popular music. This seems particularly true in the United States where elite newspapers were relatively quick to embrace a more critical approach to popular – especially rock – music. However, the fact that the impact of this emerging discourse took longer to become apparent in the European countries raises some interesting questions. For instance, was it the critical discourse in elite American newspapers that diffused and enhanced the cultural legitimacy of popular music in other countries (e.g. the Netherlands) or was it the domestic music press that eventually became accepted by elite newspapers? Due to the gap between reference years in this study, it is hard to ascertain the precise timing and source of this influence, but it may be a useful issue to consider in future research as it may provide insights into legitimacy processes and how they operate across countries. Due to the apparent aesthetic mobility of popular music, it remains a useful case for pursuing a clearer understanding of the move from local to general validation within countries as well as a case for the transnational legitimacy of particular popular genres.

In general, the amount of space given to popular music as well as the shift towards a more critical and evaluative approach all suggest that the style of writing about rock music that emerged in all four countries in the late 1960s and early 1970s became more generally adopted by elite newspapers. Amidst this general formalization and diffusion of legitimating discourse about popular music, this
chapter serves to highlight several areas of transnational convergence as well as national distinctiveness in the increasingly “global” cultural field of popular music. It points to the complexities of legitimacy processes that increasingly occur across national boundaries. In particular, it suggests that size, centrality of cultural production, educational systems, cultural policy, elite taste and other factors contribute to a complex relationship between popular music and society. At the same time, it leaves room for additional work that attends to the formalization and diffusion processes at work in this cultural field.

Social and symbolic boundaries

Chapter 3 builds on the previous chapter by considering how social boundaries based on gender are associated with the symbolic distinctions being made in newspapers between various types of popular music. The basic question posed in the chapter is: How tightly coupled are musical and social categories during the period of study and across each of the four countries? In other words, this portion of the dissertation is concerned with the interplay between symbolic boundaries in the popular music field and social boundaries based on gender. In a general sense, as popular music gained increasing media attention and cultural legitimacy, the relationship between symbolic and social boundaries in the popular music field also changed.

Initially, the decline in musical hierarchies associated with the rising prominence of popular music may have led symbolic and social boundaries to become less tightly coupled and allowed for greater attention to female musical actors, particularly in popular music. Yet after some initial increases in attention to female musical actors, often through expanded popular music coverage, the male domination of popular music coverage rises over time in all four countries. Thus, it appears that despite the potential for greater integration of female musical actors as the hierarchical distinction between classical and popular music diminished, social boundaries reaffirmed themselves as symbolic boundaries were realigned. In short,
the increasing legitimacy of popular music seems to have contributed to greater gender segregation in the field rather than more integration across gender boundaries.

The most striking finding is that the popular genres that receive the most media attention are much more male-dominated relative to other popular genres and tend to become increasingly so over time, suggesting that women are particularly excluded from the most valued spaces in both classical and popular music and are primarily represented in the coverage of more peripheral genres. Such a finding supports previous research that finds women are often “edged out” of positions that gain cultural status (Tuchman and Fortin 1984). Furthermore, this trend not only holds across the four countries, but across a variety of popular music genres. Thus, increased attention to world music in France is associated with greater male-domination of its newspaper coverage in 2005 relative to 1995, while increased attention to electronica in Germany and the Netherlands is also associated with a higher gender ratio. In general, this provides support for the general finding that men tend to dominate coverage of the most legitimate musical forms, regardless of which genres receive the most attention in a given country or time period. Thus, symbolic boundaries in musical coverage appear to be more variable across countries and over time than do gendered social boundaries.

Future research could further consider the relationship between such symbolic boundaries and other types of social boundaries. In particular, race and ethnicity are salient social categories that have frequently been associated, if not perfectly homologous, with aesthetic categories (Roy 2002, 2004; Phillips and Owens 2004). Are racial and ethnic minority musicians similarly “edged out” of the media coverage in elite newspapers? Does the salience of gendered versus racial boundaries vary cross-nationally? On one hand, research in the US shows that African American performers do not face the same type of “glass ceiling” in the mainstream music market that women face (Dowd & Blyler 2002; Dowd, Liddle & Blyler 2005), perhaps suggesting the relative durability of gendered social
boundaries. On the other hand, the exclusion or underrepresentation of musical forms associated with racial and ethnic minorities (e.g. rap) in elite newspapers of the four countries, despite the relative success of such music in the mainstream market, may be suggestive of persistent barriers to the “general” validation of minority artists. Further attention to such issues may clarify the diverse mechanisms whereby the social boundaries are reproduced or reinforced amidst shifts in symbolic boundaries.

Taken together, the two chapters that focus on newspaper coverage of popular music clearly show that the patterned inclusion of popular music has both symbolic and social dimensions. Just as certain genres are conspicuously absent from elite newspapers, female actors are evidently underrepresented in newspaper coverage, especially in the genres that are most culturally legitimate. Shifts in musical hierarchies that allow certain popular music genres to be valorized appear to reproduce their coupling with social boundaries, in this case gender. To the extent that newspaper coverage plays an important mediating role in musical careers, this has troubling implications for women who appear to face institutionalized disadvantage in gaining media recognition in the popular musical field.

The findings in this chapter raise questions about whether or not these findings hold true across media outlets or whether they are somewhat dependent on the sources selected for this study. Amidst the decentralization of critical discourse about music, perhaps elite newspapers maintain their focus on well-established musical genres and actors, which may cause them to overlook developments taking place on the periphery that may provide opportunities for female musical actors (Dickerson, 1998; Lont, 1992). Furthermore, this chapter highlights differences in the amount of space devoted to male and female actors, but additional research should consider differences in the ways that men and women in popular music are covered in media outlets. Chapter 5 takes up this particular question in a more direct manner.
Cultural consecration in popular music

The next chapter draws on recent studies of cultural consecration to ask: What forms of cultural legitimacy affect consecration in the field of popular music? Why are some albums placed among “the greatest of all time” instead of others? In this portion of the dissertation, I extend research on the role of popular, professional, and critical recognition in projects of retrospective consecration to the field of U.S. popular music. As in other fields, my findings support the notion that critics influence the valorization and consecration of popular music albums. Critical recognition consistently shows a positive impact on the odds of consecration. Albums that appeared on the top ten of the *Village Voice* critics’ poll were two to three times more likely to be on the *Rolling Stone* list and early rock music critics were especially influential in establishing a notion of the most “essential” or “greatest” albums that continues to prevail today. Albums receiving five stars from such critics were over six times more likely to be retrospectively consecrated than those that did not.

In addition to the direct influence of measures of critical recognition, the results may suggest that critics also have an indirect impact on consecration through other forms of recognition. For instance, critical reception may not determine whether or not an album appears on the Billboard charts, but it may exert some influence on what albums generate a sustained level of public interest and sales. Likewise, in its first 25 years, Grammy Award nominees are significantly less likely to appear on the *Rolling Stone* list, but over the next 30 years, a nomination for Album of the Year increases the odds of consecration by nearly 80 percent. Thus, it appears that professional recognition has increasingly fallen in line with critical evaluations. Future research could more carefully address the impact critics have on popular success and professional awards.

It may also be useful to make more careful comparisons of the role of critical discourse in different fields, such as film versus popular music. On one hand, the general findings of this chapter resonate nicely with those of Allen and Lincoln (2004)
in their study of film consecration in the US. In short, critical acclaim can have a potent impact on the odds of consecration. At the same time, however, the relationship between academic discourse and critical discourse in mainstream media outlets is not the same in the two fields. In film, for example, the widespread establishment of film studies programs in American higher education had an impact on film discourse, both by providing credentialed experts in the field as well as producing their own film theory and criticism. Popular music has had a less direct relationship with academia and the impact of academic discourse on mainstream critical discourse is more ambiguous.

Consider, for example, that the International Association for the Study of Popular Music (IASPM) acknowledges that “Popular Music Studies is not an academic discipline as such,” but that its academic study occurs in a variety of disciplines (e.g. musicology, cultural studies, social science, economics)\textsuperscript{15}. IASPM lists only ten programs in the United States that are known for giving special attention to popular music\textsuperscript{16}. By contrast, film studies is a widely available major on college campuses in the United States\textsuperscript{17}. Future research should consider such comparisons across cultural fields more carefully. It is possible, for example, that scholars have overstated the similarity between the aesthetic mobility of popular music and film to the neglect of the role of “popular aesthetic” discourse in popular music. In work with Alex van Venrooij (forthcoming), for example, we highlight variations in the prevalence of both “high art” discourse and “popular aesthetic” discourse in American, German, and Dutch reviews of popular music albums. Our findings indicate that “high art” discourse is less associated with the legitimation of popular music in Dutch newspapers whereas it is often the exclusive focus of German reviewers. This may suggest that there is a different relationship between academic and mainstream critical discourse in different countries, which may contribute to variation in popular music’s cultural legitimacy.

\textsuperscript{15} See the IASPM website under “where to study popular music” \url{http://www.iaspm.net/studying.htm}
\textsuperscript{16} IASPM lists four such programs in Germany, and one each in France and the Netherlands
\textsuperscript{17} The CollegeBoard website lists 160 US colleges that offer a Film Studies major \url{www.collegeboard.com}
Likewise, it is important to move beyond the forms of cultural legitimacy considered in this chapter and to consider how social characteristics impact the likelihood of retrospective cultural consecration. Building on the findings of chapters 3 and 4, chapter 5 attempts to estimate and shed light on the gender dynamics that shape processes of consecration in the popular music field.

**Gender and cultural consecration**

The overall concern in this chapter centers on how gender dynamics shape processes of cultural legitimacy and consecration. In particular, this chapter asks: How are various forms of cultural legitimacy distributed by gender in the popular music field and how does this impact the likelihood that female musicians are consecrated? What are the discursive strategies employed to legitimate consecrated artists and how does this discourse differ for male and female musicians? Building on the preceding chapter, regression analyses indicate that in both direct and indirect ways, gender significantly impacts a performer’s likelihood of consecration, which leaves female artists significantly underrepresented in the popular music canon. At the same time, however, it appears that the direct impact of gender declines over time. Nonetheless, the odds of consecration for female musicians appear to be indirectly limited by the continued importance of critical recognition. Indeed, critical recognition is one of the most important predictors of consecration, but the type of legitimacy least available to female artists. Consequently, despite the lessened direct effect of gender on likelihood of consecration, women continue to face formidable barriers to consecration through the mediating role occupied by critics.

In addition, this chapter calls attention to the reviews of consecrated artists to examine the explanatory discourse critics use to justify the inclusion of certain artists in the canon of popular music, and whether and how these strategies differ by gender. While others have highlighted the existing cultural frameworks about art that critics draw on to legitimate ascendant art forms (Regev 1994, Baumann 2001), less attention has been given to how gender structures such frameworks. Simply put,
we find that these legitimating strategies are, in fact, gendered. Critics more often draw on notions of historical importance, artistic autonomy, and high art criteria for male performers, while female performers are more often legitimated through their personal and professional ties with others and their perceived emotional authenticity. Not only are these sets of legitimating strategies different, they often draw on traditional notions of femininity and masculinity. The strategies more often employed for male artists – emphasizing, for instance, their autonomy in the creative process, and the originality and complexity of their music – attribute a certain degree of agency to male musicians. By contrast, in legitimating female artists through their ties to other (often male) artists and professionals, critics deny or downplay the agency of female artists and imply a certain degree of dependency on others for their success.

Taken together with chapter 3 on newspaper coverage of female musical actors, the findings highlight the increasingly important indirect forms of exclusion faced by female musicians, particularly through the mediating role occupied by critics. Newspaper coverage and critical acclaim are sources of cultural legitimacy that are not equally available to women, which hampers both the actual and reputational careers of women in the popular music field. In short, female performers are doubly disadvantaged in ways that have profound and long-standing consequences, far beyond their contemporaneous careers. In some subtle ways, this gendered discourse limits the amount and types of critical legitimacy female artists can accrue and suggests that even when consecrated, female musicians are not always fully legitimated. Again, consideration of other social boundaries (e.g. race, ethnicity) and how they shape processes of consecration and legitimating discourses are potentially fruitful avenues for further research.

**Implications and directions for future research**

One clear implication of the dissertation is that critics play an influential role as cultural intermediaries in the field of popular music. First, critics provided the
discourse that helped enhance the legitimacy of popular music. The emergence of
rock critics in all four countries seems to have contributed to the cultural legitimacy
of popular music and to its broader acceptance in the elite press of the US, France,
Germany, and the Netherlands. Second, critics play a central role in distributing
prestige within the popular music field. Critics determine the types of music that are
worthy of critical attention, the types of actors that are seen as legitimate, and the
works that are deemed to be among the “greatest” of all time. In the processing of
classifying, legitimating, and consecrating popular music, critics both reflect and
reproduce the aesthetic and social hierarchies that characterize the broader society in
which they are embedded. In drawing such conclusions, I have primarily focused in
the preceding chapters on the extent and content of critical discourse about popular
music. However, two important directions for future research will help clarify the
general findings regarding critical discourse.

First, the production process and motivation of popular music critics
themselves remains relatively less understood. With only a few exceptions, scholars
have not directly undertaken a study of those who produce critical discourse. Thus,
many studies – this dissertation included – tend to impute motives to critics,
assuming that they are engaged in a struggle to legitimate the cultural form about
which they write. Furthermore, research on critical discourse makes assumptions
about the source of the evaluative criteria critics use in making their judgments.
Future research should focus on critics, their social and educational backgrounds,
and the understandings and motivations for their work.

Second, the impact of critical discourse on the audience is also less well
understood. Thus, chapters from this dissertation show that critics have an impact
on what is legitimated and consecrated, but do not necessarily address the ways in
which such evaluations affect the audience for popular music and its accompanying
discourse. Other studies address the ways that critical discourse affects musicians or
workers in the recording industry without considering how consumers are
influenced. Many studies, including this dissertation, make assumptions about the
impact of media discourse on audiences, although research shows that this process of reception is often quite complex. How does the audience make use of the proliferating discourses about popular music? In particular, future research should consider the mediating role of social networks in shaping the impact of critical discourse on the audience members who consume it.

Another implication of the preceding chapters is that, contrary to the “de-hierarchization” that some have supposed would accompany postmodern life, globalization, a decline in elite cohesiveness, internet technology, or some other related phenomenon, social and symbolic boundaries have proven resilient. While some of the above changes have contributed to shifts in classification systems and provided opportunities for certain cultural forms (e.g. popular music) to gain greater cultural legitimacy, they have also reproduced or even reinforced certain durable inequalities (e.g. those based on gender) and given rise to new hierarchies. Thus, cultural classification systems remain an important area for ongoing research that aims to understand the processes by which their categories rise and fall or emerge and disappear, and the conditions under which their social and symbolic boundaries dissolve, bend, or take deep root.
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Appendix 1. Newspaper coverage of music: coding scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coding categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Article type</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Focuses on a conversation with an artist or an art related person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preview</td>
<td>Reports on future event(s) and/or product(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review</td>
<td>Report on a witnessed/experienced product that is explicitly mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announcement</td>
<td>Brief informational article on the availability of a new product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News story</td>
<td>Article in which an event is signaled and described (i.e. “breaking news”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background article</td>
<td>Provides background information about an artist, product, or discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion piece</td>
<td>Article in which a personal opinion is being expressed on a certain issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular column</td>
<td>Regularly appearing article with a fixed format and/or name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Music genre / subgenre</strong></td>
<td>Discipline is coded (e.g. “Classical” or “Popular)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main genre</td>
<td>Main genre is coded (e.g. “Symphony” or “Jazz)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subgenre</td>
<td>Subgenre coded, if relevant (e.g. “Vocal solo” or “Bebop/cool jazz”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Article size</strong></td>
<td>Measured in square centimeters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main actor(s)</strong></td>
<td>Recorded verbatim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Sex coded: female; male; 2 or more actors with both male and female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
De classificatie en consecratie van populaire muziek

Kritische discoursen en hiërarchieën

In deze dissertatie worden zowel classificatiesystemen als processen van consecratie op het gebied van popmuziek bestudeerd. Volgens wetenschappers is de uitholling van traditionele sociaal-culturele scheidslijnen en hiërarchieën een van de grote maatschappelijke veranderingen die westerse samenlevingen vanaf de jaren vijftig kenmerken. Deze ontwikkeling is ook zichtbaar in de wijzen waarop actoren binnen deze samenlevingen kunst- en cultuurproducten classificeren. Dergelijke “culturele classificatiesystemen” lijken sinds de jaren vijftig van de vorige eeuw minder hiërarchisch te zijn geworden, meer gedifferentieerd, met minder rigide grenzen, minder universeel gedeeld en internationaler.

Maar tegelijk duidt vergelijkend onderzoek erop dat het moment van zulke verschuivingen en de mate waarin culturele hiërarchieën zijn afgenomen, per land behoorlijk kan variëren (zie bijvoorbeeld Lamont en Thévenot 2000). Hoofdstuk 2 en 3 behelzen een bijdrage aan vergelijkend onderzoek op het gebied van classificatiesystemen, waarbij de aandacht zich richt op categorieën en hiërarchieën voor muziek in de VS, Duitsland, Frankrijk en Nederland van 1950 tot 2005. De basis voor dit onderzoek is een analyse van de muziekverslaggeving in kwaliteitsdagbladen voor elk van deze landen. Muziek is een interessante casus om de bredere veranderingen in culturele classificatiesystemen te onderzoeken; het gaat hier om een gebied van culturele productie waarin gedurende de onderzochte periode grote veranderingen hebben plaatsgevonden, waaronder de stijgende culturele status van verscheidene vormen van popmuziek.

---

18 Vertaling: Aleid Fokkema voor Lighthouse Texts
In Hoofdstuk 2 worden daarom de volgende vragen behandeld: in hoeverre heeft popmuziek een hogere culturele status verworven en welke muziekcategorieën hebben in meer of mindere mate legitimiteit verworven in de bestudeerde landen? Wat is de rol geweest van het kritisch discours in dagbladen in het formaliseren, verspreiden en legitimeren van muziekcategorieën in de vier landen?

De resultaten laten zien dat er in de kwaliteitsdagbladen van de VS, Frankrijk, Duitsland en Nederland sinds 1955 heel wat meer aandacht is voor popmuziek. Er wordt over een groter aantal popmuziekgenres geschreven en er is meer variatie in de soorten artikelen hierover, wat erop duidt dat popmuziek in de vier landen een behoorlijke legitimiteit heeft verkregen. Tegelijk vertonen de landen onderling aanzienlijke verschillen. Duitse kranten blijven het minst ontvankelijk voor popmuziek, terwijl Amerikaanse en Nederlandse kranten popmuziek het breedst omarmen. De bevindingen wijzen er verder op dat de opkomst van de rockmuziekkritiek in de jaren zestig een vergaand effect heeft gehad op het daaropvolgende mediadiscours over popmuziek. In de bestudeerde Europese kranten duurde het langer voordat dit effect zichtbaar werd. Niettemin tonen zowel de ruimte die voor popmuziek werd vrijgemaakt alsook de verschuiving naar een meer kritische en evaluerende benadering dat deze kwaliteitsdagbladen de stijl van de rockmuziekkritiek in grote lijnen hebben overgenomen. Daarbij moet aangetekend worden dat niet alle popmuziekgenres evenredig hebben geprofiteerd van de toegenomen paginaruimte voor en grotere status van popmuziek. Minder legitieme genres worden meestal buiten beschouwing gelaten en de inclusie van popmuziek en popmusici in de kwaliteitsdagbladen kent dus grenzen.

In Hoofdstuk 3 wordt op deze bevindingen voortgebouwd, waarbij voor elk land gekeken is naar de gevolgen van veranderingen in muzikale hiërarchieën voor sociale hiërarchieën, in casu voor hiërarchieën gebaseerd op gender. De volgende vraagstukken komen specifiek aan de orde in dit hoofdstuk: Hoe hecht zijn muzikale en sociale categorieën in elk van de vier landen met elkaar verweven? Hoe vast zijn
de symbolische grenzen in het veld van popmuziek verbonden met de sociale op
gender gebaseerde grenzen, en hoe verschilt deze verhouding van land tot land?

De analyses geven aan dat de toenemende culturele legitimering van
popmuziek niet heeft geleid tot een versmelting of “fusion” van gendergrenzen, en
dat er eerder sprake is van een grotere scheiding of “segregation” van mannelijke en
vrouwelijk muzikale actoren (Roy 2004). Een opvallende uitkomst is dat populaire
genres die de meeste media-aandacht krijgen naar verhouding veel meer door
mannen worden gedomineerd dan andere populaire genres. Dit lijkt in de loop van
de tijd alleen maar toe te nemen, wat erop duidt dat juist vrouwen worden
uitgesloten van de hoogst gewaardeerde plaatsen binnen zowel de klassieke muziek
als de popmuziek en dat zij voornamelijk in de verslaggeving over meer marginale
genres voorkomen. Deze uitkomst ondersteunt eerder onderzoek waarin werd
vastgesteld dat vrouwen vaak uit een positie worden verdreven zodra die positie
meer culturele status verwerft (Tuchman en Fortin 1984). Hiërarchieën in de muziek
laten misschien wel een verschuiving zien waardoor bepaalde popmuziekgrenzen
waardering kunnen verwerven, maar het lijkt erop dat de koppeling met sociale
grenzen nu gereproduceerd wordt door nieuwe symbolische grenzen, van gender in
dit geval.

In Hoofdstuk 4 en 5 wordt een van de sterkste symbolische grenzen
bestudeerd: een grens die in culturele velden naar voren komt als het erom gaat een
kleine groep van de “beste” exemplarische vertegenwoordigers te onderscheiden van
de grote restgroep. De manieren waarop culturele producenten en producten een
dergelijke gevierde status weten te bereiken en behouden is onderwerp geweest van
vele sociologische studies. Bourdieu (1986, p. 6) gebruikt de term “consecratie” om te
refereren aan het proces waarbij een “magische scheiding” wordt opgeworpen tussen
de “pure” en “sacrale” artistieke offerandes enerzijds en de “makkelijke” of
“profane” producten anderzijds. De handeling van culturele consecratie identificeert
een selectie van enkele culturele producenten en producten die een bijzondere
waardering en goedkeuring krijgen, in tegenstelling tot het overgrote deel waarbij dit
niet gebeurt. Sommige consecratiehandelingen vinden achtera af plaats, als individuen en instituten de status van hun kunstwereld trachten te verhogen door het consacrer en van enkele werken en makers die de esthetica belichamen die op dat moment als de juiste wordt gezien (Becker 1982, p. 346).

Een project van het tijdschrift Rolling Stone om met een lijst van de 500 beste albums ooit te komen ligt ten grondslag aan dit onderzoek, dat voortborduurt op studies naar retrospectieve consecratie, die zich richten op de vraag wat de invloed van verschillende vormen van culturele legitimering is op de kans op consecratie (Allen en Lincoln 2004; Allen en Parsons 2006). In Hoofdstuk 4 staan populaire, beroepsmatige en kritische vormen van erkenning centraal, waarbij een antwoord wordt gezocht op de volgende vragen: Welke vormen van culturele legitimering zijn van invloed op consecratie in het veld van populaire muziek? Waarom krijgen sommige albums een plek tussen de “beste ooit” en andere niet? Net als bij de consecratie van film is een van de meest robuuste bevindingen in dit hoofdstuk dat de lof van critici stelselmatig een positieve invloed heeft op de kans op consecratie. Het valt vooral op dat de eerste popmuziekrecensenten kennelijk in staat waren om een idee over de “beste” albums vast te leggen dat vele jaren later nog steeds geldig is.

In Hoofdstuk 5 leiden deze inzichten tot het vraagstuk van de invloed van gender op de verdeling van culturele legitimiteit en op processen van consecratie. Daarbij worden specifiek de volgende vragen gesteld: Welke rol speelt gender in de verdeling van verschillende vormen van culturele legitimering in de popmuziek en wat betekent dit voor de kans dat vrouwelijke musici geconsacreerd worden? Welke discursieve strategieën worden gehanteerd om geconsacreerde artiesten te legitimeren en hoe verschilt dit discours voor vrouwelijke en mannelijke musici?

Naast een kwantitatieve analyse van consecratie bevat dit hoofdstuk ook een inhoudelijke analyse van de Rolling Stone recensies.

De kwantitatieve analyse laat zien dat gender zowel direct als indirect een significante invloed heeft op de waarschijnlijkheid dat een performer geconsacreerd
wordt, waardoor vrouwelijke artiesten beduidend ondervertegenwoordigd zijn in de canon van popmuziek. Toch lijkt het erop dat de directe invloed van gender mettertijd is afgenomen. Aan de andere kant blijkt dat de kans dat vrouwelijke musici geconsacreerd worden indirect beperkt wordt door het aanhoudende belang van erkenning door de muziekkritiek. Eigenlijk is kritische erkenning een van de belangrijkste voorspellers van consecratie, maar het is ook een type legitimering dat voor vrouwelijke artiesten het moeilijkst te verwerven is. Vrouwen hebben dus, ondanks het afnemende effect van gender op de kans op consecratie, door de bemiddelende rol van critici nog steeds te maken met behoorlijke hindernissen die consecratie in de weg staan.
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