Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis or dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis or dissertation in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter known, including display on the world wide web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis or dissertation. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis or dissertation. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis or dissertation.

Signature:

_____ _____

Sara Ashlee Bledsoe Date

Walk the Line: The Role of Legitimacy, Gender, and Race in Cultural Consecration in the Country Music and Rock and Roll Halls of Fame

By

Sara Ashlee Bledsoe
Doctor of Philosophy
Sociology

_____
Timothy J. Dowd, PhD
Advisor

_____
Irene Browne, PhD
Committee Member

_____
Cathryn Johnson, PhD
Committee Member

_____
Vaughn C. Schmutz, PhD
Committee Member

Accepted:

_____
Lisa A. Tedesco, Ph.D.
Dean of the James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies

_____
Date

Walk the Line: The Role of Legitimacy, Gender, and Race in Cultural Consecration in the Country Music and Rock and Roll Halls of Fame

By

Sara Ashlee Bledsoe
B.A. The Ohio State University, 2007
M.Sc. The London School of Economics, 2008

Advisor: Timothy J. Dowd, PhD

An abstract of
A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies of Emory University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in Sociology
2017

Dissertation Abstract

This dissertation explores the impact of cultural legitimacy, race, and gender on cultural consecration in the Country Music and Rock and Roll Halls of Fame. The Country Music and Rock and Roll Halls of Fame play a major role in culture, specifically in popular music. These organizations induct performers that are considered exceptional and exemplars of their field. The inductions are acts of cultural consecration as they serve to separate and elevate certain performers above others. Cultural consecration plays a significant role in society in that it is a highly visible process in culture that separates individuals and achievements into those that are to be praised and remembered and those that are not. Cultural consecration provides cultural organizations with the ability to establish the legitimacy of not only the actors within the field but also of the field itself. Social inequalities in cultural consecration may then reify cultural notions regarding the abilities and worth of women and racial minorities. Symbolic boundaries are often drawn around cultural products in such a way that the music associated with disadvantaged groups is portrayed as being less legitimate or worthy of being praised or remembered. In Chapter Two of this dissertation, I examine the histories of the two halls of fame and explore how the unique nature of the two music fields have influenced each consecrating organization. In Chapter Three, I examine the effects of professional, critical, and popular legitimacy, as well as race and gender on the likelihood that performers are inducted into the Country Music Hall of Fame. In Chapter Four, I examine the impact that those same factors, as well as the genre of performers, have on the likelihood that performers are inducted into the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame. Collectively, this dissertation provides new insights into cultural consecration, as well as the fields of rock and country music.

Walk the Line: The Role of Legitimacy, Gender, and Race in Cultural Consecration in the Country Music and Rock and Roll Halls of Fame

By

Sara Ashlee Bledsoe
B.A. The Ohio State University, 2007
M.Sc. The London School of Economics, 2008

Advisor: Timothy J. Dowd, PhD

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies of Emory University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Sociology
2017

Acknowledgements

For my dissertation, I was able to combine my two loves: music and sociology. During my first semester of graduate school my advisor, Tim Dowd, stressed the importance of choosing a topic that you were passionate about because otherwise it would be difficult finish. As I neared the end of my dissertation I felt incredibly fortunate to still have the same passion for my work as when I began this journey.

I feel incredibly thankful to have had Tim as my advisor. I chose to come to Emory because I wanted to work with him, and I have always known that I made the right decision. He has guided and encouraged me since my first semester at Emory, and he has offered a level of understanding that I believe is rarity not only in academia but also in humanity. I know that both my work and I are better because of his involvement. I would also like to thank the rest of my dissertation committee, Vaughn Schmutz, Cathy Johnson, and Irene Browne, who have offered their time and expertise to enrich my work.

I have been fortunate to have benefited from the wisdom and aid of many others during my time in graduate school. I am indebted to the staff of the Sociology Department, especially Pat Hamilton, who helped me navigate the bureaucratic paths during my time at Emory. I would like to thank the Mellon Foundation for helping to fund my research. Also, many thanks go to Karen Hegtvedt, who helped guide both my research and teaching.

As an only child of only children, I have had the amazing opportunity to build a family of friends. Kate Cartwright embodies grace and wisdom, and I consider myself incredibly fortunate to call her both a friend and mentor. Through serendipity or fate the Monin's and the Murphy's came into my life. I marvel at the kindness and support that the Monin's have shown me, and the Murphy's provided me with reassurance and humor when I needed it most. Words cannot do justice to how much I appreciate you allowing me to be a part of your lives.

Many thanks to my parents, Sara and Ben Bledsoe, who gave me the sense of humor needed to deal with all the difficulties and stressors that a dissertation entails. Most importantly, I endeavor to live a life worthy of the sacrifices that my grandfather, Benjamin Forrest Bledsoe, Sr. made during his life. When I would question myself during this process, I took comfort in the belief that not only would he have proud, but he also would have been happy to see his own love of country music take shape in my research.

Finally, I want to thank my longest companion: music. While it is the focus of my research, more importantly it has also been my lifeblood, inspiration, and refuge throughout my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter One **1**
Introduction

Chapter One References **23**

Chapter Two **27**
Comparing the History and Fields Of the Rock And Roll and Country Music Halls Of Fame

Chapter Two References **67**

Chapter Three **75**
Constructing the Past: Retrospective Consecration and the Country Music Hall of Fame

Chapter Three References **113**

Chapter Four **121**
Those Who Rocked: Induction Into the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame

Chapter Four References **165**

Chapter Five **178**
The Conclusion

Chapter Five References **185**

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-A **73**
Descriptive Statistics for Performers in the Country Music Hall of Fame

Table 2-B **74**
Descriptive Statistics for Performers in the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame

Table 3-A **118**
Descriptive Statistics for Independent Variables Used in the Event History Analysis of Waiting Time to Induction for Country Music Hall of Fame Musicians

Table 3-B **119**
Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Performer Attributes and Contemporary Valorization

Table 3-C **120**
Event History Analysis for the Effects of Contemporaneous Valorization and Performer Attributes on Waiting Time for Induction into the Country Music Hall of Fame

Table 4-A **171**
Descriptive Statistics for Independent Variables Used in the Event History Analysis of Waiting Time to Induction for Rock and Roll Hall of Fame Performers

Table 4-B **172**
Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Performer Attributes and Contemporary Valorization

Table 4-C **173**
Event History Analysis for the Effects of Performer Attributes and Cultural Legitimacy on Likelihood of Induction Into the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame

Table 4-D **174**
Number of Performers Receiving Popular, Professional, or Critical Legitimacy: Constructing the Full Sample

Table 4-E **175**
Descriptive Statistics for Performers in the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame and Performers in the Full Sample

Table 4-F **176**
Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Performer Attributes and Contemporary Valorization

Table 4-G **177**

Event History Hazard Analyses for the Effects of Performer Attributes and Contemporaneous Valorization on Likelihood of Induction Into the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame

CHAPTER ONE:

INTRODUCTION

Setting the Stage

In the weeks leading up to KISS's 2014 Rock and Roll Hall of Fame induction, its bassist and co-lead singer Gene Simmons complained that the mission of the hall of fame was being diluted by the admittance of hip-hop and pop music acts. He made the claim, "If you don't play guitar and you don't write your own songs, you don't belong there" (Michaels 2014). Because Simmons argues that only rock music should be included the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame, he is also implicitly arguing that the hall of fame should be predominantly white and male, much like his own band. On the other hand, those who run the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame held a different view of rock music than Simmons did: they noted that rock's musical heritage included rhythm and blues and soul, a musical heritage it shares with hip-hop (Michaels 2014). In turn, the hall of fame has chosen to celebrate performers from different genres, including rhythm and blues, which has also resulted in the inclusion of black performers since its first induction class in 1986.

The disagreement between Simmons and the R&RHOF leaders resonates with broader empirical patterns. Debates about what constitutes rock music and, in turn, who belongs in its hall of fame are common and longstanding (van Venrooij 2009). However, such contentious debates are far less common in the realm of country music (Peterson 1992). This difference between the two genres likewise maps onto their respective halls of fame. For example, when one looks at the first class of inductees in the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame in 1986, one is met with musical diversity (with the inclusion of rock,

country and R&B artists) and racial diversity (with the inclusion of both black and white performers; Rock and Roll Hall of Fame 2014). This diversity demonstrates the expansive heritage of rock espoused by the R&RHOF leaders. On the other hand, the inductees of the other major, and more tenured music hall of fame—the Country Music Hall of Fame—is decidedly more musically and racially homogeneous (Country Music Hall of Fame 2014a). This homogeneity is likely a product of both country music's history (Peterson 1992; Roy 2002, 2004) and the fact that, unlike rock, country has remained a fairly coherent marketplace over the years (Rossman 2004). Both halls of fame do share a similarity, however: when looking across time, female performers appear to be greatly underrepresented. Apparently, women are less often thought of as exemplars for either country or rock music.

The disagreement between Simmons and the R&RHOF leaders also reveals the importance of several concepts at the heart of cultural sociology: "boundary work" (e.g., the mapping of who and what belongs to a given genre and who and what do not; Schmutz 2009),[1] "legitimacy" (e.g., the who and what that are widely accepted as worthy; Johnson, Dowd and Ridgeway 2009),[2] as well as how both of these matter for the "cultural consecration"[3] of the sort that the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame and the Country Music Hall of Fame each provide musicians. Of course, rock, country and music more

---

[1] "Boundary work" refers to the development and maintenance of differences, including both symbolic and social boundaries (see Lamont and Molnár 2002).

[2] "Legitimacy" in this sense originates from social values. To be considered legitimate, a social object must be cast in terms of those "cultural beliefs, norms, and values that are presumed to be shared by others in the local situation and perhaps more broadly" (Johnson, Dowd, and Ridgeway 2006, p. 57).

[3] Cultural consecration is a process in which certain cultural objects and/or creative workers are selected as both legitimate and exceptional representations in a given field of production, such as the fields of rock or country music (Bourdieu 1999).

generally are rife with issues of boundary work and legitimacy (Peterson 2013; Regev 2013). Because rock music is the result of a combining of rhythm and blues as well as country music, its boundaries have been blurred since its beginning (Gillett 2011). These boundaries have continued to be both blurred and patrolled in the present (Dowd 2011, 2013). The reason for this is that many rock musicians see experimenting with different sounds and borrowing from genres[4] as critical to their artistry (Regev 2013); yet, at the same time, many other musicians see purity of genre as integral because they view other genres as inferior (Lena 2012). Country music has likewise been marked by boundary work over the years, but of a different kind: cycling back and forth between a genre marked by rustic and unpolished music and performers to one marked by the urbane and cosmopolitan (Peterson 2013). As for legitimacy, because historically much of rock's specific legitimacy[5] originated from rebellion against hegemonic values (e.g., the music of protest and dissaffected youth; Bennett 2009), developing artistic legitimacy more broadly with consumers and others has had to be cultivated by portraying musicians as artists or auteurs (Regev 1994). Meanwhile, legitimacy concerns for country music have mostly revolved around what passes for "authenticity"—such as that derived from lyrical and sartorial connections to home, family and country (Peterson 2013; Rossman 2004).

Cultural consecration separates those who are perceived or portrayed as "great" from all others in their field (Allen and Lincoln 2004). As such, consecration relies greatly on boundary work (e.g., who or what belongs) and legitimacy (e.g., who or what

[4] Genre refers to patterns in content and presentation that guide the work of a group of performers, guide their networks, as well as guide those who consume their work (Becker 2008).

[5] This form of legitimacy is conferred by other cultural producers, such as fellow musicians (Bourdieu 1993).

is worthy). Cultural consecration resembles cultural valorization in that both reveal what is valued in a given genre. However, valorization differs from consecration in that it refers to work that is recognized and celebrated as good, whereas consecration draws the ultimate boundary of worthiness—that between the few greats on one side and everything else on the other side. In essence, musical work that is valorized is located above work that is deemed ordinary and below that work that is viewed as "sacred" and is, subsequently, consecrated (Allen and Lincoln 2004). Put another way, consecration is the most significant form of valorization (Lamont 1986).

The Country Music Hall of Fame and Rock and Roll Hall of Fame serve as two central sites of consecration in popular music.[6] Indeed, there are no more recognizable sites with the express intentions of culturally consecrating those who make popular music. Of course, there are many individuals and groups that valorize popular music—evaluating and ranking both the music itself and those who make it—such as those associated with The Grammy Awards, The Country Music Awards, and *Village Voice's* Yearly Top 20 Critics Polls. There are also occasional efforts to consecrate the music itself, such as *Rolling Stone's* "500 Greatest Albums of All Time" (Schmutz and Faupel 2010). These halls of fame are unique, though, in that they each are organizations focused primarily on the consecration of popular music. Each hall of fame does so by expressly choosing music performers to enshrine. The two halls of fame select for induction those who they believe are the best and most influential members of their genre. As a result, these two halls of fames resemble organizations more commonly

[6] Popular music refers to a residual category of everything that is not classical music (Regev 2013). It arose as a salient category in tandem with the creation of a salient category of classical music, beginning in the late 1800s (DiMaggio 1991; Dowd 2011).

found outside of popular music—such as art museums and symphony orchestras that likewise consecrate creators and their works (Braden 2009; Dowd 2011), as well as halls of fame devoted to athletes and their achievements (Allen and Parsons 2006).

While the establishment and operation of the Rock and Roll and Country Music Halls will be one focus of this dissertation, many of the pages to follow will also focus on the performers that the halls of fame respectively choose to consecrate and how such choices reflect and shape their respective fields of music.[7] Reputations—including those who are culturally consecrated and who are not—are based not only on the accomplishments and talent of cultural producers, but they are also dependent on others' tastes and evaluations of their historical importance (Becker 2008). While DeNora (2000) speaks of how music "gets into" everyday life, it is in this evaluative process surrounding reputations that broader social inequality "gets into the music," so to speak. It does so by way another aspect of boundary-work: the interplay between symbolic and social boundaries.

Symbolic boundaries in society more broadly help to establish and reinforce social boundaries. Symbolic boundaries are conceptual distinctions that "separate people into groups and generate feelings of similarity and group membership" (Lamont and Molnár 2002, p. 168). Symbolic boundaries, although an important aspect of social boundaries, alone are not sufficient to create social boundaries. Social boundaries are characterized by unequal access to resources and opportunities. Common social

[7] I am referring particularly to fields of "cultural production." These refer to the totality of individuals and organizations devoted to the creation and dissemination of a given aesthetic product—such as rock music or country music. Fields also involve competition for resources and standing by these individuals and organizations (Bourdieu 1993).

boundaries are built around gender, race, and class (Lamont and Molnár 2002; Pachucki, Pendergrass, and Lamont 2007; Schmutz 2009). We can thus think of symbolic boundaries as involving classification and social boundaries as involving interaction and inclusion. The symbolic boundaries found in music often reflect the social boundaries in society, including the unequal access to resources and opportunities shaped by gender (Schmutz 2009; Schmutz and Faupel 2010), class (Bryson 1996), and race (Roy 2004)—though the closeness of the relationship between social and symbolic boundaries "varies over time and across space" (Schmutz 2009, p. 299). In analyzing those who are inducted into the Rock and Roll and Country Music Halls of Fame, we are able to see how inequalities play out in the in the respective genres and how those inequalities have changed over time. We will be able to do so by empirically considering how the racial and gender composition of the two halls of fame reflects changes in the boundaries of the genres, as well as reflects broader societal phenomenon.

There is another advantage to studying the County Music Hall of Fame and the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame: we can empirically gauge how differences between these two genres shape consecration and boundary work within their respective fields. Such differences include their respective histories (Gillett 2011; Peterson 2013) and the level of cohesion within the respective music fields[8] (Rossman 2004). Because the lines between different genres may sometimes be difficult to discern (Regev 2013; Roy and Dowd 2010), and because of the shared musical heritage of genres that today are often considered quite distinct (Roy 2004), social processes that can illuminate the unique

[8] The field of country music has remained a more cohesive field over time than rock music has (Rossman 2004).

characteristics of a genre become increasingly important to both producers and consumers of music. In the 1950s, rock shared the most in common with country music and rhythm and blues (Dowd 2003). However, these genres subsequently experienced great amounts of friction and boundary work (George 2003; Peterson 2013). One result is that, especially in the present, rock's boundaries are much more "fuzzy" than are the boundaries of country music—especially with, as Simmons' opening comment revealed, other genres like hip-hop and pop sometimes being closely linked to rock (van Venrooij 2009). It remains to be seen how such fuzziness (or lack thereof) matters for whom the halls of fame choose to consecrate. Having set the stage for this dissertation and its focus, I now delve more fully into the music-historical context of my study and the concepts that figure prominently within it.

The Musico-Historical Context of Genres and Their Consecration

The Origins of Country, Rhythm and Blues and Rock

The genres of country music and rhythm and blues, which would come together to give birth to rock music, have a common musical ancestor in what elites called "folk" music during the early 20th century (Roy 2002). Although they would become two distinct genres, characterized by both unique sounds and racially polarized audiences and musicians, originally, blacks and whites were playing music that shared many commonalities. The divide came along not because of the musicians themselves but, instead, because of the recording industry (Roy 2004). At the turn of the century large record companies mainly released two kinds of music: that which was then called "popular" music as well as classical music. The emphasis on classical music was

because record companies were still in their nascent stages and their executives were trying to demonstrate that the phonograph was not a passing novelty but was instead a major step forward in home entertainment and edification. They felt the choice of classical music, in particular, would legitimize the phonograph by demonstrating its connections to high culture.[9] Recognizing that classical music alone would not sustain their business, they also released popular music that would have wide appeal to a largely white, urban audiences. Because they were focused on building the reputation of their industry, for many years, large record companies overlooked those types of music that very well may have been (and ultimately proved to be) profitable because they viewed those types of music as inferior. This overlooked music primarily included what would first be known as "race" music (later to be renamed "rhythm and blues") along with "hillbilly" music, which we now know as "country" music. While both race music and hillbilly music would struggle to enter the recording industry, the music that was associated with African Americans ultimately faced an even more challenging terrain than that associated with rural, generally less educated whites. Still, a market logic, though inhibited by racism, would ultimately recognize the vast audience for race records and would release music specifically targeted towards the black consumers. Equally, the desire for profit would ultimately suppress (though not entirely extinguish) the classism and elitism that had kept hillbilly music from being recorded. Interestingly, it was through peripheral, or "independent," record companies that these music genres were first able to enter the recording industry, and only later would the large record companies

[9] High culture is generally considered having proclivities towards cultural goods like classical music, fine foods, fine art, and so on. Such interests are generally associated with being a member of the upper class or middle class (Bourdieu 1984).

recognize the economic viability (though still not the aesthetic legitimacy) of these genres (Dowd 2003).

At the beginning of the 20th century, what would eventually come to be recognized as country music was being played in rural areas across North America. Because this music was being played in relatively isolated areas across such a vast space, there was not one unique sound. It was not until 1923 that the first "country" music record would be recorded. It would not be an easy road for those making country music because, not only was country music originally difficult to market as the field seemed so vast and different, but those originally in charge of finding and recording music talent were averse to country music and its perceived culture. This is because record executives came from major cities and saw country music and the people who made it as inferior. For example, the perception by the New York executive that oversaw the first country album was so negative that he originally did not intend to release the record. It was only because a local record distributor convinced him to make 500 copies for the distributor to sell that the record saw the light of day. However, the record saw such immediate success that the executive, and ultimately the recording industry as a whole, would recognize that, despite their feelings about the music, there was an untapped market for this music. Over the years, largely because of recording industry personnel and not the musicians, country music would come to have a more cohesive sound, though there would still be differences in the genre and changes over time. One of the primary differences within the genre is between that of soft-shell and hard-core country music. Both types represent long-held country traditions, but hard-core is characterized by a more rustic sound while soft-shell is more pop-like (e.g., polished) in its sound. Despite

these difference, both have experienced great popularity in the country music field at different points in time (Peterson 2013).

The other genre that came out of what was once known as "folk" music was originally termed "race music," and it would eventually give rise to rhythm and blues. African Americans had flocked to urban centers, like Chicago, Detroit, and New York in the 1920s and 1930s, and in these cities the likes of jazz and blues along with other similar genres would gain a following. Eventually, the overlap between jazz and blues (and gospel) would become rhythm and blues (Guralnick 2012). This genre would gain popularity, including among some whites, as it offered a harsher, faster, and what was perceived as a more authentic sound when compared to the popular music of the time. In particular, this sound appealed to young white audiences of the late 1940s and 1950s, who quickly started flocking to the genre. This group was seen as active listeners who cared greatly about both the sound and the messages contained in the music that they were consuming. During this time period, young whites listening to the music of blacks was an act of rebellion and seen as such by parents, record labels, radio stations, and society more broadly (Gillett 2011). That rebellion, though, would lead to profits for the music industry. Once-overlooked black musicians and audiences, when combined with growing demand for rhythm and blues by white audiences, turned this into a genre that enjoyed much popularity and high sales (Dowd 2003).

Rock music marks, in an unusual way, the reunification of rhythm and blues and country music (Roy 2004). However, as both genres had many years to evolve and change since their split in the 1920s, the sound when the two reunified in the 1950s was wholly different from the music that blacks and whites had been making over thirty years

prior (Lena 2012). "Rock 'n' roll" music—as it was known during its early years, later to become known simply as "rock" after 1964—did not come to national prominence until 1953 and did not begin to truly take hold until between 1954-1956[10] (Gillett 2011). From the outset, rock was the music of young people and marked a rebellion against adults and, particularly for whites, a break from country music (Peterson 2013) and the popular music of its day (Peterson 1990). The rise of rock 'n' roll itself cannot be separated from the development of youth culture. Rock 'n' roll was perceived as rebellious because it was viewed as too sexual,[11] the attitude of the genre was defiant towards authority, and the singers were either black or thought to sound too much like black singers (Gillett 2011).

While young music consumers were making breaks toward rock 'n' roll, so were country musicians. Although much of the sound of rock 'n' roll came from rhythm and blues, the genre was also influenced by the rockabilly subgenre, which included the faster, harsher sounds of country music (Gillett 2011). The youth generation enjoyed those performers that combined the sounds of rhythm and blues and country music. This included the likes of several key musicians such as Johnny Cash, Elvis Presley, and Waylon Jennings, all of whom were incorporating rock 'n' roll into their sounds. Country music would come to be seen as old-fashioned, which young people in the 1950s (just as today) would want to distance themselves from (Peterson 2013). Of course, for a genre partially rooted in rebellion, having some of its founding fathers cast out of their original

[10] Peterson (1990) argues that the year that marks the beginning of rock and roll was 1955.
[11] In fact, rock and roll was originally a euphemism in rhythm and blues songs for intercourse (Gillett 2011).

country homes for many years could have only been seen as a positive, legitimizing act within this emerging genre of rock.

The overview offered above shows that rock music was built on a combination of country and rhythm and blues, and that country music absorbed elements of rock. That dualistic heritage of rock, in part, makes it a "fuzzier" genre than country, which largely steered clear of rhythm and blues. Yet before proceeding, some further elaboration is needed. We can think of country, rhythm and blues, and rock as all comprising "popular music" (see footnote 6). Defining these genres as "pop," however, is problematic. Pop music occupies a unique space in relation to rock and music as a whole. Even amongst researchers its position is debated. Sometimes it is a treated as a genre with unique sounds (Brehony 1998; Hendy 2000). However, for other researchers, pop is not a genre at all. It is simply a subset of any number of genres that has been made more palatable to the mainstream and, subsequently, more commercially friendly and appealing (Lena and Peterson 2008). In this context, there can be (as is) pop-rock, pop-country, pop-"fill in the blank"—thus making the boundaries between genres less clear. Because "pop" music, regardless of the genre it is modifying, is a commercial designation, for many performers this will be a derogatory association. Further still, despite some who draw distinctions between rock and pop music, the term "pop rock" can also be used to refer rock music (Regev 2013) as the lines are increasingly blurry (van Venrooij 2009). Therein lies another type of "fuzziness" that complications consecration efforts.

Halls of Fame and Consecration in Country and Rock

Two organizations emerged in both country and rock to pursue the explicit mission of consecrating those musicians deemed best to exemplify their respective genre. The Country Music Hall of Fame—located in Nashville, TN—was established by the Country Music Association in 1961, and it inducted its first class of musicians in that same year. The Country Music Hall of Fame aims to identify and preserve the history of those that it believes to be most influential in shaping it the course of country music. Because of this, it is a hall of fame as well as a museum and archive. The museum itself chronologically tells its story, focusing on both what it sees as important moments in country music's development along with its "crown jewel" performers. The museum also has special exhibits and performers that it believes are currently of note in the country music field. Candidates for the CMHOF are judged by their talent and the impact that they have had on the field, including the scope of their activity and influence upon others. Interestingly, CMHOF candidates are also judged based on their professionalism and image, devotion to others, as well as their personal morals and behaviors. In the CMHOF, there are Modern Era, Veterans Era, and Rotating Categories sections for which individuals may be considered for induction. For the Modern Era category, a performer becomes eligible for induction 20 years after achieving national prominence and will remain eligible for the next 25 years. After this point, they become eligible for the Veterans Era. The "Rotating Category" section alternates between non-performers, songwriters, and recording and/or touring musicians. The CMHOF's voting panel includes "historians and industry professionals that have a historical perspective on Country Music" (Country Music Hall of Fame 2014b).

The Rock and Roll Hall of Fame Foundation was founded in 1983 by Ahmet Ertegun as an effort to archive the history of those it would deem the most important and influential individuals in rock, and it would induct its first class in 1986. Like the CMHOF, the R&RHOF (which is located in Cleveland, Ohio) acts not only to select and induct select individuals (including performers, composers, and musicians), but it also acts as a museum. The museum includes both permanent collections along with large and smaller temporary exhibits that celebrate different performers, albums, and particular groups of musicians. The Hall of Fame also maintains a list of "Songs That Shaped Rock and Roll" and includes songs that have been released over the course of the 20th century. All of the decisions regarding who to induct, who to recognize in exhibits, and what songs were of greatest importance to rock are made by a team of individuals that Ahmet Ertegun, founder and one-time chairman of Atlantic Records compiled. The team also includes Jann Wenner, who is the editor and publisher of *Rolling Stone* magazine, record executives, and two attorneys. For select features, such as the "Songs" series, different music experts are brought in to help in the selection process. The actual hall of fame consists of performers who have demonstrated "unquestionable excellence," which is determined, in part by, the influence they have had, the length and depth of their career and work, and "innovation and superiority in style and technique." To be considered, a performer's first album had to have been released at least 25 years prior. Once the nominations are compiled, they are "sent to an international voting body of more than 600 performers, historians and members of the music industry. Those performers who receive the highest number of votes are inducted" (Rock and Roll Hall of Fame 2014). As

should be clear by now, then, both halls of fame are engaged in the boundary work and legitimation that makes consecration possible.

Conceptual Issues: Boundary Work, Legitimacy and Consecration

Symbolic boundaries are used to "categorize objects, people, practices, and even time and space" (Lamont and Molnár 2002, p. 168). However, they are not universal in terms of their content; different groups use symbolic boundaries with different emphases in a struggle to define their world and their position within the social hierarchy. The boundaries that people develop are value-laden, with individuals using boundaries to position themselves and their group in ways that privilege their own group over outsiders. This is viewed as a central process through which groups develop their social status. It is important to note that boundaries are used for both inclusion and exclusion—as when groups draw boundaries, they position themselves alongside those who they view as similar to themselves while distancing themselves from those they believe to be different and often of lower social status (Lamont and Molnár 2002).

Symbolic boundaries can be found at every turn in music, whether regarding the genre preferences of listeners (Bryson 1996; van Eijck 2001), the distinction of quality made by musicians (Becker 1951; Lena 2012), or what music or musicians should be culturally consecrated (Schmutz and Faupel 2010)—with the boundaries being drawn at these different levels often intersecting. Symbolic boundaries generally act to reinforce social boundaries and inequalities. Bourdieu (1984) undertook work that is arguably the most famous demonstration of this reinforcement. His work centered on the relationship between people's cultural tastes and their position in French society, specifically their

class position. He found, among other things, that the tastes (i.e., symbolic classification) of the middle class and especially the upper class are granted deference and honor, with their tastes also justifying and reinforcing their advantaged position in an unequal society. However, for many scholars in the US, the mapping is not as clear cut for a number of reasons, including the US's differences in class structure, its particular history of racial inequality, and because Bourdieu generally overlooked how gender might influence people's cultural preferences and experiences (McCall 1992; Pinheiro and Dowd 2009). For such scholars, then, understanding *how* the performers and genres associated with different social groups come to be valued, offered legitimacy, and culturally consecrated is of great interest, as such differences reflect and reify social inequalities. Here, the work of DiMaggio is especially important.

DiMaggio's (1991) work examining the Brahmins in 19th century Boston provides insights into conscious efforts to develop symbolic boundaries through what he labels "cultural entrepreneurship" (i.e., the building of an organizational base to support such boundaries). Before the efforts of these Boston's elites, what we now call "high" and "popular" forms of art and music were consumed side by side (see footnote 6), with no significant boundaries separating them. These Boston elites put an end to this mixing of high and popular culture, however, by developing non-profit organizations that they could control, including one devoted to classical music and another to the visual arts. To institutionalize high culture, Boston's elite then had to create boundaries between art and entertainment—instructing audiences on the "sacredness" of high culture and the respect it deserved. This allowed for a change in the way in which certain cultural objects would be perceived and consumed, purging any hints of the "popular" from the offerings of the

orchestra and museum in Boston. These arts organizations were developed so that the elite in Boston could convert their economic capital into cultural capital in order to separate themselves socially from an influx of immigrants and the newly rich (DiMaggio 1991), but cultural entrepreneurs may have different motives for the founding of their organizations. Regardless of motive, however, these cultural entrepreneurs in Boston (and later across the US) built organizations that would uphold symbolic boundaries in order to elevate a particular cultural good—offering it cultural value and legitimacy.

This offering of legitimacy—and the wide acceptance of it—is a process that occurs in four stages: (1) innovation, (2) local validation, (3) diffusion, and (4) general validation. In the innovation stage, a social innovation is created to address some need or desire at the local level (e.g., the founding of the Boston Symphony Orchestra) and is framed as being consistent with overarching beliefs, values, and norms (e.g., the celebration of transcendent music). The local validation stage requires that innovations are accepted; here, local actors construe the innovation as consistent with beliefs, values, and norms (e.g., how this music enriches all). In the diffusion stage, the new social object is adopted by actors in other local contexts (e.g., when elites in other cities likewise founded arts organizations). Finally, general validation is marked by widespread acceptance in which the social object becomes part of the society's shared culture—such as the recognition of what constitutes "classical music." Once a social object has been legitimated, its legitimacy is enduring and difficult (but not impossible) to disrupt (Johnson, Dowd and Ridgeway 2006).

This four-stage process reveals that, while what is currently seen as legitimate in society is often taken for granted and seen as innate in certain actions and objects,

legitimacy is in fact created "through a collective construction of social reality" (Johnson, Dowd, and Ridgeway 2006, p. 55). Sometimes these social constructions of reality are only accepted by a small group; sometimes though, these social constructions may be accepted by society more broadly. Furthermore, what is broadly deemed to be legitimate is dependent on collective action and beliefs, and it depends on global validation among actors, though it does not require actual individual enjoyment of the cultural good. For example, one can concede the legitimacy of classical music without actually liking it (Bourdieu 1984). Without this [apparent] consensus, then actions and/or objects will not be perceived as legitimate because dissension casts doubt. The importance of the appearance of consensus in establishing legitimacy can be so great, particularly amongst reputational entrepreneurs who compile "greatest" lists and consecrating organizations like museums, that these actors often feel compelled to include those groups or individuals who have been legitimated elsewhere by other actors. This ensures their own legitimacy because it demonstrates their own knowledge and understanding of the field (Allen and Lincoln 2004; Braden 2009).[12]

Symbolic boundaries are often intertwined with issues of legitimacy, with symbolic boundaries being drawn between those social objects that are seen as legitimate and those that are seen as illegitimate (Bourdieu 1984; Lamont 1992). Social objects that are seen as illegitimate are often those that are connected to socially subordinated groups, such as women and racial minorities (Pachucki, Pendergrass, and Lamont 2007). The differences we see between the treatment of pop, rock, rhythm and blues (and its musical

[12] Although distinctions in the cultural field, like legitimacy, are most effective when they have the appearance of being chosen based on objective standards (Bourdieu 1999).

descendants), and country music, then, is a consequence of the status of their associated social groups (DeNora 2002; Dowd 2003; Roy 2002, 2004; Schmutz 2009), namely: women for pop, white men for rock, black men and women for rhythm and blues, and the working class for country. This leads to each genre facing different hurdles in its pursuit of legitimacy: they will all follow a similar process for legitimation, while having unique paths to achieving this legitimacy given their particular constituencies (Johnson, Dowd, and Ridgeway 2006).

The role of symbolic boundaries become especially apparent in the work of Bourdieu and others in considering the multiple types of legitimacy found in fields of cultural production (see footnote 7). There is both economic and cultural legitimacy. Economic legitimacy is characterized by a cultural object's commercial viability rather than its aesthetic worth (Scardaville 2009). Within the arts, commerce and aesthetics are viewed as standing in opposition to one another, with a concern for profit as being contrary to a concern for cultural legitimacy (Bourdieu 1996). There are three types of cultural legitimacy: specific legitimacy, bourgeois legitimacy, and popular legitimacy. Specific legitimacy is granted by one's peers; bourgeois legitimacy is granted by members of the dominant class; and popular legitimacy is granted by the public at large (Bourdieu 1993). Cultural producers' concern with a given kind of legitimacy is colored by their field's level of autonomy from the economic field of production. The more autonomy they have from the economic field of production, and the more they can focus on the field of cultural production, the more that they, in turn, will be focus on gaining specific legitimacy. On the other hand, the closer that these cultural producers are to the

economic field of production, the more that they will be concerned with popular legitimacy (Hesmondhalgh 2006; de Valck 2014).

Within the field of music, along with all fields of cultural production, there is a great focus (and often debate) regarding the boundary between what is considered art and what is considered a commercial product. The two orientations are generally seen as working in opposition: the more one is concerned with making profits, the more that artistic considerations may be sacrificed. This debate can be the source of the division between two seemingly similar genres of music because, in fields of cultural production, there is great value in pursuing "art for art's sake" (Bourdieu 1996). Therefore, those songs, musicians, and genres that are oriented toward making a commercially friendly product (such as "pop") are seen as least likely to create any real art. However, there are increasingly a number of debates about where these lines are drawn in cultural fields and whether or not such lines exist in such a stark and clearly demarcated fashion (de Valck 2014). Such debates in the fields of cultural production may be contributing to the erosion of the boundaries between rock and pop music (van Venrooij 2009).

As we can see, legitimacy is key to numerous fields of cultural production, with this social construction mattering greatly. Because legitimacy is so important, those in various cultural fields will make great efforts to acquire legitimacy. Bourdieu (1985) argues that, over time, there has been an increasing number of cultural goods available to a growing field of potential consumers. These cultural goods must compete for legitimacy in order to survive and thrive. Because the need for legitimacy has continued to grow, so too has the need for "agencies of consecration" that may bestow legitimacy on the cultural goods, and, ultimately, the fields and genres within which the cultural

goods are located. Consecration performs a kind of "social magic" by creating "discontinuity out of continuity" (Bourdieu et al. 1999, p. 120). It does this by selecting certain cultural goods or producers that these agencies see as legitimate, and consecration rewards them by deeming their work as symbolic of greatness within the field. Thus, consecration is a kind of social magic that separates the sacred from the profane (Bourdieu 1984). In doing so, it creates a cultural hierarchy—a hierarchy that is influenced by social boundaries found within the genre and the broader society.

Conclusions

Valorization and cultural consecration are important to fields of cultural production because they help provide legitimacy, not just to the cultural producers or their work, but they also provide legitimacy to their field as a whole (Bourdieu 1983). Cultural consecration entails being added to the canon within a given field of cultural production, whether it is music (Schmutz and Faupel 2010), film (Allen and Lincoln 2004), literature (Tuchman and Fortin 1984), etc. Cultural consecration often (though not always) begins with valorization in field of cultural production. That is the contemporaneous celebration of a cultural good, separating what is seen as good or even great at that moment in history from its peers. Valorization of a given cultural object may change over time; for example, it may no longer be seen as good for the period of time in which it originated, or it may come to be seen as having such great cultural importance that it is later added to the canon. Of course, many people may have opinions about what should be valorized and consecrated, but those opinions backed by organizations can prove especially key—those organizational "agencies of consecration"

that are created with the purpose of consecrating selected cultural fields, genres, individuals or works (Bourdieu 1999).

In this dissertation, I will be examining two central agencies of cultural consecration within popular music, namely the Country Music and Rock and Roll Halls of Fame. I will explore each hall of fame and its unique history to determine how the differences between the two halls of fame reflect difference in their respective fields. Furthermore, these differences will offer insights into the decisions that the halls of fame make during the induction process. I will then go on to examine each field and consider how the characteristics of each field influence the body of performers that have been inducted into each hall of fame. Finally, I will conclude this dissertation with a reflection on how the two halls of fame compare with one another. This dissertation project, then, will examine how the halls of fame and their choices for induction, or consecration, act to create and reify social and symbolic boundaries while bringing legitimacy to the field as a whole. Understanding the trends in cultural consecration in these two halls of fame and how different factors influence the induction process will also mark a better understanding of the kind of boundaries that exist in different music genres (see Schmutz and Faupel 2010), as well as offering a step towards a better understanding of consecration in cultural production more broadly (see Braden 2009).

REFERENCES

Allen, Michael Patrick and Anne E. Lincoln. 2004. "Critical Discourse and the Cultural Consecration of American Films." *Social Forces* 82 (3): 871–894.

Allen, Michael and Nicholas E. Parsons. 2006. "The Institutionalization of Fame: Achievement, Recognition, and Cultural Consecration in Baseball." *American Sociological Review* 71 (5): 808-825.

Becker, Howard S. 1951. "The Professional Dance Musician and His Audience." *American Journal of Sociology* 57 (2): 136-144.

Becker, Howard S. *Art Worlds*. 2008. Twenty-fifth anniversary edition. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Bennett, Andy. 2009. "'Heritage Rock': Rock Music, Representation and Heritage Discourse." *Poetics* 37 (5–6): 474–489.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1983. "The Field of Cultural Production, or: The Economic World Reversed." *Poetics* 12 (4): 311–56.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1985. "The Market of Symbolic Goods." *Poetics* 14 (1): 13–44.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1993. *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*. Edited by Randal Johnson. New York: Columbia University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1996. *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1999. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Translated by Matthew Adamson. Edited by John Thompson. Translated by Gino Raymond. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Braden, Laura E. 2009. "From the Armory to Academia: Careers and Reputations of Early Modern Artists in the United States." *Poetics* 37 (5–6): 439–455.

Brehony, Kevin J. 1998. "'I Used to Get Mad at My School': Representations of Schooling in Rock and Pop Music." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 19 (1): 113–134.

Bryson, Bethany. 1996. "'Anything But Heavy Metal': Symbolic Exclusion and Musical Dislikes." *American Sociological Review* 61: 884–899.

CMA World. 2014a. “Candidate Criteria.” *CMA World* April 15. https://web.archive.org/web/20140415224056/http://www.cmaworld.com/initiatives/hall-of-fame/candidate-criteria/. Retrieved June 11, 2017.

CMA World. 2014b. “Categories.” *CMA World* April 15. https://web.archive.org/web/20140415224037/http://www.cmaworld.com/initiatives/hall-of-fame/categories/. Retrieved June 11, 2017.

DeNora, Tia. 2000. *Music and Everyday Life.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

DeNora, Tia. 2002. “Music into Action: Performing Gender on the Viennese Concert Stage, 1790–1810.” *Poetics* 30 (1-2): 19–33.

DiMaggio, Paul. 1991. “Cultural Entrepreneurship in Nineteenth-Century Boston: The Creation of an Organizational Base for High Culture in America.” Pages 374-397 in *Rethinking Popular Culture,* edited by Chandra Mukerji and Michael Schudson. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Dowd, Timothy J. 2003. “Structural Power and the Construction of Markets: The Case of Rhythm and Blues.” *Comparative Social Research* 21: 147–201.

Dowd, Timothy. J. 2011. “Production and Producers of Life Styles: Fields of Classical and Popular Music in the United States.” *Kölner Zeitschrift fur Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* Sonderheft 51: 113- 138.

Dowd, Timothy J. 2013. “Music from Abroad: The Internationalization of the US Mainstream Market, 1940-1990.” Pages 125-136 in *Redefining the Mainstream,* edited by Andy Bennett, Sarah Baker and Jodie Taylor. London: Routledge.

Eijck, Koen van. 2001. “Social Differentiation in Musical Taste Patterns.” *Social Forces* 79 (3): 1163–1185.

George, Nelson. 2003. *The Death of Rhythm and Blues*. New York: Penguin.

Gillett, Charlie. 2011. *The Sound of the City: The Rise of Rock & Roll*. Third revised edition. London: Souvenir Press.

Guralnick, Peter. 2012. *Sweet Soul Music: Rhythm and Blues and the Southern Dream of Freedom*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Hendy, David. 2000. “Pop Music Radio in the Public Service: BBC Radio 1 and New Music in the 1990s.” *Media, Culture & Society* 22 (6): 743–761.

Hesmondhalgh, David. 2006. “Bourdieu, the Media and Cultural Production.” *Media, Culture & Society* 28 (2): 211–231.

Johnson, Cathryn, Timothy J. Dowd, and Cecilia L. Ridgeway. 2006. “Legitimacy as a Social Process.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 32 (1): 53–78.

Lamont, Michèle. 1986. “How to Become a Dominant French Philosopher: The Case of Jacques Derrida.” *American Journal of Sociology* 93 (3): 584-622.

Lamont, Michèle. 1992. *Money, Morals, and Manners: The Culture of the French and the American Upper-Middle Class*. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press.

Lamont, Michèle and Virág Molnár. 2002. “The Study of Boundaries in the Social Sciences.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 28 (1): 167–195.

Lena, Jennifer C. 2012. *Banding Together: How Communities Create Genres in Popular Music*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Lena, Jennifer C. and Richard A. Peterson. 2008. “Classification as Culture: Types and Trajectories of Music Genres.” *American Sociological Review* 73 (5): 697–718.

McCall, Leslie. 1992. “Does Gender Fit? Bourdieu, Feminism, and Conceptions of Social Order.” *Theory and Society* 21 (6): 837–867.

Michaels, Sean. 2014. “Gene Simmons: Hip Hop and Pop Should Not Be in the Hall of Fame.” *The Guardian*, March 18, sec. Music. http://www.theguardian.com/music/2014/mar/18/kiss-gene-simmons-hip-hop-pop-rock-and-roll-hall-of-fame.

Pachucki, Mark A., Sabrina Pendergrass, and Michèle Lamont. 2007. “Boundary Processes: Recent Theoretical Developments and New Contributions.” *Poetics* 35 (6): 331–351.

Peterson, Richard A. 1990. “Why 1955? Explaining the Advent of Rock Music.” *Popular Music* 9 (1): 97–116.

Peterson, Richard A. 2013. *Creating Country Music: Fabricating Authenticity*. E-book. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pinheiro, Diogo L. and Timothy J. Dowd. 2009. “All That Jazz: The Success of Jazz Musicians in Three Metropolitan Areas.” *Poetics* 37 (5–6): 490–506.

Regev, Motti. 1994. “Producing Artistic Value:” *Sociological Quarterly* 35 (1): 85–102.

Regev, Motti. 2013. *Pop-Rock Music: Aesthetic Cosmopolitanism in Late Modernity*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Rock and Roll Hall of Fame. 2014. "Induction Process." http://www.rockhall.com/inductees/induction-process/. Retrieved May 4, 2014.

Rossman, Gabriel. 2004. "Elites, Masses, and Media Blacklists: The Dixie Chicks Controversy." *Social Forces* 83 (1): 61–79.

Roy, William G. 2002. "Aesthetic Identity, Race, and American Folk Music." *Qualitative Sociology* 25 (3): 459–69.

Roy, William G. 2004. "'Race Records' and 'Hillbilly Music': Institutional Origins of Racial Categories in the American Commercial Recording Industry." *Poetics* 32 (3–4): 265–279.

Roy, William G. and Timothy J. Dowd. 2010. "What Is Sociological About Music?" *Annual Review of Sociology* 36: 183-203.

Scardaville, Melissa C. 2009. "High Art, No Art: The Economic and Aesthetic Legitimacy of US Soap Operas." *Poetics* 37 (4): 366–382.

Schmutz, Vaughn. 2009. "Social and Symbolic Boundaries in Newspaper Coverage of Music, 1955–2005: Gender and Genre in the US, France, Germany, and the Netherlands." *Poetics* 37 (4): 298–314.

Schmutz, Vaughn and Alison Faupel. 2010. "Gender and Cultural Consecration in Popular Music." *Social Forces* 89 (2): 685–707.

Tuchman, Gaye and Nina E. Fortin. 1984. "Fame and Misfortune: Edging Women Out of the Great Literary Tradition." *American Journal of Sociology* 90 (1): 72–96.

Valck, Marijke de. 2014. "Supporting Art Cinema at a Time of Commercialization: Principles and Practices, the Case of the International Film Festival Rotterdam." *Poetics* 42: 40–59.

Venrooij, Alex van. 2009. "The Aesthetic Discourse Space of Popular Music: 1985–86 and 2004–05." *Poetics* 37 (4): 315–332.

CHAPTER TWO:

COMPARING THE HISTORY AND FIELDS OF THE ROCK AND ROLL AND COUNTRY MUSIC HALLS OF FAME

Introduction

The Country Music Hall of Fame and the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame are both prominent consecrating organizations, as well as sites of popular music heritage within the United States. These sites chronicle and celebrate the histories of the respective popular music genres (Cohen, Knifton, Leonard, & Roberts 2014). They are also, as previously mentioned, important sites for cultural entrepreneurs to cultivate and increase the legitimacy of both their respective music fields as well as performers within those fields (Bourdieu 1984). Each organization is uniquely intertwined with the field it consecrates, and, equally, each hall of fame is emblematic of the characteristics and solidarity found within the country and rock genres. Examining and comparing the features of the organizations and their histories offers new perspectives on the two music fields.

Approaching Fields of Cultural Production: Entrepreneurship and Solidarity

Cultural entrepreneurs hold a powerful position because they bring together existing components of their field and combine them into something new, something that has the power to transform the world around them. DiMaggio (1991) offers a famous example of this, in that Boston Brahmins and others created a heritage site for classical music and visual arts. In doing so, they elevated certain aspects of popular culture to create “high culture,” demonstrating an appreciation for this type of culture that would come to entail a legitimated form of knowledge. In establishing the Country Music and

Rock and Roll Halls of Fame, the founders of each of these organizations were trying to accomplish similar goals. Namely, they wanted to create heritage sites for country and rock music, respectively. However, as DiMaggio explained in his study of the Boston elite, cultural entrepreneurs must deal with the nature of the field in which they are operating. Similarly, the founders of the Country Music and Rock and Roll Halls of Fame had to deal with the nature of the respective fields.

Reading Bourdieu's (1993) discussion of fields, one is left with the impression that they are rife with competition and struggle. The success of the few victors comes at the expense of the majority who toil to improve their position yet do not. That cultural entrepreneurship succeeds is thus remarkable—and likely requires much cajoling and maneuvering. Yet, when reading DiMaggio and Powell (1991), one is left with the view that fields are wracked more by uncertainty than competition—at least fields of cultural production. Given that uncertainty, organizations monitor each other closely and imitate those engaged in comparable activities. Cultural entrepreneurs, in this view, provide important templates for how others are to succeed. Finally, reading the work of Howard Becker (Becker 2008, Becker & Pessin 2006)—who is critical of Bourdieu's usage of the concept "field"—we nonetheless get the view of fields as being driven by cooperation. Cultural entrepreneurship for Becker entails the marshaling of like-minded and mutually interested actors. This points to a classic debate: whose understanding of the nature of fields is correct? Perhaps all of them are. That is, fields can vary in the extent to which they are marked by competition and uncertainty versus cooperation. The work of Albert Bergesen helps us proceed in this fashion.

The differences that are found between the Country Music and Rock and Roll Halls of Fame are partially the result of the vast differences found between their respective music fields. Country music is insular, and there are clear boundaries between country music and other genres (Fox 2004; Holt 2007). Because of this, there is relatively little disagreement regarding who qualifies as a country music performer and what makes a performer excellent. That is not to say that there is no uncertainty about quality in country music (see Long Lingo & O'Mahoney 2010), but rather that such uncertainty is far less pronounced in country than in rock music. On the other hand, rock music's boundaries are blurry and constantly being negotiated. This is partly a function of the genre's history, in which it initially resulted from combining two genres (rhythm and blues and country) and has since absorbed other disparate and varied genres (Dowd 2011; Ennis 1992; Lena & Peterson 2008). Subsequently, discussion and disagreement regarding both who is a rock music performer and what makes a rock music performer excellent is commonplace (Dowd, Ryan & Tai 2016; van Venrooij 2009; van Venrooij & Schmutz 2010).

We can thus conceptualize the fields of country music and rock as operating at opposite ends of the continuum described by Bergesen (1979, 1984). He notes that artists, though seemingly autonomous, exist in a community of other artists, along with others who help to bring their work to market, a point also made by Becker (2008). The same can be said be said for music performers who exist alongside others in their music community and, more specifically, their field—including those performers, as well as managers, producers, record company executives, songwriters, and studio musicians; Peterson (2013) makes that very point regarding the country music field and Negus

(1999) does so for the rock field. Artists within a given style, or music performers within a given genre, will share certain conventions, making the style or genre a product of the group. "Styles of art [or music genres] represent cultural communities where the usage or non-use of the style [or genre] defines membership and group boundaries" (Bergesen 1984, p. 188).

Artistic objects—including songs— may be understood and described in "more or less elaborate and restricted codes"—i.e., the manner by which information is conveyed (Bergesen 1997, 1984). Restricted codes mean that little explicit discussion is needed for such things as genre membership and quality because of common understanding, and elaborated codes are the opposite, requiring much explicit discussion in the face of little shared understanding. Hence, codes are affected by the level of solidarity occurring in the artistic community in which the object is created. Artistic groups marked by high solidarity have a clear understanding of themselves and their works; little explanation, then, is needed to understand the artistic objects that they each offer. In contrast, those groups with little solidarity lack such mutual understanding, and as a result, more discussion is needed for all to understand and appreciate various artistic objects that circulate among them. This means that, across fields, there can be variation in the level of acceptance for stylistic conventions (Bergesen 1984). Those members who are part of a group with closely shared identifications will make use of "restricted" codes. Using a restricted code results from solidarity, consensus, and a close-knit environment that elevates the group above the individual. These communities are also characterized by being self-reaffirming. Furthermore, restricted codes tend to be more implicit and have more simple and rigid options for expression. On the other end of the spectrum are

"elaborated" codes, which result when solidarity declines. Groups that have elaborated codes are more fractured and varied and operate without a set of commonly held assumptions; solidarity and consensus are forsaken in the name of the individual. Elaborated codes allow individuals to communicate more personal and individual thoughts and ideas, as well as providing general flexibility in terms of approaching the artistic object (Bergesen 1979). Finally, critics are more common in fields that use elaborated codes, as they help to make sense of and classify the artistic work that is produced (Bergesen 1984).

The field of country music is one marked by high solidarity. There is ample evidence of this. First, country music has a central geographic base, namely Nashville. Within this city resides a host of music business, musicians and support personnel, with formal and informal connections among them allowing for the easy sharing of conventions (Long Lingo & O'Mahoney 2010; Peterson 2013). In fact, Nashville is one of the major centers of music production in the US, despite being a modestly sized city (Florida and Jackson 2010). Second, this music production in Nashville has long been marked by collaboration: such as the regular out-sourcing of musical composition to teams of writers (de Laat 2015), as well as those working to foster the viability of music careers and venues in the city (Cornfield 2015). Finally, given its long term emphasis on traditional values (e.g., patriotism) and traditional themes (e.g., heartache), country music is a genre possessing clear musical boundaries (Malone 2006; McLaurin & Peterson 1992; Peterson 2013; van Venrooij 2009). That is, most people likely know what country music entails, whether or not they are fans of the genre. Put another way, country music resembles more the field described by Becker (Becker & Pessin 2006) than Bourdieu

(1983)—one with much cooperation and solidarity. As a result, when the Country Music Hall of Fame entered this field, it would likely do so with a restricted rather than elaborated code—offering little justification or transparency for its operation and choices related to consecration. Moreover, given the field's emphasis on traditionalism—which is antagonistic to bureaucracy, according to Weber—this hall likely avoided the standardized operating procedures that are commonplace in the US, at least initially (see Espeland & Sauder 2007).

On the other hand, the field of rock music is marked by low solidarity. First, rock has no one location that it calls home. New York City and Los Angeles remain primary business locations for this genre, but they have since been joined by numerous offices across the US and the world, with corporate headquarters re-locating to Europe, Japan, Canada and France over time (Dowd 2004; Negus 1999). Meanwhile, its musicians are scattered far and wide, contributing to vibrant rock scenes in such places as San Francisco and Seattle (see Florida & Jackson 2010). Second, rock emphasizes the ethos of the musician who stands apart creatively—independent and transcendent (Schmutz & Faupel 2010). Unlike in country music, then, rock musicians and bands are expected to write their own music rather than rely upon songwriting teams (Bennett 2009). That alone leads to reduced interaction and collaboration in rock relative to country music. Finally, rock is genre that subsumes a multitude of styles and conventions that may be used, combined, or changed at any time as individual creativity is celebrated, and the boundaries between rock music and other genres are increasingly blurred (Dowd 2000; Lena & Peterson 2008; van Venrooij 2009). What constitutes "rock" at a given point in time, then, is more likely debated than conceded. The field of rock comes closer to the

type of field described by Bourdieu (1983) or DiMaggio and Powell (1983)—more competitive or more uncertain than cooperative. As a result, when the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame entered this field, it likely relied upon an elaborated rather than restricted code—working to make clear its mission, actions and choices in deliberate fashion.

In the pages that follow, I examine these hypotheses regarding the code employed by each of the halls of fame. I do so by relying upon archival information, as well as my observation at both sites. Substantively, I focus below on following decisions of the halls of fame: where to locate, how to induct, and who to induct. In each of these, the Country Music Hall of Fame took a different approach than did the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame—particularly in its lack of transparency and explicit criteria. Yet, even when doing so, the Country Music Hall of Fame did not face the same controversies as the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame, given the solidarity found in the field of country music.

Building Heritage: The Establishment and Location of Two Halls of Fame

The Country Music Hall of Fame is located in Nashville, Tennessee, and the and Rock and Roll Hall of Fame is located in Cleveland, Ohio. Research on music heritage recognizes the importance and relationship between geography and the sites that chronicle the histories of music and that elevate the significance of these histories (Cohen et al. 2014). The selection process that resulted in Nashville becoming the home of the Country Music Hall of Fame stands in stark contrast to the story of how Cleveland came to be the home of the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame. The differences in selection processes offer important insights into the early foundations of each organization. Equally, the specific location of each hall of fame provides information regarding the solidarity of each field. One hall of fame was established and located with minimal public discussion

(i.e., a restricted code) and the other involved the exact opposite (i.e., an elaborated code).

The Country Music Hall of Fame

Today, Nashville is synonymous with country music in America, but it took time and some strategic choices to cement the city's place in country music. In the genre's early years, Atlanta, Georgia almost became the home to country music. While Atlanta was the home of the first recorded country performer: Fiddlin' John, the city lost its dominant position in country music when many large recording companies chose to open offices and recording studios in Nashville, TN. After Atlanta faded away, Nashville would face other challengers as the country music business had also begun establishing roots in both Texas and California (Peterson 2013). Yet, despite the growing importance of Texas and California during the 1950s and 1960s, Nashville continued to maintain its stronghold. This was especially evident when, in 1958, the Country Music Association (CMA) was formed in Nashville in an effort to promote country music (McCall 2012). This was during a time of dramatic shifts in popular music, as rock music had recently come into being and was quickly growing in popularity, thereby challenging the standing of country music (Peterson 2013). As part of their efforts to promote country music, the CMA created the Country Music Hall of Fame honor in 1961.

Given the Country Music Association's location, there was little question as to where to locate the hall of fame. The CMA board quickly and privately chose Music Row in Nashville as the location for the new popular music heritage site (McCall 2012). Music Row is home to the offices of recording companies, recording studios, as well as the offices of many professionals in the industry. As a result, not only did the CMHOF help

to promote the field of country music, but the location of the hall of fame helped to reinforce the centrality of the city and the "Nashville Sound" in the country music industry—despite the growing prominence of both Texas and California in county music (Peterson 2013).

The Country Music Hall of Fame held its first induction ceremony the same year in which it was founded in Nashville, where it has since continued to hold these ceremonies for over 50 years (McCall 2012). Because of its abrupt inception, during the first few years, the hall of fame was characterized by disorganization. As a popular music heritage site, the Country Music Foundation would not charter the Country Music Hall of Fame until 1964, and the building would not be completed on Nashville's Music Row until 1967 (Country Music Hall of Fame 2014). Once built, the purpose of the hall of fame, according to the Country Music Foundation, was to collect and preserve recordings that were viewed as being of value to the field of country music. Beginning in the 1970s, and continuing throughout the 1980s, the purpose of the hall of fame grew, and the building in which it was housed grew in kind. The CMHOF expanded its scope of interest and began collecting books, photographs, as well as other items associated with the history of country music (McCall 2012).

In 2001, reflecting its shifting cultural position and concerns, the Country Music Hall of Fame moved from Music Row to a newly built museum in downtown Nashville. This move reflected the board's concern with broadening the influence of the hall of fame beyond its hallowed position within country music. This new location was more accessible to the general public and allowed the CMHOF to greatly increase its repository—so that, now, the CMHOF holds the world's largest collection of country

music artifacts. Additionally, the architecture of the new building is far more elaborate than its predecessor. The design includes many allusions to music, as well as an allusion to the cultural history of country music. The hall of fame features a rotunda that is intended to resemble grain silos, and atop the rotunda are four concentric circles representing 78, 45, and 33 rpm vinyl records, as well as a compact disc. Bars on the exterior of the rotunda also symbolize the musical notation from the song "Will the Circle Be Unbroken" by The Carter Family. The windows on the front of the building are placed to create the appearance of the keys of a piano. Collectively, the architecture creates a clear message of the importance of country music, including its history and solidarity. The values reflected in the architecture of the building are reflected throughout the interior of the museum. As visitors walk through the museum, they travel chronologically through country music's history, beginning with a brief introduction to country's musical ancestry (folk and gospel music) and ending with current-day performers. Since moving to its new location, the CMHOF has also become a major research center on the topic of country music (McCall 2012). These changes reveal the hall of fame's concern with country music's history, as well as its growing concern with its own position within American popular music.

The Rock and Roll Hall of Fame

The Rock and Roll Hall of Fame Foundation was established in the spring of 1983 by Ahmet Ertegun, the founder and chairman of Atlantic Records. To establish the organization, Ertegun assembled a board that included Jann Wenner, editor and publisher

of *Rolling Stone* magazine, as well as record company executives Seymour Stein,[13] Bob Krasnow, and Noreen Woods. Collectively, they represented different aspects of the rock music industry (as well as the practical concerns of starting an organization of this magnitude). The founding of the R&RHOF demonstrate that, despite the fact that the genre was flourishing, there were efforts in the field at the time to bolster the legitimacy of rock music (Bennett 2007). While the CMA board knew from the outset that the CMHOF would be located in Nashville, the board of the R&RHOF was torn regarding where to locate this hall of fame, this heritage site.

From 1983 until 1986, the board underwent a lengthy selection process, deciding between several cities that each were vying to become the home of the R&RHOF—including Philadelphia, Chicago, Memphis, Detroit, New Orleans, and, of course, Cleveland. Each city put forth proposals to the board that detailed both cultural and economic arguments in favor of their selection. The reason that so many cities were being considered is that they each, in their own unique ways, have influenced the development of rock music (George-Warren 2011; Stewart 2000). Memphis, Tennessee was in contention because it was the home to Sun Studios, the recording studio opened by Sam Phillips—where the likes of Johnny Cash, Elvis Presley, Roy Orbison recorded some of their earliest music (Escott & Hawkins 1992). Detroit, Michigan was also a contender to become site of the R&RHOF, as it was home to Motown Records, which was the recording company of The Supremes, The Jackson 5, Stevie Wonder, as well as others central to R&B (Posner 2005). Many other cities also vied for the hall of fame (Stewart

[13] The Scottish band Belle and Sebastian wrote an eponymous song about Seymour Stein on their 1998 album, *The Boy with the Arab Strap*.

2000), and in doing so, they made arguments regarding their place in the history of rock music, demonstrating the varied and diverse history of the rock music itself. Cleveland, the city that ultimately won the honor of being the home to the hall of fame, argued that it was a Cleveland disk jockey who first labeled the new genre "rock and roll," and they declared that several Cleveland-based radio stations played a major role in promoting the new genre (George-Warren 2011).

When the hall of fame inducted its first class of performers on January 23, 1986 in the ballroom of the Waldorf-Astoria in New York City, it still had not selected a city to call home. It was three months later, on April 20, 1986, that the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame announced that Cleveland had been chosen to be the home of the hall of fame. While the decision to locate the CMHOF in Nashville was done privately, by a small group of people, the selection process that eventually led to Cleveland becoming the home to the R&RHOF was a contested, public process. Ultimately, Cleveland was chosen as the site of the hall of fame due to a "groundswell of public support and a $65 million commitment from city officials" ("About The Rock Hall" 2017). These characteristics reflect the nature of each field and their respective halls of fame. Country music resulted from the division of folk music, along racial lines (Roy 2002, 2004), and has since remained homogeneous (Manuel 2008). The CMHOF is private in its decision-making process, which is possible due to the high level of consensus in country music. If there was less consensus, then such quick decisions that were made quietly among a small group of people would be questioned and, quite possibly, rejected. The selection process that resulted in Cleveland becoming the home to the R&RHOF embodies this alternative. Rock music represents the coming together of different genres and social

groups (Gillett 2011). Subsequently, there continues to be many discussions within rock concerning which performers and music qualifies as rock. Rather than trying to suppress this diverse and complex history, the hall of fame itself has chosen, since its first year of inductions, to celebrate music from performers beyond the boundaries of "rock" music (George-Warren 2011). This diversity does result in much discussion and disagreement, even in the selection of the location of the hall of fame.

Even once the city of Cleveland was selected for the location of the R&RHOF, it took almost a decade for construction of the hall of fame to conclude, leaving the organization temporarily homed in New York City (George-Warren 2011). After the opening of the actual hall of fame, New York City continued to be the home of induction ceremony for many years, though now it shares that honor on a biannual basis with Cleveland (Smith 2016). The Rock and Roll Hall of Fame celebrated its opening on September 1, 1995 with a concert befitting the organization. It featured current and (at that time) future inductees, such as Johnny Cash, Bob Dylan, The Pretenders, and Bruce Springsteen, as well as many others (*Plain Deale*r Staff 2010).

The architect of the hall of fame was none other than I.M. Pei, the famed architect who had redesigned the Louvre, the National Gallery in Washington, and the Boston Museum of Fine Arts. The building itself bears a striking resemblance to the pyramids that Pei designed as part of the Louvre (Muschamp 1995). This famed architect, then, turned the hall of fame into a work of art itself, rather than an homage to rock music. Still, the decision to use a famed architect who fashioned the hall of fame into a piece of modern art conveys as much about the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame's values as the Country Music Hall of Fame's architecture conveys about it. Specifically, the

architecture itself demonstrates the value that rock music places on art (see Regev 2013; Schmutz & Faupel 2010), and the choice of a famous, respected architect is indicative of the hall of fame's concerted endeavor for legitimacy. The Rock and Roll Hall of Fame itself, much like the current Country Music Hall of Fame, is a museum that features important artifacts from rock history, including artifacts from rock's musical ancestors such as R&B, country, and jazz. However, unlike the CMHOF, the R&RHOF devotes a great deal of space, namely the top two floors of the seven, to temporary exhibits that have covered topics ranging from the psychedelic era of rock, to particular bands such as The Clash,[14] and to music festivals such as The Austin City Limits. Another unique feature of the R&RHOF is a stage for performances, which points to the important role that concerts play in rock music.

Location and Difference

Both organizations share the goal of increasing the legitimacy of the genres they each represent, as well as the performers within those genres. Each hall of fame represents the desire to establish and reinforce the worth of the music genres that they were built to commemorate. In their efforts to accomplish this, both halls of fame seek to create the narratives that will best represent their values to the public (Cohen et al. 2014). Furthermore, both halls of fame have incorporated both history and research into their organizations to increase their legitimacy. However, the two organizations differ dramatically, as well. The architecture of the CMHOF reflects an inward concern with

[14] "The Only Band That Matters" according to The Clash's then-label, CBS Records (Frere-Jones, 2004).

country music's history and traditions, whereas the architecture of R&RHOF demonstrates a concern with art and being perceived as legitimate by those outside of rock. The layout and makeup of the CMHOF itself strives to develop a simple, straightforward history of country, whereas the R&RHOF embraces the complexities and diverse narratives found in rock. Both sites' concern with their history and legitimacy create similarities within the organizations, but the audiences that they both cater to and seek approval from shape and reflect their differences.

Choosing Heritage: The Induction Processes of Two Halls of Fame

Once established, both the Country Music and Rock and Roll Halls of Fame faced the choice as to *what* to consecrate. As noted in Chapter 1, rather than focus on particular works (e.g., albums or songs), both halls of fames chose consecrate the performers themselves, rather than individual works that the performers had created. In that way, they chose a consecration path similar to those in certain sports halls of fames (Allen & Parsons 2006). Like their sports counterparts, both music halls of fame focused not on all possible candidates (e.g., from the novice to the veteran) but rather those who were eligible after a certain period of time in which they could demonstrate their impact in their field.[15] And, like those sports halls of fames, these music halls of fames have decided to induct representatives of different categories within their fields. However, given the field in which it operated, the CMHOF took a much less systematic and explicit approach to induction than did the R&RHOF.

[15] It should be noted that, originally, the CMHOF did not have any time restrictions on inductions, but today performers do have a waiting period before becoming eligible for induction.

The Country Music Hall of Fame

As the Country Music Hall of Fame's museum was changing and growing with time, so was its induction process. The first few years of the induction process were characterized by the same disorganization that the museum experienced. While the CMHOF inducted three performers in its first year, it only inducted one performer in 1962, 1964, and 1965, and it failed to induct anyone in 1963. Furthermore, there is no evidence that the selection procedures and criteria were disclosed to the public. Instead, induction decisions were at the sole discretion of the Country Music Association, and its members seemingly adhered to no specific guidelines or policies regarding who they selected for induction. The time to induction for country musicians provides one example of this: during the first decade of the CMHOF's existence, the length of time performers waited to be inducted ranged from 11 to 43 years after the release of their first single (i.e., recorded song). Not only did that induction range-of-time group together mid-career and veteran musicians, the actual waiting time required was not formally stated. In addition to this casual approach to induction time, the Country Music Hall of Fame initially had no unique categories for induction. In other words, all musicians inducted were treated as representing the same broad constituency rather than a particular group within the country music field.

In the early 1970s, while its induction time requirements remained ambiguous, the hall of fame began differentiating among inductees by introduced three unique categories: inactive, active, and open. Based on actually comparing those inducted to the three categories—rather than on the basis of explicit criteria provided by the CMHOF—we can discern that the active and inactive categories were, respectively, for performers

who were still performing and for those who had retired. The open category was for individuals who had played a major role in the country music industry—recording executives, announcers, and others who helped to advance country music. The hall of fame continued to use these categories through 1982. From 1983 until 1995, individuals (or groups) could be inducted under an "open" category or a "Performer Active over 30 years ago" category.[16] It should be noted that, with the establishment of induction categories, the hall of fame tended to limit itself to one performer per category per year, but they did not always adhere this. It should also be noted that information regarding who selected the inductees and why they did so remained hidden from the public during this time frame (CMA World 2014a, 2014b; Country Music Association 2017).

The twenty-first century brought with it the beginning of increased transparency on the part of the Country Music Hall of Fame—by way of new induction categories and panels responsible for those categories. In 2005, the hall of fame introduced the following new categories for induction: "Career Achieved National Prominence Between World War II and 1975," "Career Achieved National Prominence Between 1975 and the Present," and a rotating category that every third year would honor someone for "Recording and/or Touring Musician Active Prior to 1980," "Non-Performer," or "Career Achieved National Prominence Prior to World War II." These categories replaced those from the earlier era. Then, in 2009 for the 2010 induction cycle, the hall of fame introduced three new categories for induction that would replace the categories introduced in 2005. The first of these categories is the "Modern Era" for performers

[16] There is no information regarding what, if any, categories existed between 1995 and 2005.

whose careers had achieved "national prominence" at least 20 ago, which effectively replaced the "Career Achieved National Prominence Between 1975 and the Present" category. The second category is "Veterans Era," for those performers who achieved "national prominence"[17] more than 45 years ago, and this category effectively replaced the "Career Achieved National Prominence Between World War II and 1975," as well as the subcategory, "Career Achieved National Prominence Prior to World War II." The third category remained a rotating category, and it largely stayed the same except the "Career Achieved National Prominence Prior to World War II" subcategory was replaced with a "Songwriter" category.

There are two separate anonymous panels that vote for the nominees, and both panels are made up of historians and industry professionals. The first panel oversees the Modern Era and Rotating categories, and the second panel oversees the Veterans Era (CMA World 2014b), which indicates that the CMHOF board may believe that selecting inductees for the Veterans Era requires unique knowledge of the field. The voting panel is instructed to evaluate the candidates using nine different criteria. These different criteria can be placed into three major groups. "Basic Standard" and "Individual Candidacy" simply assess whether or not a candidate is eligible beyond the time constraints. The second grouping of criteria assesses the musical excellence and impact nominees have had, and includes the following criteria, "Scope of Activity," "Span of Influence," "Influence on Others," and "Quantity vs. Quality." Finally, the categories "Devotion to Others," "Professional Conduction and Image," and "Personal Morals and

[17] This is an ambiguous criterion. For the purpose of this project, I am defining this as the release of the performer's first record.

Behavior" all assess the personal and professional reputation of the nominee (CMA World 2014a).[18] While these panels are now publicly acknowledged, as well as are their selection criteria, note that the panel members themselves remain unknown to the public.

The history (and lack thereof) of the categories for induction into the Country Music Hall of Fame is significant for several reasons. The categories themselves, and the periods of time in which there were no categories, reveals a great deal about both CMHOF, as well as the Country Music Association that created it and continues to control the selection process for inductees. For the first ten years of the hall's existence, there were no categories for induction—which, along with the fact that no one was selected for induction in 1963, indicates that the process was unsystematic. The ability of the CMA to operate without more explicit guidelines or procedures may be partially indicative of the time in which the CMHOF was established, but it is also indicative of the high level of consensus within the country music community because they were able to continue for a decade without the public use of categories or criteria for induction. In a field based on traditionalism, as noted before, pressures toward systematization were apparently not that great. Even when the hall of fame established categories for induction in the early 1970s, it provided very little constraint to the choices made by the CMA. It was not until 2005, more than forty years after the establishment of the CMHOF, that induction categories with clear criteria were finally introduced. While the new categories may be indicative of changes within the field of country music, it may also be due to

[18] The CMA website has currently removed all information regarding the details of the categories, as well as the criteria used to evaluate the performers. These data are only currently available using the Internet archiving service web.archive.org, which archives webpage information. This website is most useful if the user has the original web address.

Weberian-described pressures to make everything more systematic and rational, showing the challenges that traditionalism faces in contemporary times (Espeland & Sauder 2007).

The history of the categories also demonstrates one of the central characteristics of the CMHOF, which is its great lack of transparency. During the 1960s, the public would have been provided with absolutely no information regarding who was eligible or a likely candidate for induction. During this time, performers who had been in the country music industry for as few as 11 years were being selected for this honor. The hall of fame offered very little additional transparency in the 1970s, and it was able to continue on this same course for decades. Even during the past decade, when it began to develop more specific criteria for induction, or at least inform the public of the criteria they used, it has continued to keep many of the inner workings private. One aspect of this insularity is that the CMHOF never discloses which performers were nominated for induction, rather it only announces the winners. A second aspect of this insularity is that it no longer discloses the criteria that the hall uses for selecting inductees. For a brief period of time, 2014-2015, the hall of fame disclosed the criteria it was using when selecting performers for induction into the hall of fame, but it no longer provides access to that information.[19] The third aspect of this insularity is epitomized by the remaining information that the hall of fame provides regarding the selection process in which it states, "Election to the Country Music Hall of Fame is solely the prerogative of the CMA" (Country Music Hall of Fame 2017). This statement reflects that neither transparency nor inclusion is prioritized in the hall of fame induction process.

[19] Again, this information was procured in 2014 and is now only accessible using web.archive.org.

The Rock and Roll Hall of Fame

Despite not having a home when first established, it is clear that the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame was hard at work in those first three years structuring the organization, as well as conceptualizing the categories and criteria for eligibility and induction. Rather than employ vague eligibility requirements and a shifting array of inductee categories—as the Country Music Hall of Fame had initially done—the Rock and Rock Hall of Fame dealt with both from the outset. In particular, the hall of fame introduced the following categories for induction into the hall of fame: "Performer," "Early Influences," and "Non-Performer." The R&RHOF likewise departed from the CMHOF in stipulating from its outset a systematic way of identifying inductees. There is a voting panel of over 900 music historians and industry professionals who cast their ballot for potential new inductees in these three categories. The "Performer" category arguably produces the most recognizable inductees, and it tends to be the focus of news coverage. Eligibility for that first category begins 25 years after the release of a performer's first record. The criteria used for evaluating inductees include "unquestionable musical excellence and talent," and inductees are expected to "have had a significant impact on the development, evolution and preservation of rock and roll." "Early Influences" are those performers who "pre-date the birth of rock & roll, but have had a profound impact on music's evolution and its iconic artists." Eligibility is thus built into the very nature of the category, requiring musicians of advanced age. The "Non-Performer category" seeks to honor those in the music industry—including musicians, songwriters and producers—who have "changed the course of music history" (Rock and Roll Hall of Fame 2014). Here, eligibility is less clear cut in terms of years, but the intent of the category suggests that

the inductee will be a veteran rather than a novice. While the standards for all three categories appear stringent, they are also, like many aspects of cultural evaluation, highly subjective. As a whole, then, this hall of fame seeks to induct those individuals who embody musical excellence and who have had an impact on the history of rock music.

Because of the initial three years that the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame hall dedicated to developing the guidelines and criteria for induction into the hall of fame, only two changes have occurred in the past thirty years of the R&RHOF's existence. Namely, the "Non-Performers" category was renamed the "Ahmet Ertegun Award for Lifetime Achievement" in 2008, honoring the late founder of the hall of fame (George-Warren 2011), and a new "Sidemen" category was introduced in 2000, which was subsequently renamed the "Award for Music Excellence" in 2010. Otherwise, the planning that went into the hall of fame during its early years has resulted in a remarkably stable operation with regards to its induction process—using the same criteria over the years and holding induction ceremonies in each of those years. The R&RHOF induction process tends to result in the addition of approximately six to twelve inductees per year, with the number of inductees per category varying from year to year. Not only has the R&RHOF largely maintained the same categories and criteria for eligibility and induction since the beginning, it has also disclosed this information to the public—announcing the nominees to the hall of fame every year, thus providing the public with information regarding who the board values enough to submit to the voting panel. Finally, adding to its openness, the hall of fame introduced fan voting in 2012 for the 2013 inductions. In this process, fans are allowed to vote for their favorite nominees, and the five nominees with the most votes count as one ballot out of the approximate 900-person body of voters

(Yarborough 2013).[20] Compared to the Country Music Hall of Fame, the RRHOF's operation has been marked by transparency rather than a dearth of it.

Choosing: Convergence and Difference

During the 25 years between the induction of the first class of the CMHOF and the induction of the first class of the R&RHOF, the push towards systemization had increased for the Country Music Hall of Fame, at least as evidence by its approach to induction (Espeland & Sauder 2007). Subsequently, there are now many similarities between the current-day categories and election procedures for both the CMHOF and the R&RHOF. The voting panels of each hall of fame include both historians with musical expertise and professionals from within the music industry. The makeup of these voting panels suggests that both halls of fame seek credibility position within the country and rock music fields. Both halls of fame now have a variety of categories for induction—categories addressing more contemporary performers, those performers who were integral to the development of the genre, sidemen or session musicians, as well as those non-performers who played pivotal roles. Finally, both halls of fame seek to induct those who have exemplified musical excellence and who have left an indelible mark on the respective genres. These similarities may be the result of organizational isomorphism (DiMaggio & Powell 1983), with the CMHOF emulating the operation of the younger, R&RHOF, (Espeland & Sauder 2007). What is striking, however, is that the R&RHOF did *not* emulate its counterpart, despite their similar mission and endeavors. That would

[20] Rush was the first band to win the fan vote, and was subsequently inducted after waiting for 15 years (Yarborough, 2013).

have been difficult for a hall of fame grappling with the low solidarity found in the field of rock music.

Despite the converging induction processes for the two halls of fame, several differences still remain. One major difference is the lack of transparency found in the CMHOF's induction process, which sets it apart from how the R&RHOF operates. As previously mentioned, because the country music field is characterized by a relatively high level of solidarity, the field can rely upon "restricted codes"—with shared understandings and assumptions meaning that there is little need for extensive explanation of induction procedures and choices (Bergesen 1979, 1984). As a result, country music tends to be self-affirming, thereby tending to avoid the discord and debate that would result if the induction choices made by the CMA were questioned. The R&RHOF has been far more open and transparent in its selection processes than the CMHOF. This transparency is likely an attempt to stave off controversy, not just because there is such a wide range of perspectives in rock music, but also because, given that there are so many different groups represented in rock music, disagreement is difficult to avoid (see below). A second major difference concerns the extensiveness of the criteria used to evaluate the nominees that the CMA put forward for induction. While the criteria were only made public for a few years, rather than the decades over which the R&RHOF's criteria have been available, the criteria for CHMOF induction went much further into detail than did those of the R&RHOF. This supports the argument that external pressures may have been the cause for the CMHOF's increased transparency and systemization in its induction process: once made public, its criteria went to great lengths to make explicit what once was implicit in the induction process. The types of criteria

(not just the number) by which the CMHOF judges performers for induction are also substantially different from the types of criteria employed by the R&RHOF. That difference reflects the high solidary, traditional aspect of country music (Buckley1979) versus the low solidary and rebellious aspects of rock (Gillett 2011). The criteria that the CMHOF uses to judge a nominee includes personal reputation, morals, and character. Collectively, then, country music values performers who are, at their core, good members of the community who have led clean lives, righted their wrongs, and value God and country above all else. On the other hand, rock performers, particularly during the earlier decades, were expected to lead lives of excess, be unapologetic, and buck authority at every turn. The few performers who are member of both halls of fame have sometimes managed to embody both sets of ideals. For example, Johnny Cash was an alcoholic, addicted to drugs, and cheated on his wife whom he then divorced, but then he found God, gave up drugs and alcohol, and married Joan Carter, to whom he was devoted for the rest of his life (Hilburn 2014).

Embodying Heritage: Performer Characteristics and Two Halls of Fame

The two halls of fame have a similar goal: to identify and celebrate those performers who best exemplify a musical genre. Despite that shared mission, however, both have taken different approaches in terms of where to locate the hall itself and how to induct performers into that hall. Those different approaches, I have argued, stem from the nature of the musical field in which each hall of fame operates: whereas the country music field is marked by high solidarity that sharp genre boundaries and traditionalism enable, the rock music field is marked by low solidarity that results from fuzzy genre

boundaries and rebellion. Now, I argue that those field differences likewise have a major impact on the type of people who are inducted into each hall of fame. This section provides a comparison of the characteristics of performers inducted into each hall of fame. Many of the differences in the fields of country and rock music are mirrored in the characteristics of the inductees into the halls of fame This section examines performer differences between the two halls of fame within the context of their respective fields, seeing what type of people "embody" heritage in those fields.

Tables 2-A and 2-B provide descriptive statistics on the characteristics of performers found in each hall. The data in the tables include the gender and racial composition of the two halls of fame. These data also include whether the inductees were soloists or groups, and the data include genres of the performers according to the classifications offered on the music website AllMusic.com.[21] Finally, the data in the tables contain information on the proportion of performers who had gained markers of critical, professional, and popular legitimacy. All of this information presages the multivariate analysis that will occur in subsequent chapters, where I examine how such characteristics shape the timing to induction in both halls, as well as the likelihood of induction in the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame. Here, the focus is comparing the characteristics found in both halls.

[TABLES 2-A AND 2-B ABOUT HERE]

[21] AllMusic.com provides a wide range of information on performers, including biographies, discographies, and the genres to which they contribute.

Gender and Hall of Fame Induction

The performer characteristic for which the two halls of fame are most similar is gender, particularly the underrepresentation of women. The Country Music Hall of Fame inductees are 14 percent female, whereas the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame is 10.7 percent female—but that still results in the proportion of women in the CMHOF being 30 percent higher than the R&RHOF. On the one hand, the fact that there are so few women in the halls of fame is unsurprising based on previous research regarding the effects of gender on cultural consecration (Braden 2009; Schmutz & Faupel 2010). On the other hand, the fact that, proportionally, the CMHOF is better representing women than the R&RHOF is unexpected. Country music is often considered more conservative and traditional when compared to the "revolutionary" field of rock music (Buckley 1979; McCusker & Pecknold 2004; Wanzenried & Woody,1979). Furthermore, while it took the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame one year to induct its first female solo performer, Aretha Franklin, it took the Country Music Hall of Fame twelve years to induct its own female solo performer, Patsy Cline. However, for many years a shift has been occurring in country music in which women are claiming their independence and asserting their value (Bufwack & Oermann 2003), which may help to explain the small difference in gender representation in the two music halls of fame. The R&RHOF does do comparatively well with one aspect of gender, the relative share of its musical groups that are comprised of men and women (i.e., mixed gender groups). While only 1.2 percent of the CMHOF includes a mixed gender group—namely The Carter Family[22]—6.2 percent of the

[22] The Carter Family was inducted into the Country Music Hall of Fame nine years after the first induction ceremony. This family included husband and wife, A.P. Carter and Sara Dougherty Carter, as well as Sara's cousin Maybelle Addington Carter. Maybelle

R&RHOF inductees are comprised by mixed-gender groups (e.g., Blondie, Joan Jett & The Blackhearts).[23] Yet, some circumspection is required when comparing these percentages: they may indicate that in the R&RHOF, when compared to the CMHOF, there is an increased need for women to be associated with men in order for them to gain entrance into the hall.

Race and Hall of Fame Induction

Ultimately, the characteristics of the inductees of the two halls of fame are dramatically different. Beyond the relative similarities of gender composition of the two halls of fame, the composition of the two halls of fame shares little else in common. Consider, for example, the racial composition of inductees. Both whites and blacks are well represented in the R&RHOF, but there are few groups that consist of members from other racial backgrounds or are from more than one racial background. The CMHOF, on the other hand, is overwhelmingly white. Specifically, 36.2 percent of the inductees in the R&RHOF are black, but only 2.3 percent of the performers in the CMHOF are black, namely DeFord Bailey and Charley Pride.

The racial composition of inductees offers one of the starkest differences between the two halls of fame, and it offers insights into the two fields of music. As mentioned in the introduction, country music arose when folk music was divided along racial lines by music executives (Roy 2004). The scarcity of black performers in the CMHOF is arguably an artifact of this division, but the fact that this division persists a hundred years

---

married A.P. Carter's brother Ezra, thus becoming a Carter herself. It also included the previously mentioned, June Carter—who would later marry Johnny Cash.

[23] Some of this difference is likely due to the scarcity of groups or bands in the CMHOF.

later is indicative of the values found within the field country music. Traditionally, country music has been associated with white working class America (Malone 2006). The lyrics, then, have often focused on the experiences and concerns of this social group—such as their romantic relationships, their working class jobs, the South, and, often, nostalgia for better days (McLaurin & Peterson 1992). Unfortunately, these latter issues were sometimes tied to an undercurrent of racism (Lund 1972) in which the protagonists in country songs and the listeners long for more "innocent" days before American whites were "besieged" by political and cultural change (Mann 2008).

With only two performers being African American out of almost a hundred inductees, there is an opportunity to take a closer look at the lives and career of DeFord Bailey and Charley Pride to gain insights into the life of a black performer in country music. Their overall underrepresentation in country music is notable and demonstrates the racial lines that were drawn over a hundred years ago when folk music diverged into "race records" and country music. The histories of these two men also provide insights into the values of country music and its hall of fame. DeFord Bailey was a harmonica, guitar, and banjo player from Smith County, Tennessee. He began his career in music when he was discovered by Humphry Bare in 1926, one of pioneers of the Grand Ole Opry.[24] Bailey became one of the first performers introduced on the Grand Ole Opry, and he was a regular performer there, alongside Bill Monroe, Uncle David Macon, and Roy Acuff—all of whom would go onto to be members of the CMHOF (Morton 1993).

[24] The Grand Ole Opry is one of the oldest and most prestigious places for country musicians to perform (Wolfe 2015). The fact that country music has such a central venue is yet another sign of country music's solidarity— rock has no counterpart in terms of a singular venue.

However, Bailey's wait of 78 years since the release of his first record for induction was almost as long as the wait of the other three performers *combined*—24, 36, and 24 years, respectively. Charley Pride's waiting time was far shorter than DeFord Bailey's, as he was inducted only 34 years after releasing his first record. Pride began his music career in the 1960s, and he experienced a great deal of popularity and success. He was the first African American to perform on the Grand Ole Opry since Bailey. When asked about his experiences as an African American in the field of country music, Pride tends to frame his experiences positively and as a novelty (Pride & Henderson 1994). African Americans in country music had often portrayed their successes as "peculiar accidents," so as to not threaten the white-male norm in country music (Pecknold & McCusker 2016). The scarcity of African Americans in the CMHOF and the experiences of Bailey and Pride strongly suggest that the path to success as an African American performer is not an easy one.

In contrast to the CMHOF, black performers make up over a third of the R&RHOF. As with country music, the nature of the early days of rock music helps us to understand why black performers make up such a large proportion of the Rock & Roll Hall of Fame. When folk music was split along racial lines, it gave rise not only to country but also to rhythm and blues (Roy 2004). Many years later when rock music arose, it was partially influenced by country music, but rhythm and blues (today known as R&B) played an even larger role in the sound and development of rock music (Dowd 2003; Gillett 2011). Black performers, then, who dominated rhythm and blues would become the forefathers of rock music. Rhythm and blues, as well as another one of its

musical progeny, rap, continues to be predominantly African American in terms of performers, and together these two genres make up almost 30 percent of the R&RHOF.

Genre and Induction

The genre composition of each hall of fame also provides important insights into the unique nature of both country and rock music. The CMHOF is made up almost entirely, 97.7 percent, of country music performers, with the only two non-country performers being Elvis Presley and The Everly Brothers—both of whom began their careers as country performers and moved into pop rock during the genre's early years. This homogeneity of music genres indicates nearly impermeable boundaries between country music and other genres. Thus, country music is characterized by restricted codes that promote the consensus that has been evident in so many areas of the CMHOF.

On the other hand, the performers in Rock and Roll Hall of Fame come from eight different genres of music, with Pop Rock,[25] R&B, Rap, and Country being the most popular genres. This diversity in the number and types of genres represented indicates that the board and voting panel of the R&RHOF do not have the same concerns with maintaining strict boundaries that can be seen in the CMHOF. The most popular genre in the R&RHOF is Pop Rock, making up 63.1 percent of the performers, but this leaves substantial room for performers from other genres. The second most popular genre is R&B, and it represents 27.0 percent of performers. The prevalence of R&B in the R&RHOF is partially the result of the heritage of rock music, as the first and second

[25] Allmusic.com does not have distinct categories for pop and rock. Regev (2013) has written extensively on the use of this designator for music, lending support for the use of this category in this dissertation.

induction classes included James Brown, Ray Charles, Sam Cooke, as well as other notable figures from R&B. However, R&B performers continue to be inducted into the hall of fame almost every year. Furthermore, rap, which also grew out of from R&B, is also represented in the R&RHOF. While the numbers of rap performers in the hall of fame are small, they are constricted by the requirement that a performer's first record must have been released at least 25 years ago to be considered eligible for induction. Although the genre dates back to the 1970s, it did not gain mainstream popularity until the late 1980s to early 1990s (Rose 1994). Therefore, it has only been in recent years that rap performers have become eligible, and they will likely grow in numbers in the future.[26]

Legitimacy and Induction

Performers in the two halls of fame also differ with regards to types and amount of professional, critical, and popular legitimacy that have been bestowed upon them over the years. Professional legitimacy plays a central role in cultural consecration, and award shows are one major way in which music performers are able to grant this type of legitimacy to one another (Schmutz & Faupel 2010). Country music has not one but two principle award shows, the Country Music Association Awards (CMA) and the Academy of Country Music Awards (ACM). Groups with restricted codes like country music tend be both self-affirming, and therefore it is unsurprising that country music would have two major occasions during which they celebrate the music and performers in their field. Rock music has many award shows, but the Grammy's stand alone as the sole major

[26] My dataset ends with performers who were eligible for the 2015 inductions. However, since then, both 2016 and 2017 inductions have included rap performers—namely N.W.A. and Tupac Shakur.

awards show in popular music (Schmutz 2005; Schmutz & Faupel 2010). The Grammys, much like the R&RHOF, cover many different genres of music, but the focus tends to fall on "popular" music of different genres, making the Grammys an appropriate measure. Within each hall of fame, the proportion of performers who have received one of these awards differs significantly.[27] Within the CMHOF performers are more likely to have received Album of the Year awards than performers in the R&RHOF. Fourteen percent of the performers in the CMHOF have received CMA Album awards, and 9.3 percent of the performers have received ACM Album awards. In the R&RHOF, only 7.2 percent have won Grammy Album awards. Performers in the CMHOF are also more than twice as likely as performers in the R&RHOF to have won Song/Record Awards, with 10.5 percent of the performers winning CMA and ACM awards but only 4.1 percent winning a Grammy Award. While this may be evidence that the voting panel of the CMHOF is more concerned with professional legitimacy than the voting panel of the R&RHOF, it may simply be the result of country music being a smaller field while rock music is far more expansive, which would simply make the odds of any performer winning an award better in country music.

Critical legitimacy has also been shown to play an important role in cultural consecration, and ratings by music critics have previously been used to capture this element of legitimacy (Schmutz 2005; Schmutz & Faupel 2010). In previous research on rock music, both the year-end critics' poll by the *Village Voice* list and *The New Rolling*

[27] There is no equivalent in the CMA or ACM Awards to the Grammy's Hall of Fame award, and the Grammy's does not have an "Entertainer of the Year" award featured in the CMA and ACM Awards. Therefore, I will only be comparing the Album of the Year Awards and the Song/Record of the Year awards.

Stone Record Guide 5-star certifications have been used to determine the album, and therefore the performers, who have received critical legitimacy (Schmutz 2005; Schmutz & Faupel 2010). Because these have previously proven to be strong measures in the past, they are used here, as well, to measure critical legitimacy in the R&RHOF. However, there are no comparable lists in the field of country music. Critics have published reviews of country music over the years, but unlike the lists in rock music, the end-of-the-year lists have always been short-lived. The best measurement of critical legitimacy in country music, then, is membership in the Grand Ole Opry (see footnote 11), and while its membership differs significantly from critics' lists in terms of operation (one is annually done, the other is not), the Grand Ole Opry plays a major role in the country music. Subsequently, it is not surprising that while 30.3 percent of the performers in the R&RHOF have had an album on the *Village Voice* poll—and 27.2 percent have had a 5-star album according to *The New Rolling Stone Record Guide*—61.6 percent of the country performers have been members of the Grand Ole Opry. Because the Grand Ole Opry does differ from the critics' lists, direct comparisons between the two are likely inappropriate; however, other insights can be gleaned. It is clear that membership in the Grand Ole Opry is very common in the CMHOF, which is compelling as membership in the Grand Ole Opry is limited and highly selective. Furthermore, the fact that there are no critics' lists in country music comparable to those found in rock offers important insights regarding the nature of country music. Specifically, the absence of critics' polls is likely the result of the high levels of consensus found in country music, as well as the fact that country music tends to be affirming rather than critical.

Popular legitimacy is granted by the general public. As with the other measures of cultural legitimacy, popular legitimacy has been shown to play a role in cultural consecration in music (Schmutz 2005; Schmutz & Faupel 2010). Out of the three forms of cultural legitimacy, the measures of popular legitimacy are most similar in the two halls of fame. Performers in both halls may (and likely) have Recording Industry Association of America (RIAA) Platinum (1,000,000 units sold) and Gold (500,000 units sold) certified albums, and thus there are measurements for both of these certifications. There is also information on the performers' *Billboard* performance, but the data here differ, again, because of the differences between the two fields. For the CMHOF, I collected data on the Country *Billboard* #1 Album charts, which focus on country performers much like the hall of fame.[28] For the R&RHOF, I collected data on the general *Billboard* #1 Album chart rather than the "rock" chart because this chart, much like the R&RHOF, covers many different genres of "popular" music, making it an appropriate measure. Thirty-eight (38.4) percent of the performers in the CMHOF have had a #1 Album on the Country *Billboard* Charts, and 33.8 percent of the performers in the in the R&RHOF have had a #1 Album on the general *Billboard* charts. The proportion of performers that have had #1 Albums on the respective charts is one of the areas of greatest similarities between the two halls of fame. The halls of fame differ once again then, though, when examining the proportion of performers who have had RIAA albums. In the CMHOF, 37.2 and 25.7 percent of performers have had Gold or Platinum albums, respectively, but in the R&RHOF, 54.4 and 51.3 percent of performers have had

[28] *Billboard* charts address the relative performance of albums and songs on a week-by-week basis. Hence, albums that are #1 on the charts are those that are best-selling for that week, (Dowd 2004).

Gold or Platinum albums, respectively. Therefore, performers in the R&RHOF are far more likely to have had an RIAA certified album, which indicates that performers in the R&RHOF have greater commercial success than do performers in the CMHOF. While this may indicate that the R&RHOF is simply more concerned with album sales, it may also be the result of the R&RHOF covering a larger variety of music and, therefore, a larger audience of consumers.

Soloists, Groups and Induction

Another difference between the two halls of fame that yields important insights about the nature of each field is the fact that the CMHOF is predominantly filled with soloists, while less than half of the R&RHOF is made up of soloists. Only 10.5 percent of the performers who have been inducted into the CMHOF are not soloists, but 54 percent of the performers who have been inducted into the R&RHOF are groups.[29] For country music, this proliferation of solo performers in the hall of is an artifact of the country field itself (Tichi 1994). Over country music's history, solo performers have been common. In order to record albums and tour to promote the albums, the solo performers (or their manager or record label) will hire songwriters, session musicians, as well as touring musicians to meet all of the needs that a band would often fulfill (de Laat 2015). In rock music, this is far less common, and that is due to the values of the genre. Since rock's

[29] In 2012, the R&RHOF inducted six groups associated with "solo" performers that had previously been inducted (such as Bill Haley's Comets). This was viewed as remedying an error made in those first two years because the groups were an integral part of those "soloists" music and should have been inducted at the same time as those performers. Because of this fact, and the fact that the groups did not independently release any music, in my dataset they have, essentially, been reunited with their lead soloists.

early history, it has worked in earnest to be seen as more than easy entertainment and to be seen, instead, as art (Regev 1994). A central component of this is being that rock performers should be largely responsible for all aspects of the creative process, including writing the songs, playing the musical instruments, and even on occasion producing the music recording process. In doing so, rock performers can isolate themselves from outside influences and have complete ownership over the product that they have created (Regev 2013). To be able to accomplish all these different facets of creating a rock album and touring, a band becomes crucial because it is difficult, though not impossible, for one person to independently accomplish these different aspects of the creative process.[30] Subsequently, more than half of the R&RHOF is currently made up of groups of more than two performers.

Consensus vs. Controversy in the Two Halls of Fame

The instability in induction categories and low levels of transparency in the induction process found in the Country Music Hall of Fame has not resulted in more controversies for that hall than the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame has endured. Instead, that instability and that lack of transparency were possible because of the far higher levels of consensus in both country music, in general, and the CMHOF, in particular. As previously discussed, like country music as a whole, the CMHOF is characterized by very strict boundaries. For example, this hall of fame is almost entirely filled with

[30] Those solo performers in rock music that are capable of executing the many different dimensions of the creative process, such as Prince and Paul Simon, tend to be revered.

"country"[31] music performers.[32] Without this high level of consensus in country music, the frequent changes and low levels of transparency found in the CMHOF would have likely led to debates, controversy, and the public questioning the choices made by the hall of fame. Instead, for over 50 years the hall of fame has been able to make their decisions free from public dissent. The solidarity and traditionalism of country music have benefitted those at the CMHOF who decide on which performers to induct.

The Rock and Roll Hall of Fame, which has been open and transparent about its induction process, has been met repeatedly with public outcry and controversies. Rock music is the product of different genres, and over the decades it has continued to evolve and incorporate a range of musical and cultural influences. Because of the history and diverse influences that can be found in rock music, the boundaries are often blurry. Subsequently, there are frequent debates regarding both what qualifies as rock music as well as who should be honored as those great performers who have left an indelible impact on the history of rock music. Because of this, while the hall of fame is transparent in their induction process, there are subjective decisions being made both by the board that nominates performers, as well as by the body of electors that selects the new class of inductees from the nominees. The fan vote was likely introduced due, in part, to the repeated public outcry from the fans, who argued that the hall of fame intentionally overlooked performers from certain genres while giving special attention to the performers of other genres. One example of this is that journalists, as well as many fans, have argued that that the hall of fame overlooks progressive rock bands (Boehm 2009).

---

[31] This designation of "country" is one of the genre categories found on AllMusic.com.
[32] Elvis Presley and The Everly Brothers are the only two inductees in the hall of fame listed as "Pop Rock," but both inductees began their careers as country music performers.

The fan vote is only equivalent to one ballot from the body of over 900 electors, but it allows the fans to draw attention to bands that they feel are being overlooked. The hall of fame has also faced several controversies over the past several years. It is reported that the managers and record labels of performers that have been nominated for induction will campaign in order to increase the likelihood of induction for those musicians that they represent. They do this because inductees experience a spike in interest and record sales, something that is often much-needed among these performers who often experienced the height of their popularity decades ago (Morrissey 2011). Also, there have been two different types of vote controversies, one that occurred in 2007, while the other has occurred several times. The 2007 controversy occurred when Grand Master Flash and the Furious Five were inducted into the hall of fame rather than The Dave Clark Five. It was alleged that Jann Werner ignored several votes for The Dave Clark Five because he wanted a rap performer finally to be inducted. As for the second type of controversy, there have also been bands who have refused to attend the induction ceremony, such as the Sex Pistols, for a number of reasons—including their view that the hall of fame is too commercial, their disapproval of the board and voting panel structure, or their displeasure with the fact that hall of fame selects which incarnation of the band to induct (Reilly 2014). There have been many disagreements surrounding the hall of fame, and in most cases, the problems arise due to the push and pull of the many different constituencies who have an interest in those who are inducted into the hall of fame. In a sense, then, the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame faces such high levels of discord partially as a result of the fact it has chosen to celebrate and embrace the diverse history and present of rock music, rather than try to erect and enforce boundaries.

Conclusion

Both the CMHOF and the R&RHOF were established to secure and elevate their genre's position in culture by celebrating their respective histories, and because of this shared goal they share some core features. However, despite rock having shared roots with country music in folk music (Roy 2002, 2004), the two genres today are profoundly different, and those differences influence each hall of fame. Country music is characterized by distinct boundaries, and the restricted codes that have resulted from this insular community have provided the board of the CMHOF with the latitude to make decisions without the fear of reprisals from the outside, influencing everything from the selection of Nashville as the home of the hall of fame to the induction process itself. The strict boundaries in country music have influenced the body of performers who have been inducted, as well—with few "non-country" musicians included in the CHMOF. In contrast, rock music is characterized by blurry boundaries and diverse pool of musicians, and as a result there, is low consensus. From the moment that the R&RHOF had to choose a city to become the home to the hall of fame, there has been disagreement, which is a direct result of the many influences that are found in rock music. Since that time, despite efforts to be open and inclusive, the R&RFHOF has been met with a steady stream of discord regarding the choices it has made. However, the efforts to be open and inclusive have paid dividends through the racial and genre diversity of the performers it celebrates by way of induction.[33] In the following chapters, I will examine the performers of each hall of fame more closely given the insights gained from this analysis.

[33] The gender composition, though, is still notably homogeneous.

REFERENCES

Allen, Michael and Nicholas E. Parsons. 2006. "The Institutionalization of Fame: Achievement, Recognition, and Cultural Consecration in Baseball." *American Sociological Review* 71 (5): 808-825.

Becker, Howard S. *Art Worlds*. 2008. Twenty-fifth anniversary edition. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Becker, Howard and Alain Pessin. 2006. "A Dialogue on the Ideas of 'World' and 'Field.' *Sociological Forum* 21: 275-286.

Bennett, Andy. 2009. "'Heritage Rock': Rock Music, Representation and Heritage Discourse." *Poetics* 37 (5–6): 474–489.

Bergesen, Albert. 1979. "Spirituals, Jazz, Blues, and Soul Music: The Role of Elaborated and Restricted Codes." Pages 333-350 in *The Religious Dimension: New Directions in Quantitative Research,* edited by Robert Wuthnow. New York: Academic Press.

Bergesen, Albert. 1984. "The Semantic Equation: A Theory of the Social Origins of Art Styles." *Sociological Theory* 2: 187–221.

Boehm, Mike. 2009. "Getting Progressive: The Rock Hall Votes in Genesis. Is Yes or Procol Harum Next? *[Updated]" *Los Angeles Times* December 29. http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/music_blog/2009/12/getting-progressive-the-rock-hall-voted-in-genesis-whos-still-missing.html. Retrieved June 11, 2017.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1983. "The Field of Cultural Production, or: The Economic World Reversed." *Poetics* 12 (4): 311–56.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Braden, Laura E. 2009. "From the Armory to Academia: Careers and Reputations of Early Modern Artists in the United States." *Poetics* 37 (5–6): 439–455.

Buckley, John. 1979. "Country Music and American Values." *Popular Music and Society* 6 (4): 293–301.

Bufwack, Mary A. and Robert K. Oermann. 2003. *Finding Her Voice: Women in Country Music, 1800-2000*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press & Country Music Foundation Press.

CMA World. 2014a. “Candidate Criteria.” *CMA World* April 15. https://web.archive.org/web/20140415224056/http://www.cmaworld.com/initiatives/hall-of-fame/candidate-criteria/. Retrieved June 11, 2017.

CMA World. 2014b. “Categories.” *CMA World* April 15. https://web.archive.org/web/20140415224037/http://www.cmaworld.com/initiatives/hall-of-fame/categories/. Retrieved June 11, 2017.

Cohen, Sara, Robert Knifton, Marion Leonard and Les Roberts, editors. 2014. *Sites of Popular Music Heritage: Memories, Histories, Places*. London: Routledge.

Cornfield, Daniel. 2015. *Beyond the Beat: Musicians Building Community in Nashville*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Country Music Hall of Fame. 2014. “The Road to the Country Music Hall of Fame.” http://countrymusichalloffame.org/contentpages/the-road-to-the-country-music-hall-of-fame. Retrieved June 13, 2017.

Country Music Hall of Fame. 2017. “Country Music Hall of Fame Election Process.” http://countrymusichalloffame.org/ContentPages/country-music-hall-of-fame-election-process. Retrieved January 27, 1027.

De Laat, Kim. 2015. “‘Write a Word, Get a Third:’ Managing Conflict and Rewards in Professional Songwriting Teams.” *Work and Occupations* 42 (2): 225–256.

DiMaggio, Paul. 1991. “Cultural Entrepreneurship in Nineteenth-Century Boston: The Creation of an Organizational Base for High Culture in America.” Pages 374-397 in *Rethinking Popular Culture,* edited by Chandra Mukerji and Michael Schudson. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

DiMaggio, Paul J. and Walter W. Powell. 1983. “The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields.” *American Sociological Review* 48 (2): 147–160.

Dowd, Timothy J. 2000. “Musical Diversity and the US Mainstream Recording Market, 1955-1990. ” *Rassegna Italiana di Sociologia* 41 (2): 223-263.

Dowd, Timothy J. 2003. “Structural Power and the Construction of Markets: The Case of Rhythm and Blues.” *Comparative Social Research* 21: 147–201.

Dowd, Timothy J. 2004. “Concentration and Diversity Revisited: Production Logics and the US Mainstream Recording Market, 1940 to 1990.” *Social Forces* 82 (4): 1411-1455.

Dowd, Timothy J. 2011. "Production and Producers of Life Styles: Fields of Classical and Popular Music in the United States." *Kölner Zeitschrift fur Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* Sonderheft 51: 113- 138.

Dowd, Timothy J., Trent Ryan and Yun Tai. 2016. "Talk of Heritage: Critical Benchmarks and DIY Preservationism in Progressive Rock." *Popular Music & Society* 39: 97-125.

Ennis, Phillip. 1992. *The Seventh Stream: The Emergence of Rocknroll in American Popular Music.* Hanover, NH: Wesleyan University Press.

Escott, Colin and Martin Hawkins. 1992. *Good Rockin' Tonight: Sun Records and the Birth of Rock 'N' Roll.* First paperback edition. New York: St. Martin's Griffin.

Espeland, Wendy N. and Michael M. Sauder. 2007. "Rankings and Reactivity: How Public Measures Recreate Social Worlds." *American Journal of Sociology*, *113*(1), 1–40.

Fox, Aaron A. 2004. *Real Country: Music and Language in Working-Class Culture*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Florida, Richard and Scott Jackson. 2010. "Sonic City: The Evolving Economic Geography of the Music Industry." *Journal of Planning Education and Researc*h 29: 310-321.

Frere-Jones, Sasha. 2004. "1979: The Year Punk Died and was Reborn." *The New Yorker* November 1. http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2004/11/01/1979. Retrieved June 10, 2017.

George-Warren, Holly. 2011. *The Rock and Roll Hall of Fame: The First 25 Years*. New York: Harper Design.

Gillett, Charlie. 2011. *The Sound of the City: The Rise of Rock & Roll*. Third revised edition. London: Souvenir Press.

Hilburn, Robert. 2014. *Johnny Cash: The Life*. Reprint edition. New York: Back Bay Books.

Holt, Fabian. 2007. *Genre in Popular Music*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lena, Jennifer C. and Richard A. Peterson. 2008. "Classification as Culture: Types and Trajectories of Music Genres." *American Sociological Review* 73 (5): 697–718.

Long Lingo, Elizabeth and Siobhan O'Mahoney. 2010. "Nexus Work: Brokerage on Creative Projects." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 55: 47-81.

Lund, Jens. 1972. “Fundamentalism, Racism, and Political Reaction in Country Music.” Pages 79-91 in *The Sounds of Social Change*, edited by R. Serge Denisoff and Richard A. Peterson. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Malone, Bill C. 2006. *Don’t Get above Your Raisin’: Country Music and the Southern Working Class*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Mann, Geoff. 2008. “Why Does Country Music Sound White? Race and the Voice of Nostalgia.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 31 (1): 73–100.

Manuel, Jeffrey T. 2008. “The Sound of the Plain White Folk? Creating Country Music’s ‘Social Origins.’” *Popular Music and Society* (4): 417–431.

McCall, Michael. 2012. *Country Music Hall of Fame and Museum, Nashville*. Nashville, TN.: Country Music Foundation.

McCusker, Kristina M. and Diane Pecknold, editors. 2004. *A Boy Named Sue: Gender and Country Music*. Jackson, MI: University Press of Mississippi.

McLaurin, Melton A. and Richard A. Peterson. 1992. *You Wrote My Life: Lyrical Themes in Country Music*. New York: Routledge.

Morrissey, Janet. 2011. “In Rock Hall of Fame Vote, a Battle of Industry Egos.” *The New York Times* December 3. https://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/04/business/in-rock-hall-of-fame-vote-a-battle-of-industry-egos.html. Retrieved May 20, 2017.

Morton, David C. 1993. *DeFord Bailey: A Black Star in Early Country Music*. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press.

Muschamp, Herbert. 1995, September 3. “Architecture With a View; A Shrine to Rock Music with a Roll All Its Own.” *The New York Times* September 3. http://www.nytimes.com/1995/09/03/arts/architecture-view-a-shrine-to-rock-music-with-a-roll-all-its-own.html. Retrieved May 17, 2017.

Negus, Keith. 1999. *Music Genres and Corporate Cultures*. London: Routledge.

Pecknold, Diane and Kristen M. McCusker, editors. 2016. *Country Boys and Redneck Women: New Essays in Gender and Country Music*. Jackson, MI: University Press of Mississippi.

Peterson, Richard A. 2013. *Creating Country Music: Fabricating Authenticity*. E-book. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Plain Dealer Staff. 2010. "Rock and Roll Hall of Fame and Museum timeline: 1995-2010." *The Plain Dealer* August 29. http://www.cleveland.com/popmusic/index.ssf/2010/08/rock_and_roll_hall_of_fame_and_3.html. Retrieved June 9, 2017. .

Posner, Gerald. 2005. *Motown: Music, Money, Sex, and Power*. Reprint edition. New York: Random House Trade Paperbacks.

Pride, Charlie and Jim Henderson. 1994. *Pride: The Charley Pride Story*. New York: William Morrow & Co.

Regev, Motti. 1994. "Producing Artistic Value." *Sociological Quarterly* 35 (1): 85–102.

Regev, Motti. 2013. *Pop-Rock Music: Aesthetic Cosmopolitanism in Late Modernity*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Reilly, Dan. 2014. "The 10 Most Controversial Rock and Roll Hall of Fame Moments." *Billboard* April 9. http://www.billboard.com/articles/news/6042281/the-10-most-controversial-rock-and-roll-hall-of-fame-moments. Retrieved June 11, 2017.

Rock and Roll Hall of Fame. 2014. "Induction Process." http://www.rockhall.com/inductees/induction-process/. Retrieved May 4, 2014.

Rock and Roll Hall of Fame. 2017. "About the Rock Hall." http://www.rockhall.com/visit/about-rock-hall. Retrieved May 14, 2017.

Rose, Tricia 1994. *Black Noise: Rap Music and Black Culture in Contemporary America*. Middle Town, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Roy, William G. 2002. "Aesthetic Identity, Race, and American Folk Music." *Qualitative Sociology* 25 (3): 459–69.

Roy, William G. 2004. "'Race Records' and 'Hillbilly Music': Institutional Origins of Racial Categories in the American Commercial Recording Industry." *Poetics* 32 (3–4): 265–279.

Schmutz, Vaughn. 2009. "Social and Symbolic Boundaries in Newspaper Coverage of Music, 1955–2005: Gender and Genre in the US, France, Germany, and the Netherlands." *Poetics* 37 (4): 298–314.

Schmutz, Vaughn and Alison Faupel. 2010. "Gender and Cultural Consecration in Popular Music." *Social Forces* 89 (2): 685–707.

Smith, Troy L. 2016, April 11. "Cleveland Will Host Rock & Roll Hall of Fame Ceremony Every Two Years." Cleveland.com April 2016. http://www.cleveland.com/entertainment/index.ssf/2016/04/cleveland_will_now_host_rock_r.html. Retrieved June 10, 2017.

Stewart, Terry. 2000. *Rock and Roll Hall of Fame and Museum Guidebook*. James Henke, editor. Custom Graphics.

Tichi, Cecelia. 1994. *High Lonesome: The American Culture of Country Music*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Venrooij, Alex van. 2009. "The Aesthetic Discourse Space of Popular Music: 1985–86 and 2004–05." *Poetics* 37 (4): 315–332.

Venrooij, Alex van and Vaughn Schmutz. 2010. "The Evaluation of Popular Music in the United States, Germany and the Netherlands." *Cultural Sociology* 4: 395-421.

Wanzenried, John W. and Robert Henley Woody. 1979. "Personality Factors and Preference for Rock and Country Lyrics." *Popular Music and Society* 6 (4): 302–306.

Wolfe, C. K. (2015). *A Good-Natured Riot: The Birth of the Grand Ole Opry*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.

Wuthnow, R. (1979). *The Religious Dimension: New Directions in Quantitative Research*. Cambridge: Academic Press.

Yarborough, Chuck. 2013. "Rush: Canadian Prog-Rock Band Ran Away with the First-Ever Fan Vote (Rock and Roll Hall of Fame Class of 2013)." Cleveland.com April 14. http://www.cleveland.com/rockhall/index.ssf/2013/04/rush_canadian_prog-rock_band_r.html. Retrieved June 10, 2017.

TABLE 2-A

Descriptive Statistics for Performers in the Country Music Hall of Fame (N = 86)

Characteristics	*Percentage*
Male	84.8
Female	14.0
Mixed Gender Groups	1.2
White	97.7
Black	2.3
Country Genre	97.7
Pop Rock Genre	2.3
CMA Album of the Year Win	14.0
CMA Song of the Year Win	10.5
CMA Entertainer of the Year Win	18.6
ACM Album of the Year Win	9.3
ACM Song of the Year Win	10.5
ACM Entertainer of the Year Win	12.8
Grand Ole Opry Membership	61.6
RIAA Gold-Certified Album	37.2
RIAA Platinum-Certified Album	25.6
Country *Billboard* #1 Album	38.4
Country *Billboard* #1 Single	55.8
Soloist	89.5

TABLE 2-B

Descriptive Statistics for Performers in the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame (N = 196)

Variable	*Percentage*
Male	83.1
Female	10.7
Mixed Gender Group	6.1
White	61.1
Black	36.4
Other Races	1.0
Mixed Race Group	1.5
Pop Rock Genre	63.3
R&B Genre	27.0
Rap Genre	2.0
Country Genre	1.0
Grammy Album of the Year Win	7.2
Grammy HOF Album	2.1
Grammy Record of the Year Win	4.1
Top 20, *Village Voice* Critics Poll	30.3
***Rolling Stone* 5-Star Album**	27.2
***Billboard* #1 Album**	33.8
RIAA Gold-Certified Album	54.4
RIAA Platinum-Certified Album	51.3
Soloist	46.0

CHAPTER THREE:
CONSTRUCTING THE PAST:
RETROSPECTIVE CONSECRATION AND THE COUNTRY MUSIC HALL OF FAME

Introduction

The business of country music records began around the 1920s. At that time, small record companies were its champions, offering this music to consumers. Meanwhile, large record companies and other entities in the music business (e.g., network radio) initially questioned the commercial viability and artistic value of this genre (Dowd 2003; Peterson 2013). In other words, they doubted both the economic legitimacy *and* cultural legitimacy of country music (see Scardaville 2009). The growing sales of country music recordings, however, would convince those early skeptics; these sales prompted large record companies to open offices and recording studios in Nashville, and they spurred radio stations and others to expand their offerings in this genre (Dowd 2003; Peterson 2013). It had thus taken country music almost three decades to gain some legitimacy, namely its economic legitimacy. Yet, ironically enough, another genre that country music helped spawn—rock 'n' roll—would threaten that very legitimacy in the 1950s and 1960s (Ennis 1992; Peterson 2013). This threat arose because young fans were deserting country music in favor of rock, the sound of a young generation coming into being (Gillett 2011).

Being under threat, some individuals and entities in country music worked to strengthen both country music and its legitimacy. Because of this, as Peterson (2013, p. 199) quite succinctly put it, "One of the best ways to show that a field exists is to construct its past." A major outgrowth of this "past construction" was the establishment

of the Country Music Hall of Fame and its first induction class in 1961 by the Country Music Association (Peterson 2013). By creating a hall of fame and consecrating select individuals, cultural entrepreneurs within the field of country music could bolster the genre's standing, especially with regards to the upstart genre of rock music. This hall of fame, then, could not only contribute to the economic legitimacy of country but also its cultural legitimacy. The latter was a pressing concern for country music at the outset of the 1960s. On the one hand, while some within country music viewed it as a worthy form of music (i.e., one with artistic merit), that was not a view widely held by those outside of the field (Dowd 2003; Pecknold 2007). On the other hand, the establishment of the CMHOF happened at a time when popular music criticism had yet to emerge in full form (Regev 2013; Schmutz 2009). Hence, while critics increasingly celebrated the merits of jazz, well-positioned reviewers who offered a "legitimating ideology" for the worth of new forms of popular music[34] (e.g., rock, country, rhythm and blues) had yet to be commonplace in 1961 (Baumann 2001; Schmutz, van Venrooij, Janssen & Verboord 2010).

Consecration and Solidarity

The Country Music Hall of Fame would put forward its own legitimating ideology. Seemingly targeting country music enthusiasts more than those outside of country music, it made arguments for the aesthetic worth of the genre through its exhibitions, its descriptions and, eventually, even its very architecture (see Chapter Two).

[34] Recall that I use the term "popular music" to refer to genres of music that are not "classical music" (see footnote 6 in Chapter One).

In other words, the CHMOF took on the role of being an "agency of consecration" (Bourdieu 1999).

Like other agencies of consecration, this hall of fame also spent considerable time touting the exemplary figures of the genre, the musicians themselves (Allen & Parsons 2006; Dowd, Liddle, Lupo & Borden 2002). Candidates to the CMHOF are judged by their talent and the impact that they have had on the field, including the scope of their activity and influence upon others in the field. Interestingly, CMHOF candidates are also judged based on their professionalism and image, devotion to others, as well as their personal morals and behaviors (see Chapter Two). The concerns of the CMHOF, then, go beyond considerations of an individual's musical career (which can be "objectively" measured by such things as hit records, newspaper reviews, and music awards), and they move into a realm that is subjective and difficult to measure—the very character of the musical performer (see Schmutz and van Venrooij 2017). This subjectivity is likely the result of the strong boundaries and high levels of consensus in the field of country music (Holt 2007). Regarding those who vote on these candidates, the CMHOF's specific inclusion on the induction panel of both historians and those who have a historical perspective on country music (Country Music Hall of Fame 2014) demonstrates a great concern for the detailing the genre's past—much like Peterson (2013) suggested above. Such concern underscores both its long history and the importance of historical ties in the legitimating ideology that the hall sets forth for country music.

The Country Music Hall of Fame can credibly undertake these consecration efforts for reasons identified by Allen and Parsons (2006). First, as previously mentioned, the induction panel of the CMHOF includes country music historians, as well other

experts within the field. Furthermore, the CMHOF is sponsored by the Country Music Association—an organization established with the purpose of representing the interests of the genre. Second, while the criteria have not always been clear to the public, when they were, they included the rigorous criteria as described in the previous paragraph. Third, the CMHOF selects very few performers each year for induction, making it a highly selective process that suggests great value and respect is given to each performer that is deemed worthy of induction. Fourth, given the lack of controversy over CMHOF induction choices (see Chapter Two), that drawing of the boundary between those inducted and everyone else is largely accepted and well understood.

That consensus is not unique to the field of country music. As previously discussed in Chapter Two, fields of cultural production can vary in terms of their solidarity. For instance, Bergesen (1984) studied the closely-knit modern art field found in New York City, examining the many players involved from artists and gallery owners to agents. This local field featured high levels of solidarity. That, in turn, meant that those operating in this field could rely upon "restricted codes" when discussing and evaluating their art works: sharing similar views, they could talk in a shorthand of sorts. While these fields with restricted codes are self-affirming, Bergesen (1984) argues, they also have more rigid options for expression. All of these characteristics can be found in the country music field. Throughout its history, there have been high levels of consensus and solidarity within country music, with only occasional divergences or disputes. The country music community prides itself on being tight-knit (Malone and Neal 2010) and on affirming those within the community, as is evidenced by the relative dearth of professional music criticism in the field (at least a dearth when compared to that found in

the field of rock music; see Schmutz, van Venrooij, Janssen & Verboord 2010). Finally, the rigidity of self-expression associated with restricted codes would result in the clear boundaries that exist between country music and other genres (Holt 2007). As a result of the restricted codes found in country music, an agency of consecration like the CMHOF has been able to make decisions at its own discretion throughout its history.

Retrospective Consecration as Ongoing Project

Scholarship on retrospective consecration, at its core, focuses on how the contemporaneous success of creators (e.g., the "immediate recognition" provided by high sales or glowing reviews) shapes which creators are "retrospectively" celebrated by established agencies of consecration (e.g., university textbooks; Braden 2009; Schmutz and van Venrooij 2017). Sometimes this retrospective consecration happens at one point in time, as when *Rolling Stone* convened a large panel of experts to select the "500 Greatest Albums of All Time" (Schmutz 2005). Sometimes it occurs after candidates have completed their careers, as is the case for the Baseball Hall of Fame (Allen & Parsons 2006).

The retrospective consecration done by the Country Music Hall of Fame (as well as that done by the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame) is ongoing rather than one-time (see Chapter Two). Furthermore, unlike the Baseball Hall of Fame, musicians may still be active in their careers when eligible for induction in the two music halls of fame. That creates some unique challenges for analysis. Once performers become eligible for induction into the hall of fame, they remain eligible in later years—thus, studying the CMHOF requires a longitudinal approach rather than the cross-sectional approach found

in Schmutz (2005), Braden (2009), etc. Also, for those performers eligible for induction while still active in their careers, their contemporaneous accomplishments need to be updated, as the accumulation of their accomplishments could be the reason for their induction. That then requires what are commonly called "time-varying attributes" (e.g., the number of hit records for each year of a musician's career; Allison 2010).

As will be made clear in the methods section, these aspects of the Country Music Hall of Fame consecration project require a certain statistical approach—what is known as "event history analysis" (Allison 2010). In this chapter, I will be analyzing at what point all of the 86 performers were inducted into the hall of fame, which can be thought of as "waiting time." More specifically, I will be examining how the likelihood of their eventual inclusion fares with each passing year. Previous research suggests that when a consecration project is ongoing, the agencies of consecration will first promote those at the core of the field before moving on to others (Dowd, Liddle, Lupo and Blyler 2002). In this chapter, I will see if that is the case by comparing how, on the one hand, contemporaneous recognition may speed that induction process for some performers and, on the other hand, how performer attributes (namely, race and gender) might slow that process for other performers.

From Valorization to Consecration

The Country Music Hall of Fame did not have to start from scratch in terms of its ongoing consecration project: when selecting the exemplary figures to celebrate, CMHOF personnel and the voting panel already had some "objective" evidence at their disposal in terms of what sociologists call "contemporaneous valorization" (Allen &

Lincoln 2004; Schmutz & van Venrooij 2017). In other words, all country music performers can and do earn feedback from the audience (popular legitimacy), from fellow musicians (professional legitimacy) and from critics (critical legitimacy; Schmutz 2005; Schmutz & Faupel 2010). For many, that feedback involves silence, but for some, the feedback involves the success that follows the release of a given country music recording (e.g., high sales; awards; rave reviews). Those who have the desired combination of that valorization, in turn, should be the musicians that the CHMOF inducted in quick fashion.

The question remains: what is that desired combination of critical, professional and popular legitimacy? One position argues that popular legitimacy is at odds with professional and critical legitimacy. Those who have high sales are "sell-outs" and "hacks" given their pursuit of profit, while those who have glowing reviews and awards are the true artists (and, by extension, the ones who should be inducted into a hall of fame). That is one common interpretation of Bourdieu's (1993) arguments. Yet, as Schmutz and van Venrooij (2017) note, we can also read Bourdieu as emphasizing not just opposition between these three types of legitimacy but also the consensus and convergence that can occur among them in the project of retrospective consecration. I delve into this issue empirically below.

Critical Legitimacy and the Grand Ole Opry

Critical, or "bourgeois," legitimacy is a type of cultural legitimacy that the dominant class grants to cultural products (Bourdieu 1993). In practice, critical legitimacy is rarely granted to cultural products or producers directly by the upper and middle classes. Rather, it tends to be awarded by well-established actors (such as cultural

entrepreneurs) who have the resources and credibility to extend this form of legitimacy to cultural products and producers alike (DiMaggio 1982; Fine 1996). In research on film, critical recognition positively influences the likelihood of a film being retrospectively consecrated: those films selected by the *New York Times* reviewers or the National Board of Review as one of the year's "ten best"—or those contemporaneously honored by the New York Film Critics Circle—enjoy a greater likelihood of being included in the American Film Institute's "100 Greatest Films of All Time" or in the prestigious "National Film Registry" (Allen & Lincoln 2004). In research on retrospective consecration in rock music, critical legitimacy, in the form of praise from music critics (e.g., lists of each year's best albums by the *Village Voice* critics) has a positive impact on the likelihood of popular music being culturally consecrated in *Rolling Stone* magazine's "500 Greatest Albums of All Time" (Schmutz 2005; Schmutz and Faupel 2010).

Both of the previous studies rely on critical outlets that have produced reviews systematically for decades—such as the *New York Times* and its critics from 1929 onward and the *Village Voice* and its critics from 1974 onward (Allen & Lincoln 2004; Schmutz 2005). In both film and rock, then, critics have played long-term and influential roles in terms of each field's operation and its associated consecration project. In the field of country music, however, there is not the same extensive tradition of critical ratings or year-end reviews: as far as I can discover, there have been no major "Top Albums" or "Top Performers" lists in country music that have spanned the decades as *The Village Voice* has done for rock. This may indicate that the importance of critical legitimacy in country music is less than it is in other areas of popular music. That is not to say that such

critical coverage is absent—but rather that no outlet has offered this type of year-end evaluation for decades on end. For example, *Country Music Magazine* ran from 1973 to 2003, and it would often, though not always, have year-end reviews, and *Country Weekly*, which ran from 1994 to 2016, also would frequently run year-end reviews. This limited critical tradition in country music may be the consequence of the solidarity found in country music, where what passes for quality is commonly understood (and described with restricted codes; see Bergesen 1984). For example, Liah Greenfield (1983) finds that in settings where audiences already possess an understanding of quality (i.e., figurative art), they need not rely as much on critics for guidance when compared to those settings in which audiences are unsure about what passes for quality (i.e., abstract art).

Annual "ten best" lists compiled by critics provide one type of critical legitimacy—what Schmutz and van Venrooij (2017) call "intermediate" rather than "immediate," because the feedback can come months after a given album's release. However, those critic lists are not the only form of intermediate feedback. While extended runs of those lists have not been common in country music, the intermediate feedback offered by the Grand Ole Opry has (Escott & Gill 2006). The beginnings of the Grand Ole Opry date back to 1925, and it is the longest and most consistent form of critical recognition in country music. From its beginnings as a radio program, the Grand Ole Opry has developed into a concert that draws thousands of fans weekly. While the Grand Ole Opry has changed venues several times, it has always called Nashville home. The Grand Ole Opry has also played host to many country music legends (Wolfe 2015). Furthermore, because ties to history are incredibly important for legitimacy in country music, the Grand Ole Opry is in the position to bestow invaluable legitimacy to

performers (see Chapter Two). The Grand Ole Opry is an entity that represents the elites in country music; they pride themselves on selecting the best performers, rather than simply the "biggest stars with the most hits". It is the management of the Grand Ole Opry, rather than other country music performers, that makes these decisions and invites performers to become members of the organization ("Opry Membership" 2017). This makes it the best indicator of critical legitimacy in country music because contemporary performers are asked to become members of the Grand Ole Opry. Membership in the Grand Ole Opry has had different performance requirements over the years, originally requiring members to perform at least 26 times a year, but that number has been reduced to 12 performances a year (Wolfe 2015). Offering an important type of valorization, I expect that membership in the Grand Ole Opry will also facilitate quick induction into the Country Music Hall of Fame. That is, among those currently inducted into the Hall, those affiliated with the Opry were inducted more quickly. In fact, 8 of the first 12 inductees into the CHMOF were also members of the Opry—including Roy Acuff, Ernest Tubb, and Hank Williams.

> ***Hypothesis 1****: Critical legitimacy, in form of Grand Ole Opry membership, will lessen the "wait time" to induction in the Country Music Hall of Fame.*

Professional Legitimacy and the Nashville & Bakersfield Sounds

Professional legitimacy is a type of cultural legitimacy that is granted by peers within a field. In the arts and other fields of cultural production, it is granted by fellow cultural producers (Bourdieu 1993). Empirical research has demonstrated the significant role that professional legitimacy plays in cultural consecration, being measured using

different indicators that are specific to each cultural field. For example, in film, it has been measured by gathering data on nominations for the Academy Awards because these awards are voted on by a body of film personnel (e.g., directors, writers) within the cinematic field (Allen and Lincoln 2004). In research on popular music, professional legitimacy has been measured via the Grammy Awards, as the voting panel is made up of musicians and other creative personnel operating within the rock field (Schmutz 2005; Schmutz and Faupel 2010). In the field of film, this professional legitimation can positively impact the likelihood of retrospective consecration of a given motion picture, whereas in the field of rock, the impact of professional legitimation is somewhat mixed in terms of that later consecration (Allen & Lincoln 2004; Schmutz 2005).

Within the Country Music Hall of Fame, professionalism is a central criterion that is used to judge a performer's worthiness of induction (Country Music Hall of Fame 2014). As a result, I expect that contemporaneous valorization by one's musical peers likely matters a great deal for induction into the CHMOF. Measuring professional legitimacy in country music reveals an important part of country music's history. Specifically, country music has two prominent country music yearly awards ceremonies, that of the Country Music Association and that of the American Country Association. Each one arose, in part, from the development of the Nashville and Bakersfield Sounds.

As noted in Chapter Two, despite Atlanta almost becoming the home of country, the genre has called Nashville its home for the majority of its history (Peterson 2013). Nashville began to emerge as the epicenter of country music in the 1920s, with the Grand Ole Opry being established in 1925 and recording studios and music executives subsequently flocking to the city (Escott and Gill 2006). Emerging from Nashville is the

"Nashville Sound," which features highly produced arrangements and even included orchestras in its earlier years. Although Nashville has remained the home of country music, other areas of the US featured country musicians with alternative sounds to those found in Nashville. In honky-tonk bars in the middle of the country, country musicians were developing harder-edged sounds that featured drums as well as electric guitars, creating what would come to be known as hard core country (Peterson 2013). During the 1950s, many people from the middle of the US moved to Bakersfield, CA, and among them were Merle Haggard and Buck Owens. Other country musicians flocked to this area, bringing their honky-tonk musical background with them, and together created what is now known as the "Bakersfield Sound." During the course of the 1950s and 1960s, this area and its unique sound grew in popularity in the field of country music (Price 2015). While the country music field features high levels of consensus and features very few divides, by the mid 1960s there was a noticeable split both geographically and musically between Nashville and Bakersfield. This divide was reflected when two country music award ceremonies were established in the mid-1960s.

The Country Music Association, which was originally founded in 1958 to promote country music and to help country musicians network, created the CMA Awards to celebrate, or valorize,, the work of country musicians (Country Music Association 2017). The Country Music Association (CMA) spent several years planning and building the CMA Awards before holding the first ceremony in 1967. Because the CMA is based in Nashville, the awards originally focused on musicians in that geographical area and, thus, tended to favor music that had the "Nashville sound." As a result, the Academy of Country Music was established in 1964 to ensure that the work of country musicians on

the West Coast was not overlooked. The ACA held its first awards ceremony in 1966 (*LA Times* Staff 2008). Again, this marks a rare, yet significant, case of division within the field of country music. Overall, these two ceremonies provide insights regarding the differences between those performers who have the Nashville Sound and those on the periphery. Given the emphasis on professionalism in the CMHOF induction criteria, among those 86 inducted in the hall, I expect that numerous awards from peers will facilitate quick induction in that hall of fame. For example, both Vince Gill and Garth Brooks encountered short wait times before being inducted into the hall of fame, and both men have received numerous awards. It remains to be seen, however, if valorization coming from Nashville matters more than that coming from the West Coast.[35] Then again, the location of the may not matter at all because, in more recent years, the awards ceremonies have often celebrated the same performers, such as they have done for George Strait.

> ***Hypothesis 2A****: Nashville-based professional legitimacy, in the form of CMA awards, will lessen the wait time to induction in the Country Music Hall of Fame.*
>
> ***Hypothesis 2B****: West Coast-based professional legitimacy, in the form of AMA awards, will lessen the wait time to induction in the Country Music Hall of Fame.*

[35] It should be remembered that, before creating the CMA Awards, the CMA established the Country Music Hall of Fame. Subsequently, if CMA Awards winners are inducted more quickly than ACM winners, it may be a direct consequence of the connections between the two organizations established by CMA. Alternatively, it may be a consequence of the CMHOF privileging those performers who have the Nashville Sound, and the CMA Awards are an indicator of having the Nashville Sound, as well as having professional legitimacy. However, this is a fine distinction because, ultimately, the CMHOF is either directly or indirectly privileging those with the Nashville Sound if CMA Award winners, in fact, are favored in terms of their induction timing.

Popular Legitimacy and Soft-Shell Country Music

Popular legitimacy is bestowed by the general public, and in music, it tends to be captured by record sales, ticket sales and other types of audience response. This type of legitimacy supposedly stands apart from the two discussed above. The reason for this, arguably, is because popular legitimacy is tied to commercial viability, which stands in opposition to artistic and aesthetic concerns (Bourdieu 1996). Yet in actuality, the relationship between sales and critical success can take a number of forms. For example, amongst Broadway creators, critical and popular success coincide. That is, Broadway musicals that generate high ticket sales also tend to receive outstanding reviews (Uzzi and Spiro 2005). In the field of jazz music, these two types of success are completely disconnected: the earnings of jazz musicians have no bearing on their critical recognition, and that recognition has no bearing on their earnings (Pinheiro and Dowd 2009). Meanwhile, in the rock music field, popular legitimacy has varied effects on albums being retrospectively consecrated. Specifically, those albums that have reached #1 on the *Billboard* charts (which involves short-term financial success) have been less likely to be consecrated, whereas those albums that have sold more than a million copies (which involves long-term financial success) have been more likely to be consecrated (Schmutz 2005). Despite the common argument that places popular legitimacy apart and in opposition to critical and professional legitimacy, the relationship between the three may instead be cumulative—with all three combining to benefit who and what are retrospectively consecrated (Schmutz & van Venrooij 2017).

When considering popular legitimacy in the field of country music, it is important to recognize a historical division that exists between what is known as “soft-shell” and

"hard core" country (Peterson 2013). Hard core country is often seen, as and it portrays itself, as more authentic. Hard core country performers pride themselves on staying true to their working class background, which is a central theme of their song lyrics and an indication of their lack of formal music training (Fox 2004). Hard core country is seen as standing in direct opposition to the "sell-out" (highly commercial) and polished form of country music, namely, soft-shell country music. Soft-shell country was founded and developed in the capital of country music—Nashville. As previously discussed, Nashville continues to play a major role in country music: it is the location of many recording studios, the current location of country music's two biggest award ceremonies, and the home of the CMHOF itself. To this day, soft-shell country music continues to be considered the "Nashville Sound" and has experienced great popularity and wide critical acceptance (Peterson 2004). Therefore, unlike in rock music, where concern with economic success is often portrayed as being negative and standing in opposition to artistic pursuits (see Bennett 2009), in country music, concern with economic success is closely intertwined with a type of country music that is valued in Nashville (Peterson 1990). Thus, among all those ever inducted in the CHMOF, I expect that those with much success on the *Billboard* charts and with million-sellers (i.e., "platinum") will be inducted more quickly. For example, the group Alabama and soloist Loretta Lynn have had great popular success and have also experienced shorter wait times when compared to other performers.

> ***Hypothesis 3****: Popular legitimacy, in the form of high sales for recordings, will lessen the wait time to induction in the Country Music Hall of Fame.*

Symbolic Boundaries and Retrospective Consecration

Any retrospective consecration project, when celebrating those deemed "great" (i.e., the canon), erects symbolic boundaries between the transcendent and the mundane, between the sacred and the facile (Bourdieu 1984). The creation of those symbolic boundaries, however, can often favor those with particular attributes—those who, by virtue of their race or gender, are equated with the authentic and esteemed and those who are not (Pachucki, Pendergrass & Lamont 2007). Such symbolic boundaries are particularly problematic if they mirror and reify and reinforce certain "social" boundaries, thereby limiting access and opportunities (Lamont and Fournier 1992). For example, DeNora (2002) makes the compelling case that, in the wake of Beethoven's impact, many begin to equate musical genius with masculinity, thereby putting women musicians of the day at a disadvantage in terms of their careers. Hence, which performers the hall of fame selects to consecrate reflects not just its view of those who best exemplify the genre, but that selection also provides insights into which *attribute*s exemplify the genre as well.

Gender and Valorization in Country Music

Valorization has proven crucial in fields of cultural production for later consecration, and unfortunately, women have been at a great disadvantage in having their work valorized (Roy & Dowd 2010; Schmutz 2009). In a study of the Amory Show in 1913, an exhibit of what was considered to be some of the best modern art of the time, women made up 17% of the population, a minority but not an inconsequential proportion of the field. However, in subsequent years, the Museum of Modern Art was far more likely to display the work of men from The Armory Show rather than the work of women

from the same event. Therefore, based on their representation in the Armory Show, women already faced some hurdles in entering the art field, and they faced even greater hurdles in having their work valorized, which proved critical in whether or not they were celebrated or remembered decades later in university textbooks (Braden 2009). This treatment of women sometimes results from notions regarding with is "appropriate" for them. For example, Tuchman and Fortin (1984) explored how women were slowly edged out of the literary world at the same time that being a novelist gained acceptance and prestige in the Victorian era. Once men began entering the field in substantial numbers, being a novelist came to be viewed as a profession for men rather than the practice of women.

Research that specifically examines the cultural consecration of women in the field of rock music has likewise demonstrated that women face great disadvantages. In examining who gets selected to *Rolling Stone's* "500 Greatest Albums of All Time" list, Schmutz and Faupel (2010, p. 697) find that "Female performers are less likely than male performers to receive cultural legitimacy of any type," and even more discouraging, for those active before 1983, being female has significant negative direct effects on the odds of having a culturally consecrated album, even when controlled for the impact of legitimacy. After 1983, being female no longer has direct negative effects, and instead the inequalities that women faced are a function of there being barriers to gaining particular types of cultural legitimacy—specifically, critical legitimacy, which proved vital to having one's work culturally consecrated.

Gender plays out in intriguing ways in the field of country music. There, women have played a major role, both as performers (Wolfe and Akenson 2003) and as

consumers (Peterson & Davis 1978). Country music's treatment of women is complex, both elevating and subordinating women at different points in time and in different areas of the field. While, on the one hand, women were historically overlooked and marginalized, on the other hand, notable women here and there have contributed to the long history of country music, and their role in the genre has only grown over time (Neal 2003; Wolfe 2003). Country music's traditional narratives have created hurdles to women entering the field and have made navigating their careers far more complex than that of male performers (Fox 1998). Since its early years, country music and its lyrics have been filled with dualisms, including that of man and woman. Differences between men and women were portrayed as vast and stemming from innate natural differences. Furthermore, a common country narrative in country music lyrics cast women as the source of men's problems. Women, too, lamented the struggles that they faced in their relationships with men in their song lyrics (Chandler and Chalfant 1985). However, the country music performed by women initially did not have the same sizable audience that men did because women's difficulties extended into the field of country music itself: female soloists or female-only groups were all but absent from the field and only accounted for two hits before 1952. Furthermore, it was not until the 1960s that women were seen as capable of being standalone performers (Peterson 2013). Notions about what is "appropriate" once limited the career opportunities of women in the field of country music.

These gender inequalities in the field of country music will likely influence the Country Music Hall of Fame and its ongoing consecration project. Just as past research reveals that women are less likely to be both valorized and consecrated within various

fields of cultural production (e.g., Braden 2009; Lang & Lang 1988; Schmutz 2009; Schmutz & Faupel 2010; Tuchman & Fortin 1984), I expect that women performers will likewise face a disadvantage. In particular, among all those inducted into the Country Music Hall of Fame, women will languish in terms of the time it took for them to be inducted. For example, it was not until 1970 that the first women were inducted, namely as two of the three members of the Carter Family, and it was another two years before the first female soloist, Patsy Cline, was inducted into the hall of fame.

Hypothesis 4*: Female performers will have longer wait times than others for induction in the Country Music Hall of Fame.*

Despite the hurdles faced by women in the arts in general, as well as country music in particular, there is also research that indicates that women in country music may not actually face the same difficulties that women face in rock music face. This evidence comes from how they are portrayed visually and lyrically. For example, for the past, few decades women in country music videos tend to be portrayed more positively and independently than women in other genres (Andsager and Roe 1999). While research on rock music videos finds that women are "symbolically annihilated" via negative portrayals (Hansen and Hansen 1988), women in country music videos have actually been shown in more progressive roles, while men in those same videos were portrayed in somewhat stereotypical roles (Andsager and Roe 1999). The reason for the difference found between country and rock music videos is tied to the traditionalism within country music. Specifically, because women are often framed as chaste, they do not tend to be sexualized and objectified in the same way that rock music tends to portray women in music videos (Wilson 2000). Furthermore, in the mid 1990s, country music lyrics began

to shift, stepping away from more stereotypical tropes that focused on the stories and experiences of men with women acting only as the source of their love, oppression, or betrayal. At the same time, women musicians began asserting themselves more than they ever had before, proclaiming their independence and social worth (Altman 1997). Collectively, then, the experiences of women in country music are complex. Still, the broader inequalities in fields of cultural production—as well as the history of career opportunities within the field of country music—would indicate that women in the CMHOF will encounter more hurdles to induction than men.

Race and Valorization in Country Music

Musical genres are often linked to specific racial-ethnic groups. For example, jazz and rhythm and blues are associated with African American performers and audiences and country music is associated with white performers and audiences (Dowd 2003; Malone 2006; Mann 2008; Peterson 2013; Pinheiro & Dowd 2009). Yet, despite those associations, there are *other* racial-ethnic groups involved in those genres—sometimes in sizable numbers (e.g., whites in jazz; Pinheiro and Dowd 2009), and sometimes in few numbers (e.g., African Americans in country; see Chapter Two). Rather than treat these racial-ethnic associations as natural and inherent for particular genres, sociologists explore how those associations came to be (see Negus and Román Velázquez 2002).

For example, Roy (2002, p. 461) discusses the notion of homology in culture and how "boundaries in cultural forms align with the boundaries between groups." He explains that genres, such as different types of music, can be used to create boundaries between different social groups. "Create" is operative word, as he details how this was

deliberately done for country music. Folk music was originally the music of rural blacks and whites, with the two groups sharing many musical styles and techniques. When record companies decided to begin releasing "folk" music, they chose to create symbolic boundaries in the forms of genres based on the social boundaries that were so strong in US society at the time. Hence, they devised business classifications whereby "hillbilly" folk music was for whites and "race" folk music was for African Americans—with those terms later changed to "country" and "blues/rhythm and blues." They put those classifications in practice by having some record labels[36] that recorded and released country music for white audiences and having other record labels that recorded and released blues for black audiences (see also Dowd 2003; Roy 2004). In dividing music made by blacks and whites, record companies erected not just symbolic boundaries but also reified the social boundaries that already existed between blacks and whites. Although this split was created by record company executives, it would have real, long-term consequences for the musicians and audiences, in general, and for country music, in particular. The "whiteness" of country music, for instance, would be reinforced by the Ku Klux Klan (KKK), which sponsored fiddle contests. The KKK even submitted country songs to be released by Edison, though he dismissed them as having a catchy tune but otherwise being trash (Peterson 2013).

---

[36] The term "record label" comes from the paper labels affixed to early recordings, which included a listing of the organizational entity (i.e., the label) responsible for the release of a given record. The relationship between the label and the owning firm has changed over time. Particularly, during the era of centralized production of the early 1900s, a large record company would have one to three distinct labels in operation. As production became decentralized in later decades, though, a large record company would have a bounty of labels under its corporate control. Regardless, using specific labels to target particular audiences was commonplace for many years (Dowd 2004; Peterson and Berger 1975).

Music need not only be used to erect boundaries; it can also be used to build bridges across races (Roy and Dowd 2010). Indeed, in a later article, Roy (2004) extends the idea of homology further by arguing that, while different cultural genres may align with the differences between social groups, often different cultural genres may be employed to help construct differences and new identities. Music's mutability allows for it and its audiences to change over time. Indeed, as seen in Chapter Two, country music does have two African Americans enshrined in its hall of fame. But, sadly, two is a woefully small number considering the historical stream from which country emerged—the folk music of blacks and whites. The early record company actions were so effective in dividing the music-listening-public that over the decades, despite some broader shifts in race relations within the US, the consequences remain today (Roy 2002). What we know today as "country music" is so tightly coupled with whiteness today that it continues to be made primarily by white musicians for a primarily white audience (Peterson 2013). If the successes of black country performers do indeed comprise "peculiar accidents" that do not upset the racial order of the field (Pecknold & McCusker 2016), then I would expect that the Country Music Hall of Fame will be slow in embracing them. Specifically, among all those inducted in the CHMOF, the two African Americans (DeFord Bailey and Charley Pride) will also languish in terms of when inducted.

> ***Hypothesis 5****: Black performers will have longer wait times than others for induction in the Country Music Hall of Fame.*

Data & Methods

The dataset compiled for this chapter addresses the 86 performers who have been inducted into the Country Music Hall of Fame from 1961 until 2015 (counting musical groups, such as The Carter Family, as a single performer). I identified these performers by consulting the Country Music Hall of Fame's website (Country Music Hall of Fame 2014). I then proceeded by gathering annual information on those 86 performers each year from the start of their career until the year that that they were inducted into the CMHOF.

While measuring the "start" of a career can be challenging, I dealt with that by way of a systematic approach: I measured the start of a performer's career by way of the release date of their first "single" (i.e., a recorded song). I chose this as the starting point because it is a specific event that has occurred in each inductee's career. Also, while today's performers generally release singles *and* albums (i.e., a collection of songs) in fairly close succession, in the early days of country music, performers would often only release singles. That was because "albums" in the modern-sense of the term did not become commonplace until after WWII (Dowd 2005). Therefore, singles are a better measure of the start of a performer's career than albums because some performers in the CMHOF did not release an album until several decades into their career. Assessing the year of induction was much more straightforward: I relied on the CMHOF website to determine that information for each of the 86 performers.

Having established the start year and induction year of each inducted performer, I collected data on every year of their career between those two points in time, thus creating a longitudinal dataset. I have taken this approach because, for several years,

there were no requirements regarding the length of a performer's career in order to become eligible for induction into the CMHOF (see Chapter Two). Furthermore, even when eligibility became a requirement, many of the eventual inductees continued to work beyond that eligibility timeline. Hence, my longitudinal dataset allows for the examination of how a performer's ongoing and ever-changing career affects when they are inducted into the hall of fame. Given this, the size of my dataset is not 86 performers, but rather, the "N" is equal to 3,476—the total number of years in which each of the performers were active before induction (i.e., "performer-years"; see Allison 2010).

Before proceeding, let me explain why my analysis only examines the waiting time of performers that have been inducted into CHMOF versus, say, the likelihood of which country musicians are inducted and which ones are not. One way that I address popular legitimacy is when a performer sales more than 500,000 copies of an album (a "gold" record) or more than a million copies (a "platinum" record; Schmutz 2005). The Recording Industry Association of America (the RIAA) is the entity that certifies both gold and platinum status. However, until 2015, it did not do so in a genre-specific fashion. Prior to that year, then, a platinum record could have been country music, but it could have also been rock, rap or even Broadway show tunes. That would greatly complicate a comparison of which gold-certified performers were inducted into the CMHOF and which ones were not, as most would likely not be under consideration from the start because most gold-certified performers are not active in country music (see Chapter Four). Collecting data solely on those RIAA-certified albums that are considered country is necessary because it has well-defined boundaries (Holt 2007), and the inclusion of performers from other genres would have resulted in findings that were not

substantively insightful. Consequently, creating a sample of those performers who had received any popular (e.g., gold, platinum albums), professional, and critical legitimacy in the decades prior to 2015, similar to Schmutz (2005) in previous research, was compromised given that one of the three forms of legitimacy was not available for country music. Put another way, while I could determine how many gold albums a CMHOF inductee earned, I could not tell how many gold albums were earned by a country music performer *not* inducted in the CMHOF based on RIAA classifications. Hence, rather than examine who gets into the Country Music Hall of Fame, I examine how long it takes for inductees.

My dataset includes information on those performers who have been inducted into the CMHOF. I have created continuous variables for the measures of popular and professional legitimacy (e.g., weeks on charts, number of awards won, etc.), and a dichotomous variable for the measure of critical legitimacy, (i.e. Grand Ole Opry membership). Similar measures have previously been used in research examining the effects of cultural legitimacy on consecration and have proven to be effective by Schmutz and Faupel (2010), as well as Schmutz (2005). For all the measures of legitimacy, I collected data on the performers' achievements prior to induction. Meanwhile, the measures for gender and race are dichotomous—and they remain the same for a given performer over the course of their respective careers.

Dependent Variable

My dependent variable is the length of time it took for a performer to be inducted into the Country Music Hall of Fame—the total number of years occurring from career

start to induction. With the exception of 2001, the Country Music Hall of Fame only inducts one to four performers per year, making it a highly selective process. Based on the CMHOF's attention to history, notoriety, and its selectivity in its inductions, it is an ideal measure of retrospective consecration (Allen & Parson 2006). The CMHOF's induction process, as already described, is an elaborate one that takes notice of and helps to highlight and reward those performers that best exemplify the country music field in terms of musical and historical contributions, as well as in terms of personal character. Those voting include members of the country music field with a variety of backgrounds and knowledge, with all having expertise on country music. This body of voters, then, represents the many areas of interest and concern within the country music field (see Chapter Two). Therefore, the length of time it takes for performers to be inducted offers real insights into what this agency of consecration values. Jim Reeves and Hank Williams had the two fastest inductions at 11 and 14 years, respectively, and DeFord Bailey and Ernest V. "Pop" Stoneman had to wait the longest at 78 and 82 years, respectively. The average time to induction, as Table 3-A shows, is 40.4 years.

[TABLE 3-A ABOUT HERE]

Independent Variable: Contemporaneous Valorization

As noted above, *critical legitimacy* proves most challenging for the country music field given the lack of regular, long-running reviews of country music. In prior research on popular music, inclusion on critic's year-end "Top Albums" lists as well as 5-Star album reviews have been used to measure critical legitimacy (Schmutz 2005; Schmutz & Faupel 2010). In country music, however, such lists have been ephemeral. I thus rely on

another measure of this type of legitimacy: I have collected data on those inductees in the CHMOF who were previously selected to be members of the Grand Ole Opry. Some performers would lose their membership because they were unable or unwilling to perform at the Grand Ole Opry the required number of times a year. Yet, I have chosen to consider a performer a member of the Grand Ole Opry even if they have lost their membership because the performers had been deemed worthy of the critical legitimacy offered by the Grand Ole Opry. For this indicator, I have dichotomous measure (non-member vs. member) as a performer cannot have multiple memberships. I measured this variable in every year of their career leading up to their induction into the hall of fame. As Table 3-A reveals, 61.6% of the CHMOF inductees were likewise members of the Grand Ole Opry.

For *professional legitimacy* (e.g., peer recognition), I have collected data on the Academy of Country Music Awards (which began in 1966) and the Country Music Association Awards (which began in 1967). While the Grammys have proven a good indicator of professional legitimacy (Schmutz and Faupel 2010), I have selected the CMA and ACM Awards as they offer insights into who those specifically within the field of country music believe are currently the best performers. This is particularly important for the field of country music because it has stronger boundaries than rock music (Holt 2007), which makes praise from others within the field even more valued. Recall, also, that I focus on the awards of two associations because of their original allegiances. The impact of the ACM and CMA awards will offer insights into the impact that the Nashville and Bakersfield Sounds have had on the induction process. In particular, I have gathered annual information on how many times, prior to induction, each performer won

either a AMA or CMA Award in the categories of "Entertainer of the Year," "Album of the Year," and "Single of the Year." I chose these particular categories because they are given specifically to the performers rather than producers or songwriters and also because they are not gender-specific. Ronnie Milsap, Alabama, Merle Haggard were three of the performers who won the most awards. Note that, as revealed in Table 3-A, only a small portion of performers (9.3-18.6% depending on the category) have won these awards.

Regarding *popular legitimac*y (e.g., sales), I constructed continuous variables that captured the number of RIAA-certified Platinum and Gold albums each inductee had previously secured in every year of their career. I also constructed continuous variables that captured, in each and every year of their pre-induction career, their total number of #1 "Hot Country"[37] singles and "Top Country" albums on the *Billboard* music charts. The use of RIAA certifications and *Billboard* charts to measure popular legitimacy has proven to be a good indicator of popular legitimacy in other research on popular music and cultural consecration (Schmutz 2005; Schmutz and Faupel 2010). Elvis Presley, Reba McEntire, Merle Haggard, as well as many others experienced considerable popular success. In fact, as noted in Table 3-A, 25.6% have platinum albums, and 38.4% have #1 albums.

Independent Variables: Artist Attributes

For all the inductees that are included in my dataset, I have constructed variables addressing their attributes. Namely, I have created dichotomous variables that address

[37] This chart has gone by different names over time, including "Hot C&W (Country and Western) Sides."

their race (e.g., white vs. non-white) and their gender (e.g., male vs. female). In the case of inductees that include multiple individuals (i.e., groups of performers), I have also created dichotomous variables that address whether their group includes both men and women.[38] Following the example of Dowd and colleagues (Dowd and Blyer 2002; Dowd et al. 2005), I have gleaned this demographic information from a variety of sources, such as music encyclopedias and journalistic accounts. This information provides insights into the inequalities found in the CMHOF—specifically if, as expected, women and non-whites are at a disadvantage for induction. Note that, according to Table 3-A women make up 14% of the hall of fame and blacks make up 2.3%.

Event History Analysis

Event history analysis is the most appropriate statistical method to use to evaluate my hypotheses concerning the Country Music Hall of Fame induction process because performers become eligible in different years and because their careers often continue to evolve once they are eligible for induction. In order to utilize this method, I had to create a longitudinal dataset that measured the different forms of cultural legitimacy for each year of a performer's career. Event history analysis allows for the determination of how multiple factors influence the likelihood of an event occurring, namely a performer being inducted into the hall of fame, in a given year (Petersen 1993). More specifically, event history analysis was created as a technique to provide an analysis as to how the timing of different factors, such as gaining different forms of legitimacy, influence the state of a

[38] I had planned to create a variable for any groups that include members from more than one racial background, but that did not occur among the inductees of the CMHOF.

given case, namely being inducted into the hall of fame. I have chosen to use Cox Regression over Kaplan-Meier to perform the event history analysis for two primary reasons. First, I selected this form of event history analysis because it allows for both dichotomous and continuous variables. Furthermore, Cox Regression allows for the analysis of multiple predictor variables (Allison 2010).

In the analysis, I report the Exp(B) as it is the hazard ratio and indicative of the effect that the different factors have on the likelihood, or churn hazard, of a performer being inducted into the hall of fame each year. Given that all the performers in this study were eventually inducted in the Country Music Hall of Fame, we can interpret each coefficient as addressing the following: it tells the likelihood that, those yet to be inducted, are likely to be inducted with each passing year. An Exp(B) greater than one means that, as time goes, the associated variable is related to an increased likelihood (i.e., a shorter time to induction), and an Exp(B) less than one means that associated variable is related to a decreased likelihood (i.e., a longer time to induction). I predict that a performer possessing popular, critical, and/or professional legitimacy will increase the churn hazard, or likelihood of a performer being inducted into the hall of fame in a given year. For artist attributes, I predict that churn hazard, or likelihood of being inducted, for men and whites will be higher than women and blacks, respectively.

Results

Table 3-B provides the correlation matrix for the independent variables used in the Event History Analysis. For the most part, the correlations are low, thereby erasing concerns about any multicollinearity problems (i.e., excessively large correlations

between individual measures). The largest coefficient is only .614, but that is relatively modest when compared to correlations often found in longitudinal data (see Dobbin & Dowd 2000). The CMA and ACA awards are positively correlated—which indicates that, despite the historical divide between the two ceremonies, they are converging on choices as to whom to celebrate. Also, professional and popular legitimacy are positively correlated, suggesting that there is more agreement than disagreement between these two forms of legitimacy. Interestingly, the divide that exists is more between critical legitimacy and professional/popular legitimacy than between critical/profession legitimacy and popular legitimacy. Finally, women, mixed gender groups and black performers are negatively correlated with a number of the measures of legitimacy. While those patterns are interesting, they are only bivariate. For a more thorough analysis of patterns, I turn to the event history analysis itself.

[TABLE 3-B ABOUT HERE]

Table 3-C considers how various types of contemporaneous valorization and performer attributes combine to shape how long musicians waited to be inducted into the Country Music Hall of Fame. Model 1 measures the impact of critical legitimacy, which previous research has shown to have a favorable influence on cultural consecration (Allen & Lincoln 2004; Schmutz 2005; Schmutz & Faupel 2010; Schmutz & van Venrooij 2017), and it uses membership in the Grand Ole Opry as an indicator. When considered on its own, this "intermediate" form of critical legitimacy has no significant impact on waiting time to induction; however, at least the coefficient itself is positive. While this lack of significance does not confirm Hypothesis 1, we will see in other models that

critical legitimacy's significant impact comes when combined with other factors, not when evaluated in isolation.

[TABLE 3-C ABOUT HERE]

Model 2 assesses the impact of professional legitimacy by way of both ACM and CMA Album, Single, and Entertainer Wins. In this model, contrary to Hypothesis 4B, none of the ACM wins had any significant effects, while only two of the three CMA measures do so. Here, then, it looks like the awards of the West-Coast contingent have no bearing on speeding up induction times for various performers. For those performers not yet in the hall of fame, each additional CMA Single of the Year they accrued would raise the likelihood of their induction in a given year by a factor of four, while each Entertainer on the Year award they accrued would do so by a factor of three. As suggested by Hypothesis 4b, this Nashville-based recognition helped shorten the waiting time for eventual induction.

Model 3 gauges the impact of popular legitimacy by considering the benefits of having RIAA-Certified Platinum and Gold albums, as well as *Billboard* #1 Country singles and albums. Unlike Schmutz (2005; Schmutz & Faupel 2010) who find that long-term financial success (that required to sell more than a million copies) matters for retrospective consecration than does short-term success (selling enough copies to reach #1 for a matter of weeks), I find the opposite in this model. Each additional #1 album a performer accrued raises the likelihood of their induction by nearly 13%. All other measures of popular legitimacy have no significant effects on the time to induction. Model 3 thus provides only partial support for Hypothesis 3.

Model 4 examines the impact of performer attributes by way of both gender and race. This model confirms Hypothesis 1, as it indicates that, among those yet to be inducted, black performers face a reduced likelihood in each passing year in terms of being inducted, with that 84% reduction per year delaying their induction time. There is no support for Hypothesis 2 as there are no significant effects for female performers or groups that included both males and females. The positive changes noted above for women in the field of country music have apparently offset the challenges that they faced initially in this field.

Model 5 offers a full model that inspects the combination of all contemporaneous valorization and performer attributes. In this model, there is now support for Hypothesis 1 because membership in the Grand Ole Opry has a positive, significant effect on waiting time to induction. Net of other factors, for those awaiting their induction, membership in this critically important organization raises induction chances by a factor of 3, thereby reducing the waiting time. Interestingly enough, once controlling for the impact of the Grand Ole Opry, the divide between Nashville and the West Coast now comes into view: each CMA Entertainer of the Year award makes a performer 2.76 times as likely to be inducted in a given year than those performers without the award, with this increased likelihood shortening the wait time for induction. In contrast, each ACM Single of the Year award has significant, negative effects on the likelihood of induction. Specifically, for each award a performer has won, they are 76% less likely as those performers without ACM Single of the Year awards to be inducted each year, putting them on a downward trajectory with regards to wait time. Therefore, this model offers support for both Hypotheses 2A and 2B. The one indicator of popular legitimacy that has significant

effects in Model 4, *Billboard* #1 country albums, has comparable though slightly larger effects in Model 5. Specifically, for those awaiting induction, every *Billboard* #1 album they performer earned would increase their likelihood of inclusion in coming years by 27%. This provides support for Hypothesis 4, but not of the other measures of popular legitimacy do. Finally, the full model offers continued support for Hypothesis 5 but not Hypothesis 4. Net of such factors as having hit albums and CMA awards, black performers awaiting induction faced reduced chances in a given year. Small wonder, then, that DeFord Bailey waited 78 years for his eventual induction.

Conclusion

While there has previously been research on the effects of gender and different forms of legitimacy on cultural consecration in popular music (Schmutz and Faupel 2010), this chapter offers the first insights regarding the effects of race, gender, and legitimacy on cultural consecration in country music. It is important to examine the field of country music because it is marked by more solidarity than is the field of rock; hence, it provides an interesting laboratory in which to test the import of valorization on consecration. The Country Music Hall of Fame has a long history and plays a prominent role as a consecrating organization in country music, and the choices it makes both reflect and help to shape the field of country music. The findings in this chapter help us to better understand how an agency of consecration operates, particularly the order in which it celebrated exemplary performers.

This study shows that the factors that influence cultural consecration in the CMHOF differ in some significant ways from previous research that has examined

cultural consecration in rock music. Previously, research on gender in country music has largely been qualitative and has provided a complex picture of gender, in which women are disadvantaged in some dimensions, yet making strides towards equality in others (Bufwack and Oermann 2003; Pecknold and McCusker 2016; Wolfe and Akenson 2003). In the CMHOF, among those eventually inducted, women do not face the same hurdles in having their work consecrated as they do in rock music. These findings provide important new insights into the field of country music, as they are evidence that the work of women is not devalued in the most visible consecrating organization in country music.

Standing in stark contrast to the gender equality found in the CMHOF, this project has revealed that those few African Americans who have been consecrated nonetheless faced a long road to get there. Thus, while the CMHOF sees all the performers in this dataset as worthy of consecration, it does clearly privilege white performers over black performers—both in terms of raw numbers and of wait time. This suggests that the racial lines that were drawn in folk music almost a century ago continue to have an impact on the field of country music today (Roy 2002, 2004). It also offers quantitative evidence regarding why there is a dearth of black performers in the field of country music. These findings add to previous research on the impact of race on success in music. Previous research examining the effects of race on the careers of performers in popular music from 1940-1990 (Dowd and Blyler 2002) and jazz (Dowd & Pinheiro 2013) has revealed that, overall, that black performers face either improving opportunities (popular music) or are centrally located rather than marginalized (jazz). Therefore, country music unfortunately stands apart from this genres in its treatment of black performers.

Critical legitimacy in the form of membership in the Grand Ole Opry has no isolated effects on consecration, but in Model 5, which examines the effects of race, gender, and legitimacy in conjunction with one another, critical legitimacy has a significant positive impact. Although this measure of critical legitimacy differs from measures used in other research on cultural consecration in popular music, it is most appropriate based on the strong boundaries that are characteristic of the field of country music and the value placed on history in country music (Peterson 2013). Subsequently, this project calls for further research on the specific ways that cultural legitimacy may be extended in various fields of music.

The effects of professional legitimacy on cultural consecration in the CMHOF offer new insights regarding the importance of Nashville in country music. In both Model 3 and 5, four of the six measures have no significant effects on consecration. This indicates that the impact of professional legitimacy on cultural consecration is limited. In Model 3, which only examines the effects of professional legitimacy in the form of ACM and CMA award-wins, ACM awards have no significant effects, and CMA Single and Entertainer of the Year positively impact cultural consecration. In Model 5, ACM Single of Year has a significant, yet negative effect on consecration, while the CMA Entertainer of the Award continues to have significant, positive effects. Collectively, these results indicate that while the impact of professional legitimacy is not great, those performers with Nashville-based CMA awards are favored over those performers with California-based ACM awards. This suggests that the centrality and importance of Nashville and the Nashville-sound reaches into the CMHOF (Price 2015).

Popular legitimacy in the form of short-term success positively influences cultural consecration in the CMHOF. In both models, only *Billboard* #1 country albums have a significant, positive impact on cultural consecration. All other forms of popular legitimacy had no effect on cultural consecration. This indicates that the voting body is less concerned with those performers who have had long-term popular success. They do not need, for example, the confirmation or external support that comes from country music that has sales in the millions

When thinking about cultural legitimacy and the Country Music Hall of Fame more broadly, two important patterns are evident in my quantitative analysis. First, as discussed in Chapter Two, the field of country music is marked by relatively high solidarity—especially when compared to the field of rock music. It is that solidarity that enabled the CHMOF to be less than clear and transparent in its induction processes over the years without generating controversy. This solidarity is also evident in the event history analysis results: all three types of legitimacy, for the most part, work in concert. That is, critical, professional and popular legitimacy all have positive effects on waiting time to induction. This shows a convergence of opinion among a critical body (the Opry), fellow musicians and audiences. Second, that solidarity does not mean, however, that there are no divisions within the field of country music. Indeed, in this high solidarity field, the division between Nashville and the West Coast nonetheless remains palpable. Those performers wining the ACM Single of the Year, hence, have longer wait times for induction net of all the other types of legitimacy they accrued. Such findings thus resonate with others who call for a nuanced understanding of the interplay between these forms of legitimacy in fields of cultural production, moving beyond the default approach

of treating popular legitimacy as being at odds with the critical and professional legitimacy (Schmutz & van Venrooij 2017). This is a theme I take up further in the following chapter.

REFERENCES

Allen, Michael Patrick and Anne E. Lincoln. 2004. "Critical Discourse and the Cultural Consecration of American Films." *Social Forces* 82 (3): 871–894.

Allison, Paul D. 2010. *Survival Analysis Using SAS: A Practical Guide.* Second edition. Cary, NC: SAS Institute.

Altman, Billy. 1997. "Women in Music: Country Ain't What It Used to Be." Pages 255-257 in *Facing Difference: Race, Gender, and Mass Media*, edited by Shirley Biagi and Marilyn Kern-Foxworth. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Andsager, Julie L. and Kimberly Roe. 1999. "Country Music Video in the Country's Year of the Woman." *Journal of Communication* 49 (1): 69–82.

Baumann, Shyon. 2001. "Intellectualization and Art World Development: Film in the United States." *American Sociological Review* 66 (3): 404-426.

Bennett, Andy. 2009. "'Heritage Rock': Rock Music, Representation and Heritage Discourse." *Poetics* 37 (5–6): 474–489.

Bergesen, Albert. 1984. "The Semantic Equation: A Theory of the Social Origins of Art Styles." *Sociological Theory* 2: 187–221.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1993. *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*. Edited by Randal Johnson. New York: Columbia University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1996. *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*. Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1999. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Translated by Matthew Adamson. Edited by John Thompson. Translated by Gino Raymond. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Braden, Laura E. 2009. "From the Armory to Academia: Careers and Reputations of Early Modern Artists in the United States." *Poetics* 37 (5–6): 439–455.

Bufwack, Mary A., and Robert K. Oermann. 2003. *Finding Her Voice: Women in Country Music, 1800-2000*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

Chandler, C.R. and H. Paul Chalfant. 1985. "The Sexual Double Standard in Country Music Song Lyrics." *Free Inquiry in Creative Sociology* 13 (2): 155–159.

Country Music Association. 2017. "About CMA." 2017. *CMA World.* http://www.cmaworld.com/about-cma/. Accessed June 28, 2017.

DeNora, Tia. 2002. "Music into Action: Performing Gender on the Viennese Concert Stage, 1790–1810." *Poetics* 30 (1-2): 19–33.

DiMaggio, Paul. 1991. "Cultural Entrepreneurship in Nineteenth-Century Boston." Pages 374-397 in *Rethinking Popular Culture,* edited by Chandra Mukerji and Michael Schudson. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Dobbin, Frank and Timothy J. Dowd. 2000. "The Market that Antitrust Built: Public Policy, Private Coercion, and Railroad Acquisitions, 1825 to 1922." *American Sociological Review* 65: 631-657.

Dowd, Timothy J. 2003. "Structural Power and the Construction of Markets: The Case of Rhythm and Blues." *Comparative Social Research* 21: 147–201.

Dowd, Timothy J. 2004. "Concentration and Diversity Revisited: Production Logics and the US Mainstream Recording Market, 1940-1990." *Social Forces* 82 (4): 1411–1455.

Dowd, Timothy J. 2005. "From 78s to MP3s: The Embeddedness of Technology and the US Market for Prerecorded Music." Pages 205-224 in *The Business of Culture: Emerging Perspectives on Entertainment, Media and Other Industries,* edited by Joseph Lampel, Jamal Shamsie and Teresa Lant. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Dowd, Timothy J. and Maureen Blyler. 2002. "Charting Race: The Success of Black Performers in the Mainstream Recording Market, 1940 to 1990." *Poetics* 30 (1-2): 87–110.

Dowd, Timothy J., Kathleen Liddle, Kim Lupo and Anne Borden. 2002. "Organizing the Musical Canon: The Repertoires of Major US Symphony Orchestras, 1842 to 1969." *Poetics* 30 (1-2): 35-61.

Ennis, Phillip. 1992. *The Seventh Stream: The Emergence of Rocknroll in American Popular Music.* Hanover, NH: Wesleyan University Press.

Escott, Colin and Vince Gill. 2006. *The Grand Ole Opry: The Making of an American Icon*. New York: Center Street.

Fine, Gary Alan. 1996. "Reputational Entrepreneurs and the Memory of Incompetence: Melting Supporters, Partisan Warriors, and Images of President Harding." *American Journal of Sociology* 101 (5): 1159–1193.

Fox, Aaron A. 2004. *Real Country: Music and Language in Working-Class Culture*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Gillett, Charlie. 2011. *The Sound of the City: The Rise of Rock & Roll*. Third revised edition. London: Souvenir Press.

Grand Ole Opry. 2017. "Opry Membership." http://www.opry.com/oprymembership. Retrieved May 24, 2017.

Greenfield, Liah. 1989. *Different Worlds: A Sociological Study of Taste, Choice and Success in Art.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hansen, Christine H. and Ranald D. Hansen. 1988. "How Rock Music Videos Can Change What Is Seen When Boy Meets Girl: Priming Stereotypic Appraisal of Social Interactions." *Sex Roles* 19 (5-6): 287–316.

Holt, Fabian. 2007. *Genre in Popular Music*. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press.

Lamont, Michèle, and Marcel Fournier, editors. 1992. *Cultivating Differences: Symbolic Boundaries and the Making of Inequality*. University of Chicago Press.

Lang, Gladys Engel and Kurt Lang. 1988. "Recognition and Renown: The Survival of Artistic Reputation." *American Journal of Sociology* 94 (1): 79-109.

LA Times Staff. 2016. "Country Cousins: What's the Difference between CMA and ACM Awards?" http://goldderby.latimes.com/awards_goldderby/2005/11/country_cousins_1.html. Retrieved October 12, 2016.

Malone, Bill C. 2006. *Don't Get above Your Raisin': Country Music and the Southern Working Class*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Malone, Bill C. and Jocelyn R. Neal. 2010. *Country Music, U.S.A.* Third revised edition. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Mann, Geoff. 2008. "Why Does Country Music Sound White? Race and the Voice of Nostalgia." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 31 (1): 73–100.

Neal, Jocelyn. 2003. "The Voice behind the Song: Faith Hill, Country Music, and Reflexive Identity." Pages 109-130 in *The Women of Country Music: A Reader*, edited by Charles K. Wolfe and James Edward Akenson. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.

Negus, Keith and Patria Román Velázquez. 2002. "Belonging and Detachment: Musical Experience and the Limits of Identity." *Poetics* 30 (1-2): 133-145.

Pachucki, Mark A., Sabrina Pendergrass, and Michèle Lamont. 2007. "Boundary Processes: Recent Theoretical Developments and New Contributions." *Poetics* 35 (6): 331–351.

Pecknold, Diane and Kristen M. McCusker, editors. 2016. *Country Boys and Redneck Women: New Essays in Gender and Country Music*. Jackson, MI: University Press of Mississippi.

Petersen, Trond. 1993. "Recent Advances in Longitudinal Methodology." *Annual Review of Sociology* 19 (1): 425–54.

Peterson, Richard A. 1990. "Why 1955? Explaining the Advent of Rock Music." *Popular Music* 9 (1): 97–116.

Peterson, Richard A. 2004. "The Dialectic of Hard-Core and Soft-Shell Country Music." Pages 87-99 in *Popular Music: Critical Concepts in Media and Cultural Studies*, edited by Simon Frith. Milton Park: Psychology Press.

Peterson, Richard A. 2013. *Creating Country Music: Fabricating Authenticity*. E-book. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Peterson, Richard A. and David G. Berger. 1975. "Cycles in Symbol Production: The Case of Popular Music." *American Sociological Review*, 158–173.

Peterson, Richard A. and Russell B. Davis, Jr. 1978. "The Contemporary American Radio Audience." *Popular Music and Society* 6 (2): 169–83.

Pinheiro, Diogo L. and Timothy J. Dowd. 2009. "All That Jazz: The Success of Jazz Musicians in Three Metropolitan Areas." *Poetics* 37 (5–6): 490–506.

Price, Robert E. 2015. *The Bakersfield Sound: How a Generation of Displaced Okies Revolutionized American Music*. Ebook. iUniverse.

Regev, Motti. 2013. *Pop-Rock Music: Aesthetic Cosmopolitanism in Late Modernity*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Roy, William G. 2002. "Aesthetic Identity, Race, and American Folk Music." *Qualitative Sociology* 25 (3): 459–469.

Roy, William G. and Timothy J. Dowd. 2010. "What Is Sociological About Music?" *Annual Review of Sociology* 36: 183-203.

Scardaville, Melissa C. 2009. "High Art, No Art: The Economic and Aesthetic Legitimacy of US Soap Operas." *Poetics* 37 (4): 366–382.

Schmutz, Vaughn. 2005. "Retrospective Cultural Consecration and Popular Music: *Rolling Stone's* Greatest Albums of All Time." *American Behavioral Scientist* 48(11): 1510-1523.

Schmutz, Vaughn. 2009. "Social and Symbolic Boundaries in Newspaper Coverage of Music, 1955–2005: Gender and Genre in the US, France, Germany, and the Netherlands." *Poetics* 37 (4): 298–314.

Schmutz, Vaughn, and Alison Faupel. 2010. "Gender and Cultural Consecration in Popular Music." *Social Forces* 89 (2): 685–707.

Schmutz, Vaughn and Alex van Venrooij. 2017. "Harmonizing Forms of Legitimacy in the Consecration of Popular Music." Unpublished manuscript. Department of Sociology, University of North Carolina at Charlotte.

Schmutz, Vaughn, Alex van Venrooij, Susanne Janssen, and Marc Verboord. 2010. "Change and Continuity in Newspaper Coverage of Popular Music since 1955: Evidence from the United States, Germany and the Netherlands." *Popular Music and Society* 33 (4): 501-515.

Wilson, Janelle. 2000. "Women in Country Music Videos." *ETC: A Review of General Semantics* 57 (3): 290–303.

Wolfe, Charles K. 2003. "'And No Man Shall Control Me': The Strange Case of Roba Stanley, Country's First Woman Recording Star." Pages 18-29 in *The Women of Country Music: A Reader*, edited by Charles K. Wolfe and James Edward Akenson. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.

Wolfe, Charles K. and James Edward Akenson. 2003. *The Women of Country Music: A Reader*. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.

Wolfe, Charles K. 2015. *A Good-Natured Riot: The Birth of the Grand Ole Opry*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

TABLE 3-A

Descriptive Statistics for Independent Variables Used in the Event History Analysis of
Waiting Time to Induction for Country Music Hall of Fame Musicians.

Variable	*N*	*%*	*Mean*	*Range*
Grand Ole Opry Membership	53	61.6	--	--
CMA Album of the Year Win	--	--	0.1251	0 - 4
CMA Song of the Year Win	--	--	0.0423	0 - 1
CMA Entertainer of the Year Win	--	--	0.1556	0 - 4
ACM Album of the Year Win	--	--	0.0788	0 - 3
ACM Song of the Year Win	--	--	0.0734	0 - 2
ACM Entertainer of the Year Win	--	--	0.1323	0 - 6
Country *Billboard* #1 Single	--	--	3.3553	0 - 39
Country *Billboard #1* Album	--	--	1.1804	0 - 20
Gold Album	--	--	1.0173	0 - 30
Platinum Album	--	--	1.1499	0 - 43
Female Performer	12	14%	--	--
Mixed Gender Group	1	1.2%	--	--
Black Performer	2	2.3%	--	--

Total number of inducted performers = 86.
Total number of performer-years prior to induction = 3476.

TABLE 3-B

Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Performer Attributes and Contemporary Valorization (N = 3,476 Performer-Years).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1													
2	-0.044												
3	-0.072	-0.020											
4	0.158	-0.133	0.153										
5	-0.088	-0.025	-0.041	-0.152									
6	-0.099	-0.028	-0.046	-0.073	0.588								
7	0.018	-0.023	-0.038	0.004	0.645	0.248							
8	-0.096	-0.027	-0.044	0.042	0.461	0.379	0.348						
9	-0.083	-0.024	-0.038	-0.027	0.441	0.512	0.386	0.494					
10	0.089	-0.035	0.028	0.075	0.585	0.306	0.800	0.498	0.397				
11	0.022	-0.046	0.117	-0.117	0.614	0.526	0.432	0.452	0.503	0.522			
12	0.028	-0.053	0.077	0.045	0.453	0.309	0.381	0.631	0.340	0.533	0.737		
13	0.037	-0.039	0.125	-0.122	0.104	0.206	0.024	0.166	0.127	0.154	0.481	0.357	
14	-0.024	-0.029	-0.047	-0.157	0.509	0.321	0.406	0.318	0.41	0.399	0.561	0.357	0.679

1 = Female, 2 = Mixed Gender Group, 3 = Black, 4 = Grand Ole Opry Membership, 5 = ACM Album Wins, 6 = ACM Single Wins, 7 = ACM Entertainer Wins, 8 = CMA Album Wins, 9 = CMA Single Wins, 10 = CMA Entertainer Wins, 11 = #1 *Billboard* Country Album, 12 = #1 *Billboard* Country Single, 13 = RIAA Gold Albums, 14 = RIAA Platinum Albums

TABLE 3-C

Event History Analysis for the Effects of Contemporaneous Valorization and Performer Attributes on Waiting Time for Induction into the Country Music Hall of Fame.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Critical Legitimacy					
Grand Ole Opry	1.500				3.389**
Professional Legitimacy					
ACM Album of the Year Win		1.751			2.729
ACM Single of the Year Win		0.599			0.243*
ACM Entertainer of the Year Win		0.649			0.566
CMA Album of the Year Win		0.925			0.682
CMA Single of the Year Win		4.043*			2.640
CMA Entertainer of the Year Win		3.055**			2.760**
Popular Legitimacy					
Billboard #1 Country Album			1.126*		1.274**
Billboard #1 Country Single			1.026		0.991
RIAA Platinum-certified Album			1.003		0.933
RIAA Gold-certified Album			0.980		1.115
				1.070	0.655
Performer Attributes				1.733	6.239
Female				0.160*	0.047**
Mixed Gender					
Black	.033*	.071	.000**	.000**	.000**
Model Significance	1011.108	1019.778	998.453	1000.593	956.733
Log Likelihood					

*p<.05
**p<.01
N = 3,476 performer-years

CHAPTER FOUR:

THOSE WHO ROCKED:

INDUCTION INTO THE ROCK AND ROLL HALL OF FAME

Introduction

While rock music emerged from the confluence of already existing musical genres—such as country and rhythm and blues—it nonetheless disrupted the music industries on which it was unleashed in the mid 1950s (Ennis 1992; Peterson 1990). As was the case with country music, it was small record and radio companies that championed this new genre of rock. Large companies in the record, radio and publishing industries were slow to embrace what they saw as more a "fad" than a sign of things to come. Yet, the tremendous success of rock music led the large companies to change their tune. Just like they did with country music—though on a grander scale with rock—large record companies began establishing numerous labels[39] to address this new genre and the sizable demand existing for it among young listeners (Dowd, 2003, 2004). Yet, unlike in the case of country music, these record companies did not focus on a particular place, as rock music was occurring in pockets all around the country (Gillett 2011). From the mid 1950s to the 1980s, the number of labels addressing rock music greatly expanded, and the

[39] As noted in Chapter Three (see footnote 36), record labels are entities that release musical recordings. Since the 1950s especially, large record firms tend to have multiple labels that they own, as well as multiple labels owned by others to which they are contractually linked. Large record firms have used their collection of labels (which can reach more than 50 for a given record firm) to target specific genres and audiences with particular performers. They used this approach, for example, to address rock music as it emerged in the 1950s and expanded greatly in the 1960s and 1970s. (Dowd 2004; Peterson and Berger 1975).

number of rock performers did so too, as did the audience demand for it (Dowd 2004). That was the context in which the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame was established.

While the founding of the Country Music Hall of Fame was arguably an effort to defend and promote the genre as it was threatened by young people's exodus in favor of rock n' roll (Peterson 2013), the same could not be argued for the founding of Rock and Roll Hall of Fame in 1983. On the one hand, the R&RHOF was founded when the economic legitimacy of rock music was thriving rather than threatened. Although the record business as a whole experienced a recession from 1979 to 1982 (Dowd 2004; Dowd & Blyler 2002), rock music seemingly boomed during the late 1970s and 1980s: it was spawning new sub-genres (Bennett 2007; Lena & Peterson 2008) and generally experiencing great popularity (Eddy 1997). On the other hand, unlike the CMHOF, the R&RHOF was established well after the rise of popular music criticism addressing contemporary genres like rock, soul, and later hip hop (see Binder 1993). In fact, during the 1960s, and especially during the 1970s and 1980s, critical coverage of rock in newspapers grew considerably on both sides of the Atlantic, as well as above and below the equator (Regev 2013; Schmutz 2009; Schmutz, van Venrooij, Janssen & Verboord 2010). The genre that the R&RHOF represented was thus fairly well situated in terms of its cultural legitimacy (i.e., its aesthetic worth rather than its economic worth). Yet, for its enthusiasts, rock still deserved even more cultural legitimacy (Bennett 2007).[40]

[40] According to Baumann (2007), legitimacy should not be conceived as a dichotomous variable. Rather, legitimacy may vary depending on both time and on different social groups' judgment.

Consecration and Artistic Legitimation

While the Country Music Hall of Fame itself arguably launched the consecration project for country music (see Chapters Two and Three), the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame was established in the middle of such a project for rock music. The ongoing project for rock was made possible by developments in both broader society and the record industry, as well as by an emerging "legitimating ideology" offered by critics (Baumann 2001, 2007; Santoro 2002). Though stemming from both country and rhythm and blues, rock began as a revolutionary musical genre. It was the music of a young generation who were experiencing a cultural shift away from the staid traditionalism of the 1950s, and the genre itself represented a counter-cultural and counter-hegemonic movement (Bennett 2009). The political turmoil of the 1960s compounded that shift: some audience members wanted serious lyrics and music that addressed and critiqued serious times (Unterberger 2002; see also Santoro 2002). The shift was even further compounded by the expanding education of this young generation of listeners—college students and graduates were gravitating towards rock music of a more "intellectual" nature (Bennett 2013).

From the 1960s onward, then, rock music was increasingly considered more than easy (if not loud and raucous) entertainment; for many members of its young and growing audience, it was considered a type of "art"—music that deserves thoughtful listening and music that both addresses its times while rising above them in transcendent fashion (Gillett 2011; van Venrooij & Schmutz 2010). Furthermore, those creating the music were more than entertainers; they were artists in the eyes and ears of their fans. The genre's intent was to be culturally subversive, and this could only be achieved if the music was being created by autonomous individuals who were creating "art for art's

sake" (Regev 1994) rather than with primary intention of earning large sales. This view of rock musicians as artists was reinforced in the mid to late 1960s when many musicians and bands, including The Beach Boys and The Beatles, began experimenting with their sound and controlling more aspects of the creative process. Executives at large record firms took notice of these changes. As a result, they sometimes granted more freedom and control to performers with a proven track record, which in turn allowed those performers to create more diverse music that expanded what rock could entail (Regev 2013; also Dowd 2000).

Amidst these changes in the broader society and the record industry, critics at established periodicals offered a "legitimating ideology" (Baumann 2001) regarding why rock music is indeed a form of art. On the one hand, they helped legitimate rock music by offering increasing coverage of it in the pages of their periodicals—signaling its worthiness by way of extended consideration (Schmutz 2009). On the other hand, these critics also described and evaluated rock music in terms once used for classical music—putting it on par with such past greats (van Venrooij & Schmutz 2010). Furthermore, critics in the media helped to support the argument that rock was an art form by framing the performers themselves as "artists" (Bennett 2009). Those cited as great "auteurs" in music are generally white men, including the likes of Bob Dylan, Elvis Costello, and later, Jeff Tweedy of Wilco (Regev 2013; see als Schmutz & Faupel 2010). What occurred for rock beginning in the 1960s thus looks like what Baumann details (2007, p. 60) as necessary for legitimation:

> Discrete areas of cultural production attain legitimacy as art…during periods of high cultural opportunity through mobilizing material or institutional resources and through the discourse that frames the cultural production as legitimate art according to one or more preexisting ideologies.

While the consecration project for rock has been ongoing for decades, agencies of consecration like the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame now do much of the heavy lifting in further legitimizing the genre (Bennett 2009). This is because the hall and its voters serve as "reputational entrepreneurs" that seek to legitimize rock by creating an edited history of those performers who are emblematic of the genre and all that the genre holds dear (see Chapter Two; Fine 1996). As Regev (1994, p. 86) points out: "…the position which holds the authority to present cultural products as fulfilling these requirements, thereby granting them artistic recognition, enjoys monumental influence. This is the production of meaning position."

The Standing of an Agency of Consecration

While Regev (1994) asserts the standing in the broader field that an organization like the Rock & Roll Hall of Fame enjoys, Allen and Parsons (2006) emphasize that its standing is based upon four factors: First, as previously mentioned, like the CMHOF, the induction panel of the R&RHOF includes music historians as well other experts within the field. Furthermore, the R&RHOF was founded by Ahmet Ertegun—cofounder and one-time chairman of Atlantic Records, and members of its board included Jann Wenner, editor and publisher of *Rolling Stone* magazine, as well as record company executives Seymour Stein, Noreen Woods, and Bob Krasnow. Second, the criteria for induction into the R&RHOF are rigorous. Performers only become eligible 25 years after the release of their first record, and they must demonstrate musical excellence and be perceived as having a lasting impact on the rock music field. Third, the R&RHOF selects very few performers each year for induction, which makes it a highly selective process that

suggests great value and respect is given to each performer that is deemed worthy of induction. Fourth, the attention given to each year's induction process and ceremony suggests that the public puts value on the selections made by the R&RHOF because they perceive those who have been inducted as objectively different from those who have not been inducted (see Chapter Two). Given such factors, we would expect that the R&RHOF is able to exert significant influence on the broader society. Indeed, the R&RHOF and those who run it are reputational entrepreneurs who attempt to control the social construction of which performers we come to believe are worthy of remembrance.

That being said, the R&RHOF operates in a field that has less solidarity than that found in the field of country music (see Chapters Two and Three). That, in turn, creates challenges for this agency of consecration, particularly regarding its suspected commercialism. The R&RHOF has frequently been the object of criticism due to the perceived incongruities between the commonly held artistic values of rock music and the performers that the hall of fame has selected for induction. Professionals in the music industry, including performers, and critics have both accused the hall of fame of fame of failing to induct performers who have played critical roles in rock while inducting other performers who have experienced large amounts of popular success (Boehm 2009; Reilly 2014). At the same time, rock fans have questioned the choices made by the hall of fame due to its failure or reticence (based on length of time performers have waited after becoming eligible) to induct some performers. In fact, to address that particular concern, in 2012 the hall of fame created the "Fan Vote" in which the public votes on the performers who have been nominated for induction (Yarborough 2013). While the winner of the fan vote only receives the equivalent of one vote from the usual body of over 900

expert voters—namely historians, critics, performers, etc.—it does provide the fans a voice. The R&RHOF, then, experiences criticism from both directions, with professionals and critics arguing that the hall of fame places too much focus on popular legitimacy and the public feeling that popular opinions are overlooked. This creates an ideal opportunity, then, to see how the three forms of contemporaneous legitimacy—especially that involving commercial success—combine to shape the retrospective consecration offered by the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame.

One point is necessary before proceeding, however. As is the case for the Country Music Hall of Fame, the consecration project of the R&RHOF is an on-going process rather than one-time affair. As a result, once performers pass the eligibility requirements (i.e., 25 years since first recording), they may be inducted immediately, be inducted a few or many years later, or may not be inducted at all. Amidst this waiting period, furthermore, these performers may still be actively pursuing their careers. The event history analysis that I provide below addresses the temporal nature of the ongoing consecration project—including the wait time for induction, monitoring of all annual activity prior to induction (what are called "time-varying attributes"), and accounting for those who are never inducted (what are called "right censored" cases; Allison 2010). I do this in two sets of analyses. The first set replicates what I did in Chapter Three: I focus on the waiting time to induction for the 196 performers who eventually were consecrated in the R&RHOF from 1986 to 2015. The second set of analyses then considers a broader sample of performers so as to assess the likelihood of being inducted versus not being inducted. The second set, then, resembles previous studies that examine retrospective consecration in rock (Schmutz 2005; Schmutz & Faupel 2010; Schmutz & van Venrooij

2017). However, my research also differs from theirs in that I only analyze performers who are eligible for induction (i.e., those who released their first record at least 25 years ago). Hence, my sample deals more with those performers who have already stood the test of time, so to speak.

From Valorization to Consecration

Scholars of retrospective consecration examine how contemporaneous evaluation matters for who and what get celebrated years later as the "best of the best" (Allen & Lincoln 2004; Braden 2009). Of course, many people have opinions regarding various musicians and musical works, but those studying retrospective consecration acknowledge that certain opinions matter more than others. Critics supposedly have well-studied expertise and familiarity with the historical arc of a given genre, and their informed status as careful observers gives them credibility (Chong 2011; Schmutz & van Venrooij 2010). Fellow professionals have first-hand knowledge of the difficulties and goals involved in the creation of music and other cultural objects, which gives their opinions considerable weight (Becker 2008; Corse & Griffin 1991). Finally, the collective impact of the buying public gives those people a powerful voice, as well (Negus 1999; Peterson and Anand 2004). From those three types of people spring the key types of contemporaneous valorization: critical legitimacy, professional legitimacy, and popular legitimacy (Bourdieu 1993).

In Chapter Three, I examined in detail how critical legitimacy, professional legitimacy, and popular legitimacy matter for retrospective cultural consecration. I refer the reader there for justification of the hypotheses regarding the effects of cultural

legitimacy on retrospective consecration in the R&RHOF. For the sake of comparison, I will be examining the same hypotheses in this chapter regarding contemporaneous valorization. The only difference is I will also be examining the effect that these different forms of legitimacy have on the overall likelihood of being inducted, in addition to the likelihood amongst a body of inductees, which can be conceptualized as wait time. I am able to expand on the analysis in Chapter Three due to data availability.

> ***Hypothesis 1****: Critical legitimacy (i.e., touted by critics) will (a) lessen the "wait time" to induction in the Rock and Rock Hall of Fame for eventual inductees and (b) increase the likelihood of induction among a sample of performers in a given year.*
>
> ***Hypothesis 2****: Professional legitimacy (i.e., honored by peers) will (a) lessen the "wait time" to induction in the Rock and Rock Hall of Fame for eventual inductees and (b) increase the likelihood of induction among a sample of performers in a given year.*
>
> ***Hypothesis 3****: Popular legitimacy (i.e., bought by public) will (a) lessen the "wait time" to induction in the Rock and Rock Hall of Fame for eventual inductees and (b) increase the likelihood of induction among a sample of performers in a given year.*

For purposes of this chapter, I will continue to emphasize a related point to the one made in Chapter Three. The three forms of legitimacy may be at odds, working against one another, or, as Schmutz & van Venrooij (2017) found, they may actually work together. That is of interest because, as seen in Chapter Three, elements of each of the three forms of legitimacy all combined to speed up the process by which performers

were inducted into the CMHOF. Specifically, those performers who possessed high amounts of each form of contemporaneous valorization were more quickly inducted that hall of fame. This begs the question: will a similar pattern be found in the R&RHOF? The historical information suggests so when we consider the following musicians who enjoyed the shortest wait times for induction: for example, The Rolling Stones, R.E.M., Bruce Springsteen, The Beach Boys, and Bob Dylan: all of them are also marked by having high amounts of each form of cultural legitimacy.

Existing scholarship provides a somewhat complicated view for rock music, thereby tempering notions that all three types of contemporaneous valorization will work in concert with regards to induction into the Rock and Rock Hall of Fame. Given previous research on rock music, it seems highly likely that critical legitimacy will play a positive role in this consecration project. In the US context, rock music has experienced a massive increase in legitimacy based on the amount of newspaper coverage it has received (Schmutz 2009). Rock critics have played a significant role in creating a discourse that has elevated the discussion and appreciation of this genre, resulting in it often being viewed as art rather than mere entertainment (Bennett 2007, 2009; Regev 1997, 2013). Some musicians, as mentioned earlier, are seen as auteurs and are likely to receive critical legitimacy because they are perceived as creating "art." While those performers' works are not necessarily created with public acceptance as the ultimate goal—but rather to address some pressing musical and/or social issues—critics nevertheless are likely to appreciate and celebrate their work (Schmutz & Faupel 2010). The legitimacy, then, that critics can bestow upon cultural products frequently has a

positive influence on the likelihood of a performer's work being consecrated in the field of rock (Schmutz 2005; Schmutz & Faupel 2010; Schmutz & van Venrooij 2017).

The picture becomes murkier, however, when turning to professional legitimacy in the field of rock. There is a common discourse in this field that "serious" rock musicians are focused intently on their craft—seeing themselves as artists, and inspiring others to do so too (Regev 1994, 1997). Because of this, many in the field claim to value and seek specific legitimacy (i.e., recognition of their peers) and want to place themselves firmly in this artistic mix, so to speak. To do this, they distance themselves from concerns with popular legitimacy and the economic field of production because creating music with specific aims to be marketable is seen as distasteful and as offering little cultural value. Furthermore, as being an "auteur" is valued in the music field (Regev 2013) just as it is valued in film (Allen & Lincoln 2004), having outside influences in creating music, particularly with commercial aims, is frowned upon. Seen in this light, accruing professional legitimacy (i.e., approving recognition from peers) should bode well of rock musicians' future consecration. Yet, there is a dark side to all this: Musicians also want to defend their standing in a field and, when confronted with new peers and new trends, they may close ranks, thereby withholding their recognition (Bourdieu 1993).

The picture becomes even murkier when we consider commercial legitimacy and whether or not it will work in concert with the other two forms of legitimacy. Commercialism has been a major force in rock music since its birth in the 1950s (Dowd, Liddle, & Blyler 2005; Peterson 1990). In fact, the likes of Elvis Presley, Chuck Berry, and Buddy Holly were all commercially successful teen idols (Regev 2013), all of whom were also inducted in the original 1986 Rock and Roll Hall of Fame class. To invoke the

terminology found at the end of Chapter One, these three musicians were simultaneously "pop music" (commercial) and "rock music" (rebellious and artistic). This pop-versus-rock tension that began in the 1950s continued to be blurred in the 1970s with "artists such as David Bowie and Alice Cooper who…were, artistically speaking, leading a double life" (Bennett 2007, p. 18), as both commercially successful performers and "serious" rock artists. Such "double lives" demonstrate both the fact that economic and cultural legitimacy are seen at odds with one another, while also showing that artists often can and do attain both forms of legitimacy. Today, the commercial demarcation that had once marked the boundary between pop music and rock music has weakened over the period between 1985-86 and 2004-2005, evidenced by the blurring of the boundaries of two genres that, at least to critics, had once been considered highly important (van Venrooij 2009). Small wonder, then, that those albums that have been RIAA certified platinum are not subsequently disparaged but, instead, have been more likely to be consecrated whereas those albums that have reached #1 on the *Billboard* charts have been less likely to be consecrated (Schmutz 2005). This likely has to do with the fact those albums that have achieved platinum status have had sustained success, demonstrating an important role within the field. It remains to be seen, then, how these three types of contemporaneous valorization—critical, professional and popular—combine in shaping induction into the Rock and Rock Hall of Fame. Will they be at odds, or will they be in tandem?

Symbolic Boundaries and Retrospective Consecration

Scholars of retrospective consecration likewise consider not only the impact of contemporaneous evaluation but also the impact that both genre designations and the attributes of the performers themselves have upon the very way that they are remembered (Braden 2009; Dowd, Ryan and Tai 2016; Lang & Lang 1988; Schmutz & Faupel 2010). In other words, they argue that how we classify music and people ("symbolic boundaries") is intertwined with exclusionary practices found in the everyday world ("social boundaries;" see Lamont and Molnár 2002). This is an important argument to consider when approaching a musical genre that, on the one hand, is classified as porous and evolving (Lena & Peterson 2008; van Venrooij 2009) and, on the other, is classified as the domain of white, male musicians (Coates in Whiteley, 1997). Do those symbolic boundaries, in turn, shape the consecration project of the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame?

Genre and Boundaries

While the country music genre is marked by only a few divisions—such as those between hard core and soft-shell, between the Bakersfield versus the Nashville sounds (see Chapter Three), the rock music genre is marked not only a multitude of divisions (e.g., subgenres) but also by fuzzy borders with other genres (Lena & Peterson 2008; Lena 2012; van Venrooij 2009). This reflects, on the one hand, rock's roots: the genre was founded on the coming together of multiple musical traditions—including but not limited to country and R&B (Ennis 1992). This also reflects the subsequent trajectory of rock music, whereby many musicians have incorporated different genres on music into their work, proudly proclaiming the likes of blues and folk influences (Regev 2013).

However, others who are more purists in their approach to rock, viewing their genre as superior, have guarded and policed the boundaries between genres (Lena 2012). Rock is, in many ways, characterized between the push and pull of these two orientations towards other genres. Yet, even as that tension has played out, what Regev (2013) calls "pop rock"[41] has occupied the core of this morphing genre—representing the genre's artistic aspirations. Its centrality would continue into the 1980s and all the way to the 21st century (van Venrooij 2009). Even among a fuzzy genre like rock music, those classified as working at the heart of the genre ("pop rock") should be treated favorably in the consecration project—a point that Dowd and colleagues (2002) similarly find in the field of orchestral music. Among all inductees, pop rock performers averaged 7.32 years of wait time, with Madonna and The Ramones among those pop rock performers enjoying the shortest wait times.

> ***Hypothesis 4A****: Pop rock performers will have (a) a shorter "wait time" to induction in the Rock and Rock Hall of Fame for eventual inductees and (b) a greater likelihood of induction among a sample of performers in a given year.*

Cultural fields may experience a process of "declassification" in which the number of genres proliferate (DiMaggio 1991b), and that is what has happened for rock and popular music in general (Lena 2012). In order to accommodate the vast growth in genres, the differences between them becomes less and the overlap between genres increases. Thus, the blurring grows as the genres that Ennis (1992) described as the

---

[41] Recall from Chapter One that Regev (2013) and others use "pop rock" to describe rock music in positive terms, that which strives for artistry. That is distinct from the "pop" label that denotes commercialism and accessibility and, in turn, can have negative connotations.

source of rock have subsequently grown into other genres, as well—such that rhythm and blues, which helped spawn rock music, has likewise spawned hip-hop (Lena & Peterson 2008; Lena 2012). Changes in musical boundaries are of interest because as the perceived value of different genres begin to shift, so may the groups that they symbolically represent, which means that the fan base of pop or hip-hop may be less socially divided when there were distinct boundaries. In critical reviews published in newspapers, the lines between genres like hip-hop and rock do appear to be decreasing (van Venrooij 2009). Because of homologies between culture and social groups, this could indicate shifts in either/both the social value of these genres and the position of their audiences.

This leads us to ask if these changes and weakening in critical boundaries may lead to changes in those who are culturally consecrated? As critical legitimacy has proven important to being culturally consecrated elsewhere (Schmutz & Faupel 2010), perhaps these shifts may be reflected in further changes in the social composition in the halls of fame, particularly in the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame as rock appears to be seeing many of its boundaries weakened. Indeed, as the Gene Simmons complaint at the opening of this dissertation reveals, the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame has frequently been faced with discussion and debate over whether performers in genres other than rock music have a place in the hall of fame. This becomes particularly difficult to manage with the rock genre, which influences and is influenced by so many other genres. Furthermore, as the lines between genres are blurred, does it have neutral or even positive effects on the reception of those performers beyond the rock genre? In other words, what is the impact of symbolic classification of genres on the R&RHOF's consecration project? Given the hall's historical emphasis on the genre roots of rock (George-Warren 2001), and given

the merging boundaries of rock and hip hop (van Venrooij 2009), I hypothesize that performers in the following genres will also be treated favorably when compared to all others: the impact of a performer's genres on the likelihood of their induction is important as it offers insights into the kinds of boundary work that may be taking place.

> ***Hypothesis 4B****: R&B, country and rap performers will have (a) a shorter "wait time" to induction in the Rock and Rock Hall of Fame for eventual inductees and (b) a greater likelihood of induction among a sample of performers in a given year.*

Gender and Valorization in Rock Music

Women performers have occupied an uneasy position in the field of rock music. While able to rock, the way they have been classified by business personnel and others has tended to restrict their opportunities—such as when they are steered from rock to pop (Carson, Lewis & Shaw 2004; Clawson 1999; Roy & Dowd 2010). "Pop" music is distinct from "pop rock" as the former term has a second-rate cultural status (Chambers 1985, Regev 2013); that lower status is likely not due to its commercial nature alone. The distinctions that are made between what is considered "art" or legitimate culture are often linked to the groups with which it is associated (Pachucki, Pendergrass, & Lamont 2007). Pop music criticisms, then, are likely colored by pop music's association with femininity, particularly given the long history of easy-listening songstresses championed by record business executives (Dowd, Liddle & Blyler 2005; Whiteley 1997). That long history also maps somewhat onto audiences, as when females are found more likely to listen to pop music than males (Christenson & Peterson 1988). Such symbolic classifications—

what women performers should do—has implications for evaluation: music critics generally favor those genres that are more male dominated, which puts pop music as a disadvantage critically. Furthermore, when women are found in those genres, they tend to be ignored and "crowded out" by critical inattention, reinforcing the idea that certain genres are "male" (Schmutz 2009; Whiteley 2000). All of this confirms what Scardaville (2009) has argued: when a cultural object is gendered as "female" it can also taint its ability to be seen as art.

The symbolic classification of what women performers should do has had long term implications for both their careers and the consecration. As discussed in Chapter Three, women have faced an uphill battle in their attempts to work and to have their work consecrated in a variety of fields of cultural production (e.g., Braden 2009; Tuchman and Fortin 1984). The field of rock music has proven no more hospitable to women's careers than either the literary or art fields. In terms of commercial success over half a century, when a few record firms dominated the field of production in the 1940s and early 1950s, women had much less successful careers than did their male counterparts: this was partly because business personnel thought a few women performers were sufficient for the demand. Yet, as big record firms began to establish more and more labels to target the demand for rock music (see Chapter Two & Three), the career opportunities for women performers likewise expanded from the mid 1950s onwards. But there were still limits to those new opportunities: when women performers became too numerous, their numbers declined afterword—indicating a glass ceiling of sorts (Dowd, Liddle & Blyler 2005). Those limited opportunities translated to limits to their consecration. When examining a discrete act of consecration—inclusion in the *Rolling Stone* "500 Greatest Albums of All

Time" list—overall, women are far less likely to have their work consecrated than men. While that negative effect for albums made women disappears in later years, by 1983, women performers at that time still have unequal access to critical legitimacy, the very thing that helps consecration. Finally, for those women who are included in that list, they tend to be described in less glorious terms than their male counterparts, with their emotionality and their connections to men emphasized (Schmutz & Faupel 2010). Given all this, I expect women to fare less well with men in the consecration project of the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame. For example, while the first women inducted into the hall of fame—Aretha Franklin and the members of The Supremes—were inducted in1987 and 1988, respectively, the remaining 28 performers inducted between 1986 and 1988 were all men.

> ***Hypothesis 5****: Female performers will have (a) a longer "wait time" to induction in the Rock and Rock Hall of Fame for eventual inductees and (b) a reduced likelihood of induction among a sample of performers in a given year.*

Race and Valorization in Rock Music

African American performers have occupied a unique position in the fields of rock and popular music more generally. They have historically moved back and forth between the fuzzy boundaries of rhythm and blues and rock, for instance, sometimes enjoying highly successful careers in the process (Dowd 2003; Ennis 1992). Yet, given symbolic classifications that tend to conflate race and genre (Roy 2002, 2004), black performers have encountered a number of social boundaries in these fields. In terms of career opportunities, for example, black musicians faced changing fortunes throughout

the 20th century. As noted previously, giant corporations in the early recording and radio industries were reluctant to release their music—and largely did not do so until small record companies proved that there was a viable audience for these musicians (Dowd 2003). From the 1950s onward, black performers encountered both gains and challenges (Dowd & Blyler 2002). Just as female performing acts suffered from the domination of a few recording firms in the recording industry, black performers did as well, but just as women performers benefitted from the expansion of record labels, so too did black performers. Specifically, when production became more decentralized in the recording industry from the mid 1950s onward, black musicians experienced more success. There are also phenomena that uniquely affected black musicians. Black musicians' success was negatively affected by segregation in both the radio industry and in the musicians' union. With the demise of both forms of segregation, black performers enjoyed expanded career opportunities, and in turn, heightened commercial success. Interestingly, greater racial conflict in the US also increased the relative amounts of success that black musicians experienced, while the industry recession of 1979-1982 hampered their careers. We see, then, that while black performers have experienced some upswings in relative success from the 1950s onward, they also repeatedly encountered hurdles, as well. Indeed, Keith Negus (1999) finds that when giant record companies experience economic downturns, business efforts surrounding black musicians are among the first cuts.

Matters of race have also figured in the evaluation of genres, but we know less about how it does for retrospective consecration in the field of rock music. Note, for instance, that concerned citizens and others have classified the music of black performers

as being dangerous threats to society (Binder 1993). In fact, it was the linkage to black performers that prompted the original outcry in some quarters about the newly emergent rock'n'roll (Gillette 2011). Yet, in the field of rock—with its emphasis on rebellion—that so-called dangerousness could actually be a badge of honor (see Chapter Two). While I know of no study addressing black performers and retrospective consecration, historically-based research offers some clues about how they will fare. When African Americans play prominent roles in the founding of genres, they also tend to figure prominently in the histories set forth for those genres, as found in the cases of blues and jazz (Grazian 2005; Lopes 2002). To be sure, the contributions of black performers to rock's development are sometimes forgotten—despite the guitar-based accomplishments of such towering figures as Chuck Berry and Jimi Hendrix, among others. Indeed, that "forgetting" of the connection between African American performers and rock is what led frustrated musicians to establish the Black Rock Coalition (Mahon 2004). Yet, given the fact that R&RHOF, among other things, is setting forward a history of rock that respects its roots and tributaries, I expect that it will likewise look favorably on black performers. Indeed, Chuck Berry, Ray Charles and Marvin Gaye were among the first three classes of inductees in the R&RHOF.

> ***Hypothesis 6****: Black performers will have (a) a shorter "wait time" to induction in the Rock and Rock Hall of Fame for eventual inductees and (b) an increased likelihood of induction among a sample of performers in a given year.*

Intersections of Gender and Race in Music

Black women exist at the intersections of multiple systems of oppression, including (but not limited to) gendered and racial systems. The effects of these systems of oppression are numerous and complex, and they bleed through into culture and music. Music has been a way for black women to express themselves and tell their stories (Collins 2008), but it has also been one of the dimensions of their oppression. Early, in the days of Motown and soul music, black women experienced some marginalization, but they also encountered some opportunities to make their voices and perspectives heard (Posner 2005). The star example of this is the Queen of Soul, Aretha Franklin, who has led an incredibly successful career. She has received not only popular and professional recognition (Ritz 2015) but also critical recognition. However, the critical recognition that she received is emblematic of many women, including women of color. While she was one of few female performer's whose music was deemed as having historical importance, that historical importance was gendered. Furthermore, her career was in some ways credited to a man rather than simply being the result of her own talent (Schmutz & Faupel 2010). In more recent years black women continue to occupy positions of both oppression and power within music, particularly within hip hop. Black women have established themselves in the music field not only as performers but also in positions like songwriting and producing. At this same time, though, black women are frequently controlled and denigrated in hip hop lyrics and music videos. Thus, black women's position within hip hop in many ways reflects their position in the broader culture (Emerson 2002). Also, while the first two female performers to be in inducted in

1987 and 1988 were also black, namely Aretha Franklin and The Supremes, the prevalence of black females in the hall of fame has decreased over the years.

> ***Hypothesis 7****: Black female performers will have (a) a longer "wait time" to induction in the Rock and Rock Hall of Fame for eventual inductees and (b) a reduced likelihood of induction among a sample of performers in a given year.*

Data & Methods

My first dataset addresses the population of the 196 performers who have been inducted into the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame (counting groups as a single inductee).[42] I have pulled the data from the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame's website (Rock and Roll Hall of Fame 2014a). My second dataset also includes both the inducted *and* those performers who were eligible to be inducted, namely those performers who released their first major record at least 25 years ago, and had a reasonable chance of being inducted into the hall of fame but were not. This latter grouping includes those performers who have enjoyed contemporaneous acclaim in terms of sales, professional recognition or critical evaluation. Hence, I have collected data on popular legitimacy (e.g., sales) by gathering information on all performers who released albums since 1955 that have topped the "*Billboard* 200" chart and its previous incarnations, including "Top LPs", "Best-Selling Pop Albums" as well as others. I gathered data on albums that topped these charts dating back to 1955, for what would come to be known as "rock" music did not come to national prominence until 1953 and did not begin to truly take hold until between 1954-1956

[42] While there are a number of other induction categories, the focus of this project is on performers, and therefore all others are excluded.

(Gillett 2011). Similarly, Peterson (1990) argues that "rock" music's advent was in 1955. Together, these two sources make 1955 a reasonable starting point for album data collection. Another way I gauged popular legitimacy was by collecting data on performers that had released albums that have been certified gold (500,000 records sold) or platinum (1,000,000 records sold) by the Recording Industry Association of America (RIAA) since 1958 when the program originally began. For professional legitimacy (e.g. peer recognition), I collected data on those performers who have won a Grammy Award in the categories of "Album of the Year" and "Record of the Year" since the awards started in 1959. For critical legitimacy, I have compiled a list from the *Village Voice's* critics' top 20 albums of the year. This list was first published in 1971 and has been published yearly since 1974. I also collected data on all albums that received 5-star ratings in the *New Rolling Stone Record Guide* (1983).

I then determined the year that each performer would be eligible for induction into the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame and removed every performer from the second dataset who were, as of 2015, ineligible for induction based on when they began their career. This resulted in a total of 793 different performers in the dataset. Having established the first year of eligibility and the induction year (if inducted), I created a longitudinal dataset by making note of the year in which each marker of legitimacy was received, as performers often continue to lead active careers after becoming eligible, and that activity may influence the choices of the hall of fame. So to summarize: my first dataset only includes those performers who were inducted into the R&RHOF, and because it is a longitudinal dataset, the size of my dataset is not 196 performers, rather, the "N" is equal to 1,439—the total number of years in which each of the performers

were active before induction (i.e., "performer-years"; see Allison 2010). My second dataset includes all performers who, as described above, had a reasonable chance of induction into the hall of fame, including those performers who were inducted into the hall of fame. The size of this dataset was not the 793 performers who were eligible for induction; instead, the "N" is equal to 8,956—the total number of years in which each of the performers were active before either induction or the 2015 cut-off date.

Three important points must be made about the construction of this database. First, my approach in Chapter Four (and Chapter Three to a lesser extent) is partially modeled after the approach used by Schmutz and Faupel (2010), as well as Allen and Lincoln (2004) and Schmutz (2005). However, recently (Elwert & Winship 2014) have argued that such methodology is faulty because it is, in a sense, selecting on the dependent variable. This is because I will essentially be creating a pool of contemporaneous success stories from which to determine the retrospective likelihood of becoming the largest success stories (i.e. those who are inducted into a hall of fame). Methodologically, Elwert and Winship (2014) do have a relatively strong argument, but substantively they do not. This is because, while technically those who are inducted into either hall of fame can be any musician, the reality is they very likely will have had some level of professional, popular, and/or critical success. This is partially due to the realities of the field and partially due to induction selection criteria that necessitates one, if not more, of these forms of success. Second, because the study focuses specifically on popular music performers, I excluded any compilation albums as well as soundtracks because the impact that they may have on the reputation of a particular performer would be difficult to determine, as there are multiple performers on a given album. There is

precedent for this decision as Schmutz (2005) noted that these albums are not directly associated with a specific performer so it is less likely to be consecrated. Subsequently, it is unlikely that such albums would have an influence on the consecration of performers. However, I did choose to include greatest hits collections as well albums consisting of B-sides and previously unreleased songs because the purchase of those albums indicates that the performer is receiving popular recognition. Third, I excluded those performers whose careers began in prior to 1940. These performers, if inducted, would be inducted as an "Early Influence" rather than as a "Performer." While there are no time-specifications regarding the time period of performers considered for the "Early Influence" category, an examination of the time period in which those performers' careers began suggests that 1940 is a conservative cutoff point.

Dependent Variables

My first dependent variable concerns the amount of time it took for all inductees to enter the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame—with time calculated as the years that passed between their initial eligibility and their actual induction. My second dependent variable is whether or not a performer from a broader sample is inducted into the R&RHOF. With only 196 performers inducted over the course of 30 years, the R&RHOF is a highly selective process. Based on the R&RHOF's attention to talent, notoriety, and its selectivity in its inductions, it is an ideal measure of cultural consecration. The R&RHOF's induction process, as already described, is an elaborate process that takes notice of and helps to highlight and reward the values that the rock music field views as most important, including musical influence, innovation, style and technique.

Furthermore, those voting include performers, historians, and members of the recording industry. This body of voters, then, possesses a breadth of knowledge and represents the many areas of interest and concern within the rock music field. Therefore, the characteristics of the inductees offer real insights into the values of the field.

[TABLE 4-A ABOUT HERE]

Independent Variables: Contemporaneous Valorization

The dataset construction provides me with information on those rock musicians who enjoyed popular, professional, and critical legitimacy and those who do not. Hence, I have both dichotomous (e.g. gender, race, and music genre) and continuous (e.g., number of such albums that became platinum, number of records of the year, etc.) variables. Additionally, I gathered data on how many of each indicator every eligible performer had in each year of their eligibility. These measures of popular, professional, and critical legitimacy have proven to be strong and effective by Schmutz and Faupel (2010), as well as Schmutz (2005).

For *professional legitimacy* (e.g., peer recognition), **t**he dataset construction also provides information on those performers who did and did not enjoy recognition from their peers. In particular, for each performer in the dataset, I have constructed variables based on which performers have won a[n] "Album of the Year", and "Record of the Year"[43] Grammy Award since its first ceremony in 1959. Here, I created continuous (e.g., number of nominations) variables that, again, include how many of each award a

[43] Because this study is examining the consecration of performers directly rather than performers via the albums that they have released, the "Song of the Year" variable was not appropriate to use based on the fact that "Song of the Year" may include only song writers who are the performers who are inducted.

performer had in a given year of eligibility. The Grammys have proven a good indicator of professional legitimacy previously (Schmutz & Faupel 2010), and I have chosen to replicate this measure.

Regarding *critical legitimacy*, the dataset construction differentiates between which rock musicians received critical praise and which ones did not. Thus, I measured critical legitimacy via variables addressing those performers who had a five-star album in *The New Rolling Stone Record Guide* or who had a Top 20 Album of the year by the *Village Voice* critics, which had its first list in 1971 and has had continuous coverage since 1974. I have chosen *Village Voice* because it is a well-recognized newspaper covering culture along with other topics. Furthermore, use of this measure has been shown to be a strong and effective measure of critical legitimacy (Schmutz & Faupel 2010). Here again, the variables are continuous (e.g., number of times having a Top 20 album)[44] and include the number of albums a performer had in each year of eligibility. Following Allen and Lincoln (2004), Schmutz (2005) and Schmutz and Faupel (2010), I am interested in seeing how these various types of contemporaneous valorization combine to influence the likelihood of induction into the R&RHOF.

Finally, regarding *popular legitimac*y (e.g., sales), I constructed continuous variables that captured the number of RIAA-certified Platinum and Gold albums each inductee had previously secured in every year of their career. I also constructed continuous variables that captured, in each and every year of their eligibility, their total number of #1 *Billboard* Albums. The use of RIAA certifications and *Billboard* charts to

[44] *The New Rolling Stone Record Guide* was released prior to the first hall of fame induction, and therefore the counts remain the same over the course of the performers' eligibility.

measure popular legitimacy has proven to be a good indicator of popular legitimacy in other research on popular music and cultural consecration (Schmutz 2005; Schmutz and Faupel 2010).

Independent Variables: Performer Attributes and Genre

For all the musicians and groups that are included in my two datasets, I have constructed variables addressing their attributes. Namely, I have constructed dichotomous variables that address their race (e.g., white vs. non-white) and their gender (e.g., male vs. female). In the case of music groups, I have dichotomous variables that address whether their composition is a mixture of genders or races. I also have created a dichotomous variable for those who are black female performers. Following the example of Dowd and colleagues (Dowd and Blyler 2002; Dowd et al. 2005), I have gleaned such demographic information from a variety of sources, such as music encyclopedias and journalists accounts. This information provides insights into the inequalities found in the R&RHOF—specifically if, as expected, women are at a disadvantage for induction. In Table 4-A, which only includes inductees into the hall of fame, we can see that there is a large gender imbalance in the hall of fame, with 83.1% of the performers being male. Interestingly, black performers are well-represented in the hall of fame, as 36.2% of the inductees are African American.

For all those performers in the dataset, I have also created variables for genre in order to assess the impact that a performer's genre has on their likelihood of being inducted into the hall of fame. To determine the genre that the performer is associated with I used Allmusic.com. Allmusic.com is a website that collects album reviews and

information for performers across genres. I created dummy variables for pop rock[45], R&B, rap, and country music and coded them according the performers' Allmusic.com page. I chose to examine the effect of these genres on a performer's likelihood of induction because of the clear central role of pop rock to the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame. I am also examining the impact of R&B and country music due to the important role that each genre played in the formation of rock music. Finally, the impact that being classified as an R&B or a rap performer has on the likelihood of induction into the hall of fame should offer insights into the types of boundary work that may be taking place in the hall of fame. As we can see in Table 4-A, the importance of R&B to rock's music heritage can be seen in the genres of the performers in the hall of fame. While 61.1% of the performers are pop rock, 27% of the performers are classified as being R&B.

Event History Analysis

Event history analysis is the most appropriate statistical method to use to study the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame induction process because performers become eligible in different years, and their careers often continue to change once they are eligible for induction. In order to utilize this method, I had to create two longitudinal datasets that measured the different forms of cultural legitimacy for each year of a performer's career—one dataset for those already inducted, and another dataset that addressed a sample and the likelihood for induction among those sample performers. Event history analysis allows for the determination of how multiple factors influence the likelihood of

[45] Allmusic.com does not have distinct categories for pop and rock. Regev (2013) has written extensively on the use of this designator for music, lending support for the use of this category in this chapter.

an event occurring, namely a performer being inducted into the hall of fame, in a given year (Petersen 1993). Event history analysis allows for the determination of how multiple factors influence who is inducted into the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame after they became eligible. More specifically, event history analysis was created to provide an analysis as to how the timing of different factors, such as gaining different forms of legitimacy, influences the state of a given case, namely being inducted into the hall of fame. I have chosen to use Cox Regression over Kaplan-Meier to perform the event history analysis for two primary reasons. First, I selected this form of event history analysis because it allows for both dichotomous and continuous variables. Furthermore, Cox Regression allows for the analysis of multiple predictor variables (Allison 2010). Finally, with regards to the second dataset, I employed Cox Regression because it had many instances of right censoring, namely when the event in question (induction into the hall of fame) had not taken place by the end of the period of study. However, both Cox Regression and Kaplan-Meier allow for this type of censoring (Allison 2010).

In both sets of analyses, I report the Exp(B)—the hazard ratio that is indicative of the effect that the different factors have on either (a) waiting time until induction or (b) the likelihood of a sample performer being inducted into the hall of fame each year. In the dataset in which all the performers were eventually inducted in the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame, we can interpret each coefficient as addressing the following: it tells the likelihood that, those yet to be inducted, are likely to be inducted with each passing year. An Exp(B) greater than one means that, as time goes, the associated variable is related to an increased likelihood (i.e., a shorter time to induction), and an Exp(B) less than one means that associated variable is related to a decreased likelihood (i.e., a longer time to

induction). In the dataset that includes all eligible performers with a reasonable likelihood of induction, I interpret each coefficient as follows: an Exp(B) greater than one means that the associated variable is related to an increased likelihood, and an Exp(B) less than one means that associated variable is related to a decreased likelihood. I predict that a performer possessing popular, critical, and/or professional legitimacy will increase the churn hazard—whether it be the waiting time for eventual induction or the likelihood of possible induction into the hall of fame in a given year. For genre, I predict that pop rock, R&B, rap, and country performers will increase the churn hazard in both sets of analyses. For artist attributes, I predict that the churn hazard in both sets of analyses for men and whites will be higher than for women and blacks, respectively. Both sets of analyses also allow me to inspect whether or not intersectionality that black women performers face will impinge upon both wait times for eventual induction or the likelihood of possible induction.

Results

Table 4-B provides the correlation matrix for the first independent variable used in the Event History Analysis. For the most part, the correlations are low, thereby erasing concerns about any multicollinearity problems (i.e., excessively large correlations between individual measures). The largest coefficient is -0.847 between Black performers and pop rock, which is admittedly high but within keeping with some correlations found in longitudinal data (see Dobbin & Dowd 2000). Interestingly, the correlation matrix suggests that the divide that exists among forms of cultural legitimacy is more between popular legitimacy and professional/critical legitimacy than between popular/profession

legitimacy and critical legitimacy, which was also the case in Chapter Three. Furthermore, women and black performers tend to be negatively correlated with a number of the measures of legitimacy. While those patterns are interesting, they are only bivariate. For a more thorough analysis of patterns, I turn to the event history analysis itself.

[TABLE 4-B ABOUT HERE]

Table 4-C considers how various types of contemporaneous valorization and performer attributes combine to shape how long musicians waited to be inducted into the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame. Model 1 examines the impact of performer attributes by way of both gender and race. There is not the expected support for Hypothesis 5 and 6 in this model, as there are no significant effects for female performers or black performers. Interestingly, groups that include both males and females are 2.236 times as likely to be inducted in a given year, with this increased likelihood shortening the wait time for induction. On the other hand, groups that include members of multiple races are only 27.7% percent as likely to be inducted in a given year, with this decreased likelihood increasing the wait time for induction.

[TABLE 4-C ABOUT HERE]

Model 2 measures the impact of critical legitimacy, which previous research has shown to have a favorable influence on cultural consecration (Allen & Lincoln 2004; Schmutz 2005; Schmutz & Faupel 2010; Schmutz & van Venrooij 2017), and it uses *Village Voice,* Top-20 album lists and *Rolling Stone* 5-Star albums as indicators. When considered on its own, these "intermediate" forms of critical legitimacy have a positive,

significant effect on waiting time to induction, which offers support for Hypothesis 1. Specifically, each album on the *Village Voice* list increases the likelihood of induction by 1.097 times, and each *Rolling Stone* 5-Star Album increases the likelihood of induction by 1.419, meaning that indicators effectively shorten the wait time to induction.

Model 3 assesses the impact of professional legitimacy by way of Grammy Album and Record awards, as well as having albums in the Grammy Hall of Fame. While one of the indicators in this model offers support for Hypothesis 2, another indicator provides results contrary to the hypothesis. Each Grammy Album win makes a performer 2.5 times as likely to be inducted into the hall of fame in a given year, effectively shortening their wait time. On the other hand, each album in the Grammy Hall of Fame that a performer has decreases their likelihood of induction, thereby increasing their wait time. This is possibly because the Grammy Hall of Fame Albums are also subject to a waiting period before becoming eligible for induction, and performers may simply be inducted into the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame before having an album inducted into the Grammy Hall of Fame.

Model 4 gauges the impact of popular legitimacy by considering the benefits of having RIAA-Certified Platinum and Gold albums, as well as *Billboard* #1 albums. Just as Schmutz (2005; Schmutz & Faupel 2010) finds that long-term financial success (that required to sell more than a million copies) matters for retrospective consecration, I find that RIAA Platinum albums also matter, with each album increasing the likelihood of induction by about 5%. However, running contrary to Schmutz (2005; Schmutz & Faupel 2010), I find that short-term success has an even larger positive impact on retrospective consecration, as each additional #1 album a performer has accrued raises the likelihood of

their induction by nearly 27%. Also, running contrary to both the work of Schmutz (2005; Schmutz & Faupel 2010), as well as my hypothesis, each RIAA Gold album actually makes a performer less likely to be inducted into the hall of fame with each passing year, thus increasing their wait time. Model 4 thus provides only partial support for Hypothesis 3.

Model 5 examines the effect of the genres of the performers on their likelihood of induction. The results support Hypothesis 4A; however, hypothesis 4B receives only partial support. Pop Rock performers are 2.5 times more likely to be inducted year into the hall of fame than performers from other genres, thus decreasing their wait time. There are no significant results for performers in the country music genre. However, R&B performers are 2.23 times more likely to be inducted in a given year, and rap performers are a whopping 17.8 times more likely to be inducted into the hall of fame in a given year, thus decreasing their wait times substantially.

Model 6 offers a full model that inspects the combination of all contemporaneous valorization and performer attributes. Net of such factors as having hit albums and *Village Voice* albums, black performers awaiting induction are 4.6 times as likely to be inducted in a given year, offering support for Hypothesis 6 ,which suggests that black performers will have shorter wait times given their historical positioning in the field of rock music. On the other hand, women are less likely to be inducted in a given year, offering support for Hypothesis 5, which suggests they would face longer wait times. Interestingly, mixed-gender groups are still more than twice as likely to be inducted, decreasing their wait times. In this model, there is mixed support for Hypothesis 1 because *Rolling Stone* 5-Star albums no longer have a significant effect, though albums

on the *Village Voice* list continue to have a positive effect on induction, with each album increasing the likelihood of induction by about 17%. Interestingly enough, once controlling for other factors, the Grammy awards no longer have a significant impact on induction, providing no support for Hypothesis 2. Furthermore, controlling for other factors also results in only #1 *Billboard* albums having any effect, namely each album increasing the likelihood of induction by 36.5%, thus lessening the support for Hypothesis 3. There is also continued support for Hypothesis 4A: pop rock performers are nearly six times as likely to be inducted in given year, decreasing their wait time. However, there is less support for Hypothesis 4B because being an R&B performer no longer has an effect on induction, similar to being a country performer. However, rap performers still face shortened wait times, as they are over nine times as likely to be inducted in a given year.[46]

In Model 7, which includes an interaction term for black females, along with all of the variables from Model 6, there are no significant changes. Specifically, the coefficient capturing the interaction and hopefully capturing intersectionality—BlackFemale— is insignificant. A comparison of the likelihood ratios between the Models 6 and 7 show almost no change—indicating that the model with the interaction (the variable for black females) brings no significant improvement in fit. Both pieces of evidence reveal that, at least for this analysis, I find no evidence of intersectionality with regards to black women and consecration.

[46] Given the high correlation between black performer and pop rock, I re-ran Model 6 while excluding the pop rock variable. The findings in that model resemble those in Model 6, thereby showing that this correlation is not a problem for my analysis.

[TABLE 4-D ABOUT HERE]

My second set of analyses examines those performers eligible for induction in addition to inductees into the hall of fame. This includes performers who have received any professional, critical, or popular legitimacy, as measured in this analysis, at some point in their careers. Table 4-D reveals the nature of this sample. There are 196 performers who have been inducted into the hall of fame. Regarding critical legitimacy, 224 performers have had albums on the *Village Voice* Top-20 critic's list, and 84 have had *Rolling Stone* 5-Star albums. For professional legitimacy, 29 performers have had Grammy Record wins, 26 have had Grammy Album wins, and 27 have albums in the Grammy Hall of Fame. Finally, for popular legitimacy, 175 performers have #1 *Billboard* albums, 500 have RIAA Gold Albums, and 523 have RIAA Platinum Albums. Given that some performers have more than one of these types of success, the total number of performers is not simply the sum of all these numbers in Table 4-D. Instead, there are actually 793 performers in this sample.

[TABLE 4-E ABOUT HERE]

Table 4-E offers descriptive statistics for all performers eligible for induction into the hall of fame, as well descriptive statistics specifically for those performers *actually* inducted into the hall of fame. We can see that while the gender imbalance in the full sample is less than what is found in the hall of fame, males, nonetheless, make up 78.6% of the sample. Interestingly, black performers are actually less represented in the full sample—only 20.5% of sample performers are African American. Also, the genre composition of the full sample is notably different. Only 13.6% are R&B, rather than the

27.2% found in the R&RHOF, and 10.1% of the performers in the full sample are country, instead of 1.0% in the hall of fame.

[TABLE 4-F ABOUT HERE]

Table 4-F provides the correlation matrix for the independent variables used in the Event History Analysis. For the most part, the correlations are low, once again easing any concerns about any multicollinearity problems (i.e., excessively large correlations between individual measures). The largest coefficient is only -0.669, but that is relatively modest when compared to correlations often found in longitudinal data (see Dobbin & Dowd 2000). Interestingly, there is low levels of correlation among the forms of legitimacy, with the highest level of correlation being 0.305 and existing between Grammy Album wins and #1 *Billboard* albums. This indicates that, amongst the body of eligible performers, there is little relation between different forms of legitimacy. Finally, women and black performers are sometimes negatively correlated with the indicators of legitimacy, though the effects are diminished when compared to the body of inductees. Remember, those correlation patterns are just that—correlations. For a more thorough analysis of patterns, I turn to the event history analysis itself.

[TABLE 4-G ABOUT HERE]

The analyses in Table 4-G considers the effects of race, gender, genre, as well as measures of professional, critical, and popular legitimacy on the likelihood of induction in a given year. Model 1 consists of performer attributes and includes gender and race. For performer attributes, the findings for the full sample of eligible performers differ from the findings on the performers who have been inducted into the hall of fame (see Table 4-C). Specifically, this model offers support for Hypothesis 5 as it shows that

women significantly less likely to be inducted into the hall of fame in a given year. The model also provides support for Hypothesis 6. African American performers in the sample have an increased likelihood of being inducted by a factor of more than two. There are no significant effects for both mixed gender and mixed race groups. Also, there were no significant effects for performers who that were neither black nor white.

Model 2 measures the impact of critical legitimacy, which previous research has shown to have a favorable influence on cultural consecration, and uses the *Village Voice's* critics poll as well as the 5-star albums from *The New* Rolling Stone *Record Guide.* Both of these indicators support Hypothesis 1 because they increase the likelihood of a performer being inducted into the hall of fame in a given year. Specifically, each album on the *Village Voice* list increases the likelihood of induction in a given year by about 32%, and each album in *The New* Rolling Stone *Record Guide* increases the likelihood of induction in a given year by about 77%.

Model 3 measures professional legitimacy and includes Grammy Record and Album of the Year wins, as well as having an album in the Grammy Hall of Fame. While one of the indicators in this model offers support for Hypothesis 2, another indicator provides results contrary to the hypothesis. Each Grammy Album win makes a performer almost 4 times as likely to be inducted into the hall of fame in a given year. On the other hand, each album in the Grammy Hall of Fame that a performer had makes them substantially less likely to be inducted into the hall of fame in a given year.[47]

[47] This is possibly because the Grammy Hall of Fame Albums are also subject to a waiting period before becoming eligible for induction, and performers may simply be inducted into the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame before having an album inducted into the Grammy Hall of Fame.

Model 4 measures popular legitimacy and includes having RIAA-Certified Platinum and Gold albums, as well as *Billboard* #1 albums, all of which have a significant impact on the likelihood of induction into the hall of fame in a given year. However, some indicators increase the likelihood of induction while one indicator decreases the likelihood of induction, thus offering tenuous support for Hypothesis 4. In this model, each *Billboard* #1 Album increases the likelihood of a performer being inducted into the hall of fame in a given year by about 27% times, and each RIAA-Certified Platinum album increases the likelihood of a performer being inducted into the hall of fame in a given year by about 7%. However, for every album that was RIAA-Certified Gold, the performers slightly less likely to be inducted in a given year.

Model 5 examines the effect of the genres of the performers on their likelihood of induction. The results supported hypothesis 3A, but, in the case of country, are in direct contrast to hypothesis 3B. Pop Rock performers are almost seven times more likely to be inducted year into the hall of fame than performers from other genres. R&B performers are 13 times more likely to be inducted in a given year into the hall of fame, and rap performers are more than 20 times more likely to be inducted into the hall of fame. Country music performers, on the other hand, have no significant likelihood of consecration in the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame.

Model 6 includes all measures of critical, professional, and popular legitimacy as well as genre and performer attributes. In this model, Hypothesis 5 is no longer supported as being female no longer has a significant impact on the likelihood of a performer being inducted into the hall of fame in a given year, but Hypothesis 6 continues to receive support because black performers are four times as likely to be inducted in a given year.

Hypothesis 1 continues to be supported because albums on the *Village Voice* yearly list, as well as albums in *The New* Rolling Stone *Record Guide*, continue to have significant positive effects on the likelihood of induction. Unlike Model 2, this model offers no support for Hypothesis 2; all indicators of professional legitimacy cease to have an impact on the likelihood of induction. For popular legitimacy, RIAA-Certified Gold albums cease to have an impact on the likelihood of a performer being inducted into the hall of fame, but the effects of the other two measures of popular legitimacy, RIAA-Certified Platinum albums and #1 albums on the *Billboard* charts, continue to be significant and positive, though their impact is decreased—yet still offering support for Hypothesis 4. For genre, pop rock performers are 9.117 times as likely to be inducted into the hall of fame, R&B performers are six and a half times as likely to be inducted, and rap performers are ten times as likely to be inducted. Country music performers continue to have no significant relationship to consecration. Thus, the previous support for Hypothesis 4A is increased, and, save for the country genre, the findings continue to support Hypothesis 4B.

Model 7, which includes an interaction term for black females, along with all of the variables from Model 6, shows that intersectionality receives no support in this particular setting. . Specifically, the coefficient capturing the interaction—BlackFemale—is insignificant. A comparison of the likelihood ratios between the Models 6 and 7 show almost no change, indicating that the model with the interaction (the variable for black females) continue to brings no significant improvement in fit. Both pieces of evidence reveal that, for the analyses in this research, I find no evidence of intersectionality with regards to black women and consecration.

Conclusion

Previous research on cultural consecration in rock music has examined the effect of cultural legitimacy as well as gender on the likelihood of being culturally consecrated (Schmutz and Faupel 2010). This study, like previous research, has examined the effects of cultural legitimacy and gender on cultural consecration, but it also adds to our understanding by examining the effects of race and genre on cultural consecration in music. This offers insights as to the effects that race and boundary work have on music in our culture. Also, while Schmutz and Faupel (2010) examined what factors make a cultural object more likely to be culturally consecrated, I have examined what factors make performers more or less likely to be culturally consecrated.

This study reveals that the factors that influence cultural consecration in the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame—an ongoing and continuous consecration project—are largely the same as factors that previous research has found to be influential in cultural consecration in rock music that is more temporally discrete and one time—such as the *Rolling Stone 500 Greatest Albums* list (Schmutz 2005; Schmutz & Faupel 2010; Schmutz & van Venrooij 2017). While the analyses of the inductees of the R&RHOF indicate that inducted female performers do not significantly differ from their male counterparts in terms of waiting time to induct. However, when who does and does not get inducted, examining the field as a whole, women are less likely to be culturally consecrated than men. The research in this chapter has revealed that black performers and the music genres typically associated with African American performers and audiences have a higher likelihood of being inducted into the hall of fame. These findings support previous research on the impact of race on success in music. However, some of these effects may

be explained by the foundational role of rhythm and blues in the formation of rock music. Also, because this study examined inductions through 2015, there would be fewer rap performers than are in the music field, and these performers would have been some of the forbearers of rap music and therefore an important part of music history.

Intriguingly, in statistical models that examine the impact of intersectionality by way of variables assessing the careers of female black performers both models that the effects that being a black female had on the likelihood of being inducted into the R&RHOF in a given year, there were no significant results. This may due to the negative effects that being female has on the likelihood of inducted being counterbalanced by the positive effect that being black has on the likelihood of induction. However, it may also be reflective of the position of black women in the music industry and the fact that they simultaneously occupy positions of oppression and power. Regardless, these statistical models likely obscure the complex realities of being a black woman in this music field.

The analyses of the R&RHOF inductees as well as the full sample have revealed similar results with regards to the effects of legitimacy and genre on the likelihood of induction into the hall of fame. This indicates that the processes for both selection in general and for waiting are the same. All indicators of critical legitimacy play a significant role in increasing the likelihood of induction into the hall of fame, again demonstrating the important role that critics play in cultural consecration. On the other hand, the effects of professional legitimacy are ultimately non-existent. When considering the full models, professional legitimacy has no significant impact upon either waiting time for inductees or the likelihood of induction for the larger sample. Based on previous research this was highly unexpected. However, compared to previous research

on cultural consecration in popular music, the results do indicate that the R&RHOF does judge popular legitimacy more positively than it had been judged by other agencies of consecration. Therefore, in a field where popular legitimacy is often judged negatively by academics and by participants, the R&RHOF does treat it, comparatively, more favorably. While there is not overwhelming support for the argument of detractors of the R&RHOF who argue that the organization places too much emphasis on popularity, there is some support.

This chapter and its new findings offer insights into another site of consecration in rock music, revealing the values of the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame. I have examined the factors that may increase or decrease the likelihood of induction into the hall of fame. Namely, the results overwhelmingly show the important role of critical legitimacy in the field of rock—particularly as it pertains to critical and popular legitimacy. In this field marked by low solidarity, professional legitimacy stands apart from the two other forms of cultural legitimacy, thereby diverging from the field of country music, wherein its solidarity leads to all three forms of cultural legitimacy as converging.

This chapter also supports arguments in the music press, as well as in previous academic research, by showing the negative impact that being female has on the likelihood of induction. Among those chosen by the R&RHOF, they face no barriers in terms of waiting time. The trick for women performers, however, is actually getting inducted—that is where the glass ceiling comes into play for them. This chapter also extends previous research by demonstrating something that might not be the case at first glance: although rock music is widely considered a "white" genre, the historical and contemporary relationship of black performers to this genre with "fuzzy" boundaries has

meant black performers actually fare well in the consecration project of the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame—both in terms of the likelihood of induct and the waiting time for induction. That stands in stark contrast to the substantial barriers that black performers have faced in both the field of country music and the consecration project of the Country Music Hall of Fame (see Chapter Three).

Finally, when all factors are considered simultaneously in the event history analysis, genre has the largest impact in terms of likelihood on whether or not a performer gets inducted into the hall of fame, with pop rock, R&B, and rap performers being far more likely than country music performers, as well as those from other genres, to be inducted. This, combined with the findings regarding black performers, indicates that the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame does not overlook or subordinate music created by black performers or the genres traditionally associated with them. This is no doubt due to the large role that R&B has played in the development of rock music and has continued to play via its genre progeny like hip hop.

REFERENCES

Allen, Michael Patrick and Anne E. Lincoln. 2004. "Critical Discourse and the Cultural Consecration of American Films." *Social Forces* 82 (3): 871–894.

Allen, Michael and Nicholas E. Parsons. 2006. "The Institutionalization of Fame: Achievement, Recognition, and Cultural Consecration in Baseball." *American Sociological Review* 71 (5): 808-825.

Allison, Paul D. 2010. *Survival Analysis Using SAS: A Practical Guide.* Second edition. Cary, NC: SAS Institute.

Baumann, Shyon. 2001. "Intellectualization and Art World Development: Film in the United States." *American Sociological Review* 66: 404-426.

Baumann, Shyon. 2007. "A General Theory of Artistic Legitimation: How Art Worlds are Like Social Movements." *Poetics* 35: 47-65.

Becker, Howard S. *Art Worlds*. 2008. Twenty-fifth anniversary edition. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Bennett, Andy. 2007. "The Forgotten Decade: Rethinking the Popular Music of the 1970s." *Popular Music History* 2 (1): 5–24.

Bennett, Andy. 2009. "'Heritage Rock': Rock Music, Representation and Heritage Discourse." *Poetics* 37 (5–6): 474–489.

Binder, Amy. 1993. "Constructing Racial Rhetoric: Media Depictions of Harm in Heavy Metal and Rap Music." *American Sociological Review* 58 (6): 753–767.

Boehm, Mike. 2009. "Getting Progressive: The Rock Hall Votes in Genesis. Is Yes or Procol Harum Next? *[Updated]" *Los Angeles Times* December 29. http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/music_blog/2009/12/getting-progressive-the-rock-hall-voted-in-genesis-whos-still-missing.html. Retrieved June 11, 2017.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1993. *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*. Edited by Randal Johnson. New York: Columbia University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1996. *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Braden, Laura E. 2009. "From the Armory to Academia: Careers and Reputations of Early Modern Artists in the United States." *Poetics* 37 (5–6): 439–455.

Bryson, Bethany. 1996. "'Anything but Heavy Metal': Symbolic Exclusion and Musical Dislikes." *American Sociological Review* 61: 884–899.

Carson, Mina, Tina Lewis and Susan M. Shaw. 2004. *Girls Rock!: Fifty Years of Women Making Music*. Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky Press.

Christenson, Peter G. and Jon Brian Peterson. 1988. "Genre and Gender in the Structure of Music Preferences." *Communication Research* 15 (3): 282–301.

Chong, Phillipa. 2011. "Reading Difference: Instrument Specialization and Gender Interpretation in Alternative Rock." *Poetics* 39 (1): 64–84.

Clawson, Mary Ann. 1999. "When Women Play the Bass: Instrument Specialization and Gender Interpretation in Alternative Rock Music" *Gender & Society* 13 (2): 193-210.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 2008. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York: Routledge.

Corse, Sara M. and Monica D. Griffin. 1997. "Cultural Valorization and African American Literary History: Reconstructing the Canon." *Sociological Forum* 12 (2): 173-203.

DiMaggio, Paul. 1991a. "Cultural Entrepreneurship in Nineteenth-Century Boston: The Creation of an Organizational Base for High Culture in America." Pages 374-397 in *Rethinking Popular Culture,* edited by Chandra Mukerji and Michael Schudson. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

DiMaggio, Paul. 1991b. "Social Structure, Institutions and Cultural Goods." Pages 133-155 in *Social Theory for a Changing World*, edited by Pierre Bourdieu and James Coleman. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Dowd, Timothy J. 2000. "Musical Diversity and the US Mainstream Recording Market, 1955-1990." *Rassegna Italiania di Sociologia* 41 (2): 223-264.

Dowd, Timothy J. 2003. "Structural Power and the Construction of Markets: The Case of Rhythm and Blues." *Comparative Social Research* 21: 147–201.

Dowd, Timothy J. 2004. "Concentration and Diversity Revisited: Production Logics and the US Mainstream Recording Market, 1940-1990." *Social Forces* 82 (4): 1411–1455.

Dowd, Timothy J. and Maureen Blyler. 2002. "Charting Race: The Success of Black Performers in the Mainstream Recording Market, 1940 to 1990." *Poetics* 30 (1-2): 87–110.

Dowd, Timothy J., Kathleen Liddle and Maureen Blyler. 2005. "Charting Gender: The Success of Female Acts in the US Mainstream Recording Market, 1940–1990." *Research in the Sociology of Organizations* 23: 81–123.

Dowd, Timothy J., Trent Ryan and Yun Tai. 2016. "Talk of Heritage: Critical Benchmarks and DIY Preservationism in Progressive Rock." *Popular Music & Society* 39: 97-125.

Eddy, Chuck. 1997. *The Accidental Evolution of Rock'n'Roll: A Misguided Tour Through Popular Music*. New York: Da Capo Press.

Elwert, Felix and Christopher Winship. 2014. "Endogenous Selection Bias: The Problem of Conditioning on a Collider Variable." *Annual Review of Sociology* 40: 31-53.

Emerson, Rana A. 2002. "'Where My Girls At?': Negotiating Black Womanhood in Music Videos." *Gender & Society* 16 (1): 115–135.

Ennis, Phillip. 1992. *The Seventh Stream: The Emergence of Rocknroll in American Popular Music.* Hanover, NH: Wesleyan University Press.

Fine, Gary Alan. 1996. "Reputational Entrepreneurs and the Memory of Incompetence: Melting Supporters, Partisan Warriors, and Images of President Harding." *American Journal of Sociology* 101 (5): 1159–1193.

Gillett, Charlie. 2011. *The Sound of the City: The Rise of Rock & Roll*. Third revised edition. London: Souvenir Press.

Grazian, David. 2005. *Blue Chicago: The Search for Authenticity in Urban Blues Clubs.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Johnson, Cathryn, Timothy J. Dowd, and Cecilia L. Ridgeway. 2006. "Legitimacy as a Social Process." *Annual Review of Sociology* 32(1):53–78.

Lamont, Michèle and Virág Molnár. 2002. "The Study of Boundaries in the Social Sciences." *Annual Review of Sociology* 28 (1): 167–195.

Lang, Gladys Engel and Kurt Lang. 1988. "Recognition and Renown: The Survival of Artistic Reputation." *American Journal of Sociology* 94 (1): 79-109.

Lena, Jenn C. 2012. *Banding Together: How Communities Create Genres in Popular Music*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Lena, Jennifer C. and Richard A. Peterson. 2008. "Classification as Culture: Types and Trajectories of Music Genres." *American Sociological Review* 73 (5): 697–718.

Lopes, Paul. 2002. *The Rise of the Jazz Art World.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Mahon, Maureen. 2004. *Right to Rock: The Black Rock Coalition and the Politics of Race*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Marsh, Dave and John Swenson, editors. 1983. *The New Rolling Stone Record Guide*. New York: Random House.

Negus, Keith. 1999. *Music Genres and Corporate Cultures*. London: Routledge.

Pachucki, Mark A., Sabrina Pendergrass, and Michèle Lamont. 2007. "Boundary Processes: Recent Theoretical Developments and New Contributions." *Poetics* 35 (6): 331–351.

Peterson, Richard A. 1990. "Why 1955? Explaining the Advent of Rock Music." *Popular Music* 9 (1): 97–116.

Peterson, Richard A. 2013. *Creating Country Music: Fabricating Authenticity*. E-book. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Peterson, Richard A. and N. Anand. 2004. "The Production of Culture Perspective " *Annual Review of Sociology* 30: 311-334.

Petersen, Trond. 1993. "Recent Advances in Longitudinal Methodology." *Annual Review of Sociology* 19: 425–454.

Posner, Gerald. 2005. *Motown: Music, Money, Sex, and Power* Reprint edition. New York: Random House.

Regev, Motti. 1994. "Producing Artistic Value." *Sociological Quarterly* 35 (1): 85–102.

Regev, Motti. 1997. "Rock Aesthetics and Musics of the World." *Theory, Culture & Society* 14 (3): 125–142.

Regev, Motti. 2013. *Pop-Rock Music: Aesthetic Cosmopolitanism in Late Modernity*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Reilly, Dan. 2014. "The 10 Most Controversial Rock and Roll Hall of Fame Moments." *Billboard* April 9. http://www.billboard.com/articles/news/6042281/the-10-most-controversial-rock-and-roll-hall-of-fame-moments. Retrieved June 11, 2017.

Ritz, David. 2015. *Respect: The Life of Aretha Franklin*. New York: Little, Brown.

Roy, William G. 2002. "Aesthetic Identity, Race, and American Folk Music." *Qualitative Sociology* 25 (3): 459–69.

Roy, William G. 2004. "'Race Records' and 'Hillbilly Music': Institutional Origins of Racial Categories in the American Commercial Recording Industry." *Poetics* 32 (3–4): 265–279.

Roy, William G. and Timothy J. Dowd. 2010. "What Is Sociological About Music?" *Annual Review of Sociology* 36: 183-203.

Santoro, Marco. 2009. "What is 'Cantautore?': Distinction and Authorship in Italian (Popular) Music." *Poetics* 37 (4): 366–382.

Scardaville, Melissa C. 2009. "High Art, No Art: The Economic and Aesthetic Legitimacy of U.S. Soap Operas." *Poetics* 30: 111-132.

Schmutz, Vaughn. 2005. "Retrospective Cultural Consecration and Popular Music: *Rolling Stone's* Greatest Albums of All Time." *American Behavioral Scientist* 48(11): 1510-1523.

Schmutz, Vaughn. 2009. "Social and Symbolic Boundaries in Newspaper Coverage of Music, 1955–2005: Gender and Genre in the US, France, Germany, and the Netherlands." *Poetics* 37 (4): 298–314.

Schmutz, Vaughn and Alison Faupel. 2010. "Gender and Cultural Consecration in Popular Music." *Social Forces* 89 (2): 685–707.

Schmutz, Vaughn, Alex van Venrooij, Susanne Janssen, and Marc Verboord. 2010. "Change and Continuity in Newspaper Coverage of Popular Music since 1955: Evidence from the United States, Germany and the Netherlands." *Popular Music and Society* 33 (4): 501-515.

Schmutz, Vaughn and Alex van Venrooij. 2017. "Harmonizing Forms of Legitimacy in the Consecration of Popular Music." Unpublished manuscript. Department of Sociology, University of North Carolina at Charlotte.

Tuchman, Gaye, and Nina E. Fortin. 1984. "Fame and Misfortune: Edging Women Out of the Great Literary Tradition." *American Journal of Sociology* 90 (1): 72–96.

Valck, Marijke de. 2014. "Supporting Art Cinema at a Time of Commercialization: Principles and Practices, the Case of the International Film Festival Rotterdam." *Poetics* 42: 40–59.

Venrooij, Alex van. 2009. "The Aesthetic Discourse Space of Popular Music: 1985–86 and 2004–05." *Poetics* 37 (4): 315–332.

Venrooij, Alex van and Vaughn Schmutz. 2010. "The Evaluation of Popular Music in the United States, Germany and the Netherlands." *Cultural Sociology* 4: 395-421.

Whiteley, Sheila, editor. 1997. *Sexing the Groove: Popular Music and Gender*. New York: Routledge.

Whiteley, Sheila 2000. *Women and Popular Music: Sexuality, Identity and Subjectivity*. E-book. New York: Routledge.

Yarborough, Chuck. 2013. “Rush: Canadian Prog-Rock Band Ran Away with the First-Ever Fan Vote (Rock and Roll Hall of Fame Class of 2013).” Cleveland.com April 14. http://www.cleveland.com/rockhall/index.ssf/2013/04/rush_canadian_prog-rock_band_r.html. Retrieved June 10, 2017.

TABLE 4-A

**Descriptive Statistics for Independent Variables Used in the Event History Analysis of
Waiting Time to Induction for Rock and Roll Hall of Fame Performers.**

Variable	*N*	*%*	*Mean*	*Range*
Top 20, *Village Voice*	--	--	0.9745	0 - 11
Rolling Stone 5-Star Album	--	--	0.57	0 - 12
Grammy Record of the Year Win	--	--	0.0561	0 - 2
Grammy Album of the Year Win	--	--	0.0867	0 - 3
Grammy Hall of Fame Album	--	--	0.0204	0 - 1
Billboard #1 Album	--	--	1.0714	0 - 15
Platinum Album	--	--	4.0051	0 - 38
Gold album	--	--	2.7857	0 - 29
Pop Rock	124	63.3%	--	--
R&B	53	27.0%	--	--
Rap	4	2.1%	--	--
Country	2	1.0%	--	--
Female Performer	21	10.7%	--	--
Male Performer	163	83.1%		
Mixed Gender Group	12	6.1%	--	--
Black Performer	71	36.2%	--	--
Other Race	2	1.0%	--	--
Mixed Race Group	3	1.5%	--	--
Black Female Performer	12	6.1%	--	--

Total number of inducted performers = 196.
Total number of performer-years prior to induction = 1,439.

TABLE 4-B

Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Performer Attributes and Contemporary Valorization (N = 196 Performers).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1																	
2	-0.089																
3	0.182	-0.049															
4	-0.048	-0.026	-0.090														
5	-0.062	-0.011	-0.116	-0.018													
6	-0.069	0.002	-0.136	-0.045	-0.039												
7	-0.078	-0.008	-0.213	-0.044	-0.054	0.352											
8	-0.057	-0.031	-0.080	-0.017	-0.021	0.194	0.179										
9	-0.038	0.028	-0.072	-0.020	-0.026	0.342	0.214	0.726									
10	0.113	-0.035	0.026	-0.019	-0.025	-0.061	-0.060	-0.022	-0.027								
11	0.039	-0.020	-0.128	-0.008	-0.048	0.317	0.103	0.141	0.386	-0.048							
12	-0.046	-0.025	-0.331	-0.036	-0.089	0.214	0.053	0.116	0.136	-0.090	0.380						
13	-0.097	0.035	-0.210	-0.026	-0.097	0.125	0.061	0.043	0.175	-0.075	0.461	0.634					
14	-0.122	0.055	-0.847	0.096	-0.189	0.146	0.206	0.087	0.042	-0.016	0.030	0.350	0.183				
15	0.140	0.003	0.770	-0.072	-0.030	-0.094	-0.159	-0.056	-0.041	-0.077	-0.089	-0.283	-0.153	-0.747			
16	-0.034	-0.018	0.023	-0.010	-0.013	-0.032	0.155	-0.012	-0.014	-0.013	0.084	0.021	-0.032	-0.103	-0.051		
17	0.211	-0.029	-0.099	-0.015	-0.020	0.002	-0.049	-0.018	0.127	-0.021	0.338	-0.062	0.152	-0.161	-0.079	-0.011	

1 = Female, 2 = Mixed Gender Group, 3 = Black, 4 = Other Races, 5 = Mixed Race Group, 6 = *Rolling Stone* 5-Star Albums, 7= *Village Voice* Critics' List Top 20 Albums, 8 = Grammy Record Wins, 9 = Grammy Album Wins, 10 = Grammy Hall of Fame Album, 11 = #1 *Billboard* Album, 12 = RIAA Platinum Albums, 13 = RIAA Gold Albums, 14 = Pop Rock, 15 = R&B, 16 = Rap, 17 = Country

TABLE 4-C
Event History Hazard Analyses for the Effects of Performer Attributes & Cultural Legitimacy on Waiting Time for Induction Into the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7
Performer Attributes							
Female	0.772					0.522*	0.652
Mixed Gender	2.236*					2.788**	2.778**
Black	0.885					4.647**	5.563**
Other	0.809					1.139	1.148
Mixed Race	0.277*					2.141	2.511
Black Female							0.644
Critical Legitimacy							
Top 20, *Village Voice* critics poll		1.097*				1.166**	1.168**
Rolling Stone 5-Star Album		1.419**				0.974	0.975
Professional Legitimacy							
Grammy Album of the Year Win			2.458**			0.823	0.832
Grammy Record of the Year Win			0.852			1.536	1.530
Grammy HOF Album			0.365*			0.618	0.582
Popular Legitimacy							
Billboard #1 Album				1.268**		1.365**	1.369**
RIAA Gold-certified Album				.931**		0.946	0.949
RIAA Platinum-certified Album				1.053**		1.044	1.040
Genre							
Pop Rock					2.528**	5.985**	6.935**
R&B					2.230*	1.779	1.777
Rap					17.845**	9.288**	10.342**
Country					1.556	1.186	1.210
Model Significance	.009*	.000**	.000**	.000**	.000**	.000**	.000**
Log Likelihood	2439.896	2414.899	2436.516	2401.856	2432.767	2343.504	2342.838

*p<.05 ; **p<.005 N=1,439

TABLE 4-D

Number of Performers Receiving Popular, Professional, or Critical Legitimacy: Constructing the Full Sample

Source of Legitimacy	*Number*
Rock and Roll Hall of Fame Inductees	196
***Village Voice* top 20 critics' list**	224
***Rolling Stone* 5-Star Album**	84
Grammy Record of the Year Win	29
Grammy Album of the Year Win	26
Grammy Hall of Fame Album	27
#1 *Billboard* Album	175
Gold Album	500
Platinum Album	523
Total Performers in Sample	793

TABLE 4-E

Descriptive Statistics for Performers in the R&RHOF (N= 196) & Performers in the Full Sample (N=793)

	R&RHOF	*Full Sample*
Male	83.1	78.6
Female	10.7	15.1
Mixed Gender Group	6.2	6.2
White	61.1	71.9
Black	36.2	20.5
Other Races	1.0	3.3
Mixed Race Group	1.5	4.4
Top 20, *Village Voice* Critics Poll	30.3	28.2
***Rolling Stone* 5-Star Album**	27.2	10.6
Grammy Album of the Year Win	7.2	3.3
Grammy HOF Album	2.1	3.4
Grammy Record of the Year Win	4.1	3.7
***Billboard* #1 Album**	33.8	22.1
RIAA Gold-Certified Album	54.4	63.1
RIAA Platinum-Certified Album	51.3	66.0
Pop Rock	63.1	58.9
R&B	27.2	13.6
Rap	2.1	4.4
Country	1.0	10.1

TABLE 4-F

Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Performer Attributes and Contemporary Valorization (N = 8956 Performer-Years).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
2	-0.109															
3	0.051	-0.013														
4	-0.048	-0.034	-0.093													
5	-0.083	0.051	-0.109	-0.039												
6	-0.063	0.026	-0.034	-0.051	-0.001											
7	-0.021	0.068	-0.074	0.003	-0.024	0.282										
8	0.070	0.050	0.045	0.031	-0.020	0.001	-0.039									
9	0.017	-0.032	0.017	-0.031	-0.001	0.189	0.020	0.384								
10	-0.021	0.008	0.099	-0.020	-0.012	0.046	-0.038	0.101	0.228							
11	0.051	0.007	-0.005	-0.018	-0.044	0.177	-0.043	0.113	0.305	0.071						
12	0.026	-0.053	-0.130	-0.032	-0.042	0.102	-0.100	0.014	0.141	-0.021	0.440					
13	0.045	-0.049	-0.100	0.004	-0.022	-0.008	-0.152	0.113	0.189	-0.012	0.357	0.499				
14	-0.171	0.079	-0.472	-0.105	0.035	0.102	0.185	-0.064	-0.071	-0.096	-0.010	0.080	-0.086			
15	0.049	0.024	0.633	-0.035	-0.016	0.006	-0.064	-0.059	-0.013	-0.026	-0.015	-0.065	-0.078	-0.374		
16	-0.035	-0.030	0.194	-0.021	0.005	-0.032	0.014	-0.023	-0.020	-0.019	-0.008	-0.002	-0.009	-0.121	-0.040	
17	0.180	-0.104	-0.139	-0.072	-0.056	-0.084	-0.108	-0.016	0.017	-0.048	-0.056	0.080	0.207	-0.428	-0.143	-0.046

1 = Female, 2 = Mixed-Gender Group, 3 = Black, 4 = Other Races, 5 = Mixed-Race Group, 6 = *Rolling Stone* 5-Star Albums, 7= *Village Voice* Critics' List Top 20 Albums, 8 = Grammy Record Wins, 9 = Grammy Album Wins, 10 = Grammy Hall of Fame Album, 11 = #1 *Billboard* Album, 12 = RIAA Platinum Albums, 13 = RIAA Gold Albums, 14 = Pop Rock, 15 = R&B, 16 = Rap, 17 = Country

TABLE 4-G
Event History Hazard Analyses for the Effects of Performer Attributes & Contemporaneous Valorization on Likelihood of Induction Into the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7
Performer Attributes							
Female	0.608*					0.684	0.718
Mixed Gender Group	1.105					1.020	1.019
Black	2.076**					4.004**	4.070**
Other	0.303					0.755	0.759
Mixed Race Groups	0.425					0.590	0.375
Black Female							0.917
Critical Legitimacy							
Top 20, *Village Voice* critics poll		1.323**				1.385**	1.385**
Rolling Stone 5-Star Album		1.771**				1.224*	1.224*
Professional Legitimacy							
Grammy Album of the Year Win			3.771**			1.422	1.419
Grammy Record of the Year Win			0.602			0.908	0.906
Grammy HOF Album			0.241**			0.384	0.382
Popular Legitimacy							
Billboard #1 Album				1.265**		1.193**	1.194**
RIAA Gold-certified Album				.918**		1.005	1.005
RIAA Platinum-certified Album				1.072**		1.063**	1.062**
Genre							
Pop Rock					6.790**	8.999**	9.117**
R&B					13.034**	6.542**	6.584**
Rap					20.507**	9.888**	9.911**
Country					0.264	0.426	0.431
Model Significance	.000**	.000**	.000**	.000**	.000**	.000**	.000**
Log Likelihood	3240.009	3157.553	3246.471	3215.589	3117.009	2954.581	2954.550
*p<.05 ; **p<.005							N=8956

CHAPTER FIVE:

THE CONCLUSION

The Country Music and Rock and Roll Halls of Fame were established to secure each genre's role in culture by curating their history and consecrating those performers who they view as emblematic of excellence and the values of the field. Each field has its own set of cultural values that have directed and shaped the choices of each hall of fame. The actions of each hall of fame represent their values as well as how they want to be perceived by the public. Therefore, by studying the halls of fame and the characteristics of the individuals that they have inducted over the course of their histories, we have a better understanding of the two agencies of consecration and their respective genres. This dissertation has provided new insights regarding the impact of different forms of cultural legitimacy, as well as race and gender, on the cultural consecration process in two central consecrating organizations in the popular music field. In this conclusion, I reflect upon how the findings in this dissertation augment and extend previous research, and I consider new questions that may be answered in future research.

As musical heritage sites, the Country Music and Rock and Roll Halls of Fame share similar motivations. Both organizations were established to improve the reputation and legitimacy of their attendant genres. The Country Music Hall of Fame was established in 1961 in an effort to secure country music's position in the popular music field as rock music was growing in popularity and threatening the country music field. Although rock music was thriving when the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame was established in 1983, the field was still working diligently to establish further the legitimacy of rock music. By establishing halls of fame, both fields were able to celebrate those performers

that they viewed as emblematic of excellence within the respective fields, and in doing so, these newly established sites of heritage bolstered the reputations of their respective genres, taking a similar approach to non-profit arts organizations of the past that likewise sought to legitimate particular genres (DiMaggio 1982). However, the motivation that led to the establishment of each hall of fame is one of few similarities that can be found within the two halls of fame.

The organizational processes in which the two halls of fame were established reflect the characteristics of the two genres. Country music is characterized by strong boundaries and high levels of solidarity, which decreases the tendency towards disagreements within the community while also allowing for the use of "restricted" codes—ways of describing and approaching music that rest more upon shared assumptions than deliberate and explicit discussion. Subsequently, the CMHOF has maintained high levels of privacy and discretion in their decision-making, including the induction process. In contrast, the rock music field is more fractured and has lower levels of solidarity, and this has resulted in the use of more elaborated codes—where a lack of shared assumptions regarding rock music and its quality has required explicit information and discussion during the consecration project. As a result, the R&RHOF has relied upon comparatively transparent decision-making and induction processes, but given the lack of solidarity, they still experience dissension and controversy in the wake of their actions (Bergesen 1984).

The museum of each hall of fame was used to tell the history of the two genres, and in each museum, choices were made that reflect the values of each hall of fame. These values both influence and are influenced by their respective fields. The focus of the

Country Music Hall of Fame museum is on country music alone. The museum briefly covers country music's folk and gospel heritage, but otherwise the performers and exhibits in the museum is inwardly turned on the field of country music and its constituencies. In contrast, the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame features performers and exhibits from several different music genres. The differences in the museums reflect the strict boundaries found in country music and the blurry boundaries found in rock music.

Just as the choices made in the establishment and creation of each hall of fame offers insights into the fields in which they are located, their choices as to whom they would induct, and thus consecrate, also offer insights into the two music fields. The experiences of women in fields of country and rock music offer one example of the differences between these two fields. In country music, women had been marginalized in the genre during its early years, but over the past few decades, women had made great strides within the field. This shift is reflected in the effects of gender on cultural consecration in the CMHOF. Specifically, while women were all but absent during the first ten years of the CMHOF's history (Peterson 2013), those women eventually inducted did not significantly differ from their male counterparts in terms of how long they had to wait for this induction. This dissertation thus provides a new perspective on the effects of gender in country music, as previous research has not yet examined the effects of gender on cultural consecration in country music. On the other hand, prior research on the effects of gender in rock and popular music has indicated that women are disadvantaged at every turn. They face hurdles in US recording market itself (Dowd, Liddle, and Blyler 2005), they are edged out of genres as they become successful (Schmutz 2009), and they are less likely to have their work consecrated as one of *Rolling*

Stone magazine's 500 "Greatest Albums" (Schmutz and Faupel 2010). Yet, when it comes to the consecration project of the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame, we see a more complicated picture: while women performers are not significantly different from men performers in terms of the likelihood of induction into this hall of fame, they nonetheless face a significantly long wait time than do men. This dynamic increases our understanding of the considerable reach of gender inequality in rock music, as well as how it plays out in ongoing fashion.

The effects of race on induction into the two halls of fame stands in direct contrast to the effects of gender. The field of country music is known for being overwhelmingly white (Manuel 2008), and the CMHOF reflects this great racial disparity, with only two performers out of 86 being black. Event history analysis indicates those black performers (DeFord Bailey and Charley Pride) faced significantly longer waiting times for induction than did other CMHOF inductees—even when controlling for a host of other factors. Yet, in great contrast, black performers are well represented in the R&RHOF. Furthermore, black performers are significantly more likely to be inducted in the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame than are performers of other races, and the wait time for induction is significantly shorter for black performers as well. This provides evidence that symbolic and social boundaries are weaker in the R&RHOF, as the organization has chosen to consecrate the music of different races and genres. Given those weak boundaries, the effects of intersectionality common elsewhere are not in play in the consecration project of the R&RHOF—at least in terms of induction. In particular, black women performers are no less likely to be inducted, nor are they more likely to face extended waiting times for induction. This dissertation research thus helps to fill the gap that has resulted from race

being generally overlooked in work on cultural consecration in music as well as in fields of cultural production in general.

This dissertation also offers new insights into the effects that different forms of cultural legitimacy have on cultural consecration in the two halls of fame. The high levels of consensus that have shaped the CMHOF as an organization have also influenced the impact that cultural legitimacy has on the yearly inductions. At least one measure of critical, professional, and popular legitimacy all have some influence on the likelihood of a performer being inducted into in a given year. Moreover, most of the significant indicators work in concert in terms of being positive and in bolstering the chances of consecration. Hence, in this field of music where consensus is high, we do indeed see a convergence between contemporaneous evaluations of a critical entity (the Grand Ole Opry), professionals (the CMA awards) and the public (best-selling albums) and that convergence, in turn, is borne out in terms of how quickly the Country Music Hall of Fame inducts those possessing those forms of legitimacy. Yet, even in a field with high solidary, there is room for disagreements. The "family disagreement" between the Nashville and West Coast constituencies of country music matter, in that those performers associated with the West Coast face a longer time to induction, while those associated with Nashville enjoy a quicker time to induction. Not only, then, does high solidarity in the country music field enable an induction process with relatively little controversy, it also enables a process marked by consensus—where signs of success largely reinforce one another.

Cultural legitimacy also plays a significant role in the choices made by the R&RHOF—but in this field with low solidarity and fuzzy boundaries, cultural legitimacy

took on a different role for the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame's consecration project than it did for that of the Country Music Hall of Fame. Critical legitimacy consistently and positively influenced both the likelihood of induction for the R&RHOF, but also shortened the waiting time for inductees, thereby supporting previous research that emphasizes the role of critical discourse in consecration (Baumann 2011; Schmutz 2005; Schmutz & Faupel 2010; Schmutz & van Venrooij 2017). Popular legitimacy also played a significant role, when examined alone, on the induction process, increasing the likelihood of induction in a given year. This finding demonstrates that the R&RHOF is, in fact, more concerned with popular legitimacy than other consecrating bodies in music, based on work that researchers have previously done (Schmutz and Faupel 2010; Schmutz 2005). Finally, professional legitimacy plays the smallest role in cultural consecration in the R&RHOF, as it ultimately has no impact on neither the likelihood of induction nor waiting time to induction. Hence, the consecration project of the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame is marked by a notable split between critical and popular legitimacy—whereby critics and fans have comparable impact on the induction process—and professional legitimacy, whereby the awards conferred by fellow musicians have no impact whatsoever. That could be, of course, a result of the Grammy Awards themselves—which have a notable history of controversies and a lack of consensus (Anand & Watson 2004). Overall, though, the use of elaborated codes, driven by low solidarity in the rock music field, has resulted in the R&RHOF being more driven by less agreement among various actors than is the case for the CMHOF.

Despite adding to our understanding of cultural consecration, this dissertation has also produced new questions to be answered in the future. This dissertation only

examines the effect of the genres of performers. In the future, the sub-genres of the performers will need to be examined as there is great diversity in the music created under the umbrella of most genres, and these differences may have a large influence on cultural consecration. This could reveal nuances in the preferences of the board and voting bodies of both halls of fame. Another question that will need to answered years from now is how does being classified as a rap performer impact induction into the hall of fame. During the 1980s, the most recent time period in which the performers in the R&RHOF dataset could have been beginning their careers, rap music had not become the mainstay in popular culture the way it has in subsequent years (van Venrooij 2009). Therefore, there may be surge in the number of rap performers in the R&RHOF in future years. Regardless, the findings will increase our understanding of the blurriness of boundaries in popular music and cultural consecration. Indeed, while Gene Simmons wanted to draw the line clearly with regards to who does and does not belong in the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame, the fuzziness of this genre suggests that walking the line is a more apt metaphor—with performers of many genres faring well in the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame while performers representing that musical range fare poorly in the Country Music Hall of Fame. In other words, the boundaries of genres and their consecration is not given but, rather, must be constructed and negotiated. They must be walked.

REFERENCES

Anand, N. and Mary R. Watson. 2004. "Tournament Rituals in the Evolution of Fields: The Case of the Grammy Awards." *The Academy of Management Journal* 47 (1): 59-80.

Baumann, Shyon. 2001. "Intellectualization and Art World Development: Film in the United States." *American Sociological Review* 66: 404-426.

Bergesen, Albert. 1984. "The Semantic Equation: A Theory of the Social Origins of Art Styles." *Sociological Theory* 2: 187–221.

DiMaggio, Paul. 1982. "Cultural Entrepreneurship in Nineteenth-Century Boston." *Media, Culture & Society* 4 (1): 33–50.

Dowd, Timothy J., Kathleen Liddle, and Maureen Blyler. 2005. "Charting Gender: The Success of Female Acts in the US Mainstream Recording Market, 1940–1990." *Research in the Sociology of Organizations* 23: 81–123.

Manuel, Jeffrey T. 2008. "The Sound of the Plain White Folk? Creating Country Music's 'Social Origins.'" *Popular Music and Society* 31 (4): 417–31.

Peterson, Richard A. 2013. *Creating Country Music: Fabricating Authenticity*. E-book. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Schmutz, Vaughn. 2005. "Retrospective Cultural Consecration in Popular Music Rolling Stone's Greatest Albums of All Time." *American Behavioral Scientist* 48 (11): 1510–23.

Schmutz, Vaughn. 2009. "Social and Symbolic Boundaries in Newspaper Coverage of Music, 1955–2005: Gender and Genre in the US, France, Germany, and the Netherlands." *Poetics* 37 (4): 298–314.

Schmutz, Vaughn, and Alison Faupel. 2010. "Gender and Cultural Consecration in Popular Music." *Social Forces* 89 (2): 685–707.

Schmutz, Vaughn and Alex van Venrooij. 2017. "Harmonizing Forms of Legitimacy in the Consecration of Popular Music." Unpublished manuscript. Department of Sociology, University of North Carolina at Charlotte.

Venrooij, Alex van. 2009. "The Aesthetic Discourse Space of Popular Music: 1985–86 and 2004–05." *Poetics* 37 (4): 315–332.