CHANGING HIGHBROW TASTE: FROM SNOB TO OMNIVORE*

Richard A. Peterson
Vanderbilt University

Roger M. Kern
Vanderbilt University

Appreciation of fine arts became a mark of high status in the late nineteenth century as part of an attempt to distinguish "highbrowed" Anglo Saxons from the new "lowbrowed" immigrants, whose popular entertainments were said to corrupt morals and thus were to be shunned (Levine 1988; DiMaggio 1991). In recent years, however, many high-status persons are far from being snobs and are eclectic, even "omnivorous," in their tastes (Peterson and Simkus 1992). This suggests a qualitative shift in the basis for marking elite status—from snobbish exclusion to omnivorous appropriation. Using comparable 1982 and 1992 surveys, we test for this hypothesized change in tastes. We confirm that highbrows are more omnivorous than others and that they have become increasingly omnivorous over time. Regression analyses reveal that increasing "omnivorousness" is due both to cohort replacement and to changes over the 1980s among highbrows of all ages. We speculate that this shift from snob to omnivore relates to status-group politics influenced by changes in social structure, values, art-world dynamics, and generational conflict.

Not only are high-status Americans far more likely than others to consume the fine arts but, according to Peterson and Simkus (1992), they are also more likely to be involved in a wide range of low-status activities. This finding confirms the observations of DiMaggio (1987) and Lamont (1992), but it flies in the face of years of historical research showing that high-status persons shun cultural expressions that are not seen as elevated (Lynes 1954; Levine 1988; Murphy 1988; Beisel 1990). In making sense of this contradiction, Peterson and Simkus (1992) suggest that a historical shift from highbrow snob to omnivore is taking place.

MEASURES

The 1982 national survey on which Peterson and Simkus (1992) base their findings was replicated in 1992, so it is now possible to test for the changes in highbrow taste that they posit.[1] Both surveys ask respondents to select the music genres they like from a list of alternatives ranging across the aesthetic spectrum, and then to pick the one kind of music they like the best. We focus on *musical* taste, rather than taste for other types of art because only for music were respondents asked to choose from such a list of contrasting alternatives.

Highbrow is operationalized as liking both classical music and opera, and choosing one of these forms as best-liked from among all

* Direct correspondence to Richard A. Peterson, Department of Sociology, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37235. We thank Narasimhan Anand, Bethany Bryson, Paul DiMaggio, Michael Epelbaum, Larry Griffin, Michael Hughes, Guillermina Jasso, Barbara Kilbourne, Michèle Lamont, Holly McCammon, Claire Peterson, and Darren Sherkat for comments on the methodology or on an earlier draft of this paper. Early versions were presented at the 1994 annual meeting of the American Sociological Association in Los Angeles, at Princeton and Harvard Universities, and at the New School for Social Research. Finally, we gratefully acknowledge the support of the National Endowment for the Arts and of its Director of Research, Thomas Bradshaw.

[1] The data come from the Survey of Public Participation in the Arts, which polled two national-area probability samples of persons over age 18, one in 1982 and the other in 1992. The surveys were conducted by the U.S. Bureau of the Census for the National Endowment of the Arts. For a detailed description of these data sets see Robinson et al. (1985) and Robinson (1993).

kinds of music. This measure appears to be a valid index of being highbrow because those respondents we labeled highbrow attended performances of plays, ballet, classical music, musicals, visited art galleries, and attended opera significantly more often than did others in the sample.

Among highbrows, the snob is one who does not participate in any lowbrow or middlebrow activity (Levine 1988), while the omnivore is at least open to appreciating them all. Perfect snobs are now rare in the United States. Indeed, in the 1960s Wilensky (1964:194) "could not find one [Detroit area resident] in 1,354 who was not in some area exposed to middle- or low-brow material," and in our national sample of 11,321 we found just 10 highbrow respondents in 1982 and 3 in 1992 who said they did not like a single form of low- or middlebrow music.

We operationalize *omnivorousness* as a variable that can be measured as the *number* of middle- and lowbrow forms respondents choose. Following Wilensky (1964) and Rubin (1992), we differentiate between middlebrow and lowbrow because they are distinctly different and because critical observers have suggested that when highbrows are open to non-highbrow art forms, they seek out lowbrow forms created by socially marginal groups (Blacks, youth, isolated rural folks) while still holding commercial middlebrow forms in contempt (Lynes 1954; Sontag 1966).

Five music genres are considered *lowbrow*: country music, bluegrass, gospel, rock, and blues. Each of these genres is rooted in a specific "marginal" ethnic, regional, age, or religious experience (Malone 1979; Lipsitz 1990; Ennis 1992). There are three *middlebrow* music genres—including mood/easy-listening music, Broadway musicals, and big band music. These forms have been in the mainstream of commercial music throughout the twentieth century (Goldberg 1961; Nanry 1972; Ennis 1992).[2] The lowbrow measure can range from 0 to 5; the middlebrow measure can range from 0 to 3. Omnivorousness can range from 0 to 8.

In both years (1982 and 1992) highbrows, on average, have about two years more education, earn about five thousand dollars more annual family income, are about 10 years older, are more likely to be White, and are more likely to be female than are others in the sample.[3] All of these differences are statistically significant. Neither highbrows nor others, however, are more likely to be currently married.[4]

FINDINGS

The top row of Table 1 shows that, on average, highbrows chose 1.74 lowbrow genres of 5 possible in 1982 and 2.23 in 1992, a statistically significant increase of nearly half a genre per person in just one decade. This finding is in line with the prediction of increasing highbrow omnivorousness. The first row also shows that others increased their number of lowbrow choices as well, but the rate of change for highbrows is significantly greater than for non-highbrows ($p < .05$, difference of proportions test). Also, in the 1982–1992 decade, highbrows overtook others in the number of lowbrow genres chosen.

In the second row of Table 1 we see that in 1982 highbrows, on average, liked almost two of the three middlebrow music genres. This sharply contradicts the expectations of Lynes (1954) and Sontag (1966) that highbrows will shun middlebrow forms, but is congruent

[2] Both the 1982 and 1992 surveys asked about other musical forms as well. Barbershop, rap, reggae, New Age, and marching band music, for example, were included in one survey year but not the other, so they could not be included except as noted below. In addition the category "folk" was reworded in a way that made it incomparable from one survey year to the next. Jazz was included on both years, but it was not put in either of the scales because, while its roots are clearly lowbrow, it is now taught in conservatories of music as highbrow and largely consumed as middlebrow (Leonard 1962; Nanry 1972; Ennis 1992), and survey data has clearly shown an unusually diffuse evaluation of what is called "jazz" by different people (DiMaggio and Ostrower 1990; Peterson and Simkus 1992).

[3] Unfortunately respondents to the 1992 survey were not asked their occupation, so we cannot assess this important component of social class position as Peterson and Simkus (1992) did using the 1982 data.

[4] Currently married respondents were distinguished from all others because, on average, they attend arts performances less often than do those who are single, divorced, and widowed (DiMaggio and Ostrower 1990).

Table 1. Univariate Statistics for Highbrows and Others, 1982 and 1992

	Highbrows			Others		
Variable	1982	1992	Difference	1982	1992	Difference
Number of lowbrow music genres liked (max. = 5)	1.74	2.23	.49**	1.80	2.07	.27**
Number of middlebrow music genres liked (max. = 3)	1.98	2.12	.14	1.01	1.12	.11**
Percent male	44	35	−9	46	46	−2**
Age in years	54.19	56.18	1.99	42.98	46.59	3.61**
Family income	$26,360	$33,304	$6,945**	$20,614	$28,301	$7,686**
Percent married	66	63	−3	64	64	0
Percent White	96	96	0	88	86	−2
Education in years	14.57	14.33	−.24	12.19	12.67	.48**

*$p < .05$ level **$p < .10$ level (one-tailed tests)

Note: A highbrow is defined as a respondent who likes both opera and classical music and chooses one of these forms as the music genre he or she likes best.

with Peterson and Simkus's (1992) ideas about omnivorousness because highbrows are found to like more middlebrow forms than others and because this difference increases (although not significantly statistically) from 1982 to 1992.

Taken together, these findings suggest that in 1992 highbrows, on average, are more omnivorous than they were in 1982 and have become more omnivorous than others. At the same time, non-highbrows are increasing their number of musical preferences as well. With just these two data points it is not possible to say definitely whether there is a long-term secular trend toward omnivorousness or whether the change is due to forces just affecting the decade under study. We return to these questions below.

Did all highbrows tend to become more omnivorous between 1982 and 1992—in other words, could the difference be called a *period* effect (Rogers 1982)? Alternatively, did individual highbrows retain their tastes unchanged, with the observed difference resulting from older cohorts of highbrows with more snob-like tastes being displaced by younger, more omnivorous cohorts? Abramson and Inglehart (1993), for example, show that cohort replacement has dramatically changed values in eight Western nations. Cohort is here measured as *year of birth* (Rogers 1982).

To answer these questions, we pool the two years of data and employ four OLS regression analyses. The dependent variable in each analysis is the number of middlebrow or lowbrow genres chosen by highbrows and by others, analyzed separately. The independent variables of interest in each of the analyses are the *birth year* of the respondent (measured by subtracting the respondent's age from the year of the interview) and the *year of the interview* (measured as a dummy variable; 1 = 1992).

A number of variables have been shown to influence arts participation independent of age.[5] These include education, gender, race, (measured here as Whites versus others), adjusted family income,[6] and the size of the respondent's residential community[7] (DiMaggio and Useem 1978; Blau 1989; DiMaggio and

[5] Each control variable was tested for interactions with both birth year and year of interview, and no significant interactions were found.

[6] Because family income was reported in categories, the midpoint of the respondent's income category was subtracted from the mean of the income midpoints for the year in which the interview took place. This transformation means that the income distributions for each year were set to a mean of zero, nullifying any effect of inflation while retaining the effect of changing distributions of income across years.

[7] This was measured in 12 categories ranked from small to large.

Table 2. OLS Coefficients from the Regression of Number of Lowbrow and Middlebrow Musical Genres Liked on Birth Year, Year of Interview, and Selected Control Variables

	Highbrows				Others			
	(Model 1) Number of Lowbrow Genres Liked		(Model 2) Number of Middlebrow Genres Liked		(Model 3) Number of Lowbrow Genres Liked		(Model 4) Number of Middlebrow Genres Liked	
Variables	b	Beta	b	Beta	b	Beta	b	Beta
Birth year	.02	.16^{++}	−.01	−.07	.01	.12^{++}	−.01	−.23^{++}
Year of interview (1 = 1992)	.44	.15^{+}	.25	.13^{+}	.20	.07^{++}	.15	.07^{++}
Control Variables								
Male	−.07	−.02	−.20	−.10	.01	.01	−.20	−.09**
Adjusted family income	.00	−.11	.01	.04	.00	.01	.00	.12**
White	−.92	−.13	.60	.13*	.18	.05**	.38	.12**
Education in years	.05	.10	.00	.01	.05	.11**	.10	.28**
Size of community	−.01	−.04	.00	.02	−.02	−.08**	.02	.08**
Constant	−27.45*	—	9.25	—	−16.61**	—	26.20**	—
Significance of F	—	.00	—	.12	—	.00	—	.00
Adjusted R^2	—	.06	—	.02	—	.06	—	.16
Number of respondents	—	354	—	354	—	10,967	—	10,967

$^{+}p < .05$ $^{++}p < .01$ (one-tailed tests)
$^{*}p < .05$ $^{**}p < .01$ (two-tailed tests)

Ostrower 1990; Robinson 1993). Each of these could conceivably influence the degree of omnivorousness, so they are included as control variables. Marital status was not included as a control variable because it was not significantly linked with the number of music genres chosen.

The results of the four OLS regression analyses are presented in Table 2. The positive coefficient for birth year in Model 1 shows that, controlling for the year of the interview and the other variables, highbrows in later cohorts like significantly more lowbrow forms than do older highbrows. The size of the effect is such that two people born 20 years apart differ by .40 (20 × .02 =.40) music genres chosen. The positive effect of 1992 interview year shows that, net of the controls, highbrows interviewed in 1992 liked significantly more lowbrow music genres than highbrows did a decade earlier, indicating an increase of .44 forms chosen.

Turning to the number of middlebrow music genres liked by highbrows, Model 2 shows that birth year has no effect on middlebrow music taste, but highbrows interviewed in 1992 did like significantly more middlebrow genres than did those interviewed a decade earlier, an increase of .25 genres. Taken together, these results show that both cohort replacement and period effects increase highbrows' tastes for lowbrow music, while only period effects increase their taste for middlebrow music.

The results of the OLS regression analyses for non-highbrows are shown in Models 3 and 4 of Table 2. We see a pattern similar to that for highbrows: Controlling for the other variables in the model, in 1992 non-highbrows liked more low- and middlebrow music genres than they had in 1982, and younger cohorts of non-highbrows liked more lowbrow genres and fewer middlebrow genres than did older cohorts.

DISCUSSION

Taken together, the findings of this study support the assertion that omnivorousness is replacing snobbishness among Americans of

highbrow status. The change is due in part to cohort displacement, but has occurred mostly because highbrows of all ages are becoming more omnivorous. This is not to say that most highbrows have become perfect omnivores. (In 1982 only eight and in 1992 only seven highbrows said that they liked *all* other types of music.) The point is that in 1992 highbrows, on average, reported liking significantly more kinds of nonelite music of all genres than did highbrows a decade earlier and also that in 1992 highbrows are more omnivorous than non-highbrows. This latter finding is strengthened by using the information on all 17 nonelite genres of music included in the 1992 survey. Highbrows report liking 7.49 of the 17 genres of music included in 1992 versus 4.84 genres, on average, for the non-highbrows, and this difference is significant.[8] In addition, the findings for non-highbrows show that the increase between 1982 and 1992 in the number of music genres liked, while greatest among highbrows, is a society-wide trend.

Theorizing on Omnivorousness

The omnivorousness of high-status persons, as reported by Peterson and Simkus (1992), is an empirical generalization and does not provide an explanation for why there has been such a profound shift in the way high status is designated. Having found strong support for the shift from snobbishness to omnivorousness, we now focus briefly on the omnivore concept and suggest a number of factors that contribute to this shift.

As we understand the meaning of omnivorous taste, it does not signify that the omnivore likes everything *indiscriminantly*. Rather, it signifies an *openness* to appreciating everything. In this sense it is antithetical to snobbishness, which is based fundamentally on rigid rules of exclusion (Bourdieu [1979] 1984; Murphy 1988) such as: "It is *de rigueur* to like opera, and country music is an anathema to be shunned." While by definition hostile to snobbish closure (Murphy 1988), omnivorousness does not imply an indifference to distinctions. Rather its emergence may suggest the formulation of new rules governing symbolic boundaries (Lamont and Fournier 1992).

Several studies have shown that criteria of distinction, of which omnivorousness is one expression, must center not on *what* one consumes but on the *way* items of consumption are understood. Bourdieu ([1979] 1984, [1965] 1990), for example, contrasts unreflective consumption for personal enjoyment with intellectualized appreciation. He identifies intellectualized appreciation in ways that most easily fit a monolithic symbolic landscape appropriate to the era of the elitist snob. Nonetheless, the culture of critical discourse (Gouldner 1979) central to Bourdieu's view is also amenable to a *discriminating* omnivorousness if the ethnocentrism central to snobbish elitism is replaced by cultural relativism. Under these conditions, cultural expressions of all sorts are understood in what relativists call *their own terms*.[9]

If this indeed is the way omnivores mark symbolic boundaries, they do not embrace contemporary country music, for example, as representing how they identify themselves as do hard-core country music fans (Peterson and Kern 1995). Rather, they appreciate and critique it in the light of some knowledge of the genre, its great performers, and links to other cultural forms, lowbrow and highbrow. Intellectuals have long provided the grounds for an aesthetic understanding of jazz, blues, rock, and bluegrass music. More recently country music has begun to be taken seriously as magazine articles in elite cultural periodicals such as *American Heritage* (Scherman 1994) and books by humanist scholars (Tichi 1994) begin to provide omnivores with the tools they need to develop an aesthetic understanding of country music.

Why the Historic Shift from Snobbishness to Omnivorousness?

Changes in fashion are often ephemeral (Davis 1992), but a shift in the basis of taste from snobbishness to omnivorousness sug-

[8] The significance of the difference between these two means is inferred from a test of the difference of proportions of the number of music genres liked by highbrows and others, which is significant at the $p < .01$ level (one-tailed test).

[9] As critical thinking within anthropology has made clear, the idea of "cultural relativism" itself is a form of hubris because it is impossible for an outsider to experience another's culture as a native does (Clifford and Marcus 1986).

gests that significant alterations in social power relationships are involved (Williams 1961). In concluding we speculatively suggest five linked factors that may contribute to the shifting grounds of status-group politics (Shiach 1989).

Structural change. A number of social processes at work over the past century make exclusion increasingly difficult. Rising levels of living, broader education, and presentation of the arts via the media have made elite aesthetic taste more accessible to wider segments of the population, devaluing the arts as markers of exclusion.

At the same time, geographic migration and social class mobility have mixed people holding different tastes. And the increasingly ubiquitous mass media have introduced the aesthetic tastes of different segments of the population to each other. Thus the diverse folkways of the rest of the world's population are ever more difficult to exclude, and at the same time, they are increasingly available for appropriation by elite taste-makers (Lipsitz 1990).

Value change. If structural changes shape the opportunity, value changes concerning gender, ethnic, religious, and racial differences rationalize the change from snob to omnivore. In the nineteenth century group prejudice was widely sanctified by scientific theory and expressed society-wide in laws of exclusion. This changed gradually, and the Nazi brutalities of World War II gave "racism" of all sorts such a bad name that most discriminatory laws in this country have since been abolished. It is now increasingly rare for persons in authority publicly to espouse theories of essential ethic and racial group differences (Takaki 1993).[10] The change from exclusionist snob to inclusionist omnivore can thus be seen as a part of the historical trend toward greater tolerance of those holding different values (Inglehart 1990; Abramson and Inglehart 1993).

Art-World change. Developments in the fine art worlds over the past one and one-half centuries first provided the theories and the modes of display for the making of the highbrow into snob and more recently provided the rationale for the omnivore. The elitist theorists of the early nineteenth century European Royal Academies of music, painting, drama, and dance argued among themselves, but they stood united in their belief that there was one standard and that all other expressions were vulgarities (White and White 1965). Thus they created an aesthetic and moral environment in which highbrow snobbery flourished (Arnold 1875:44–47; Levine 1988:171–241).

The market forces that swept through all the arts brought in their wake new aesthetic entrepreneurs who propounded avant-guardist theories that placed positive value on seeking new and ever more exotic modes of expression, but in the latter half of the twentieth century the candidates being championed for inclusion were so numerous and their aesthetic range so great that the old criterion of a single standard became stretched beyond the point of credibility. It became increasingly obvious that the quality of art did not inhere in the work itself, but in the evaluations made by the art world (Zolberg 1990: 53–106), and that expressions of all sorts from around the world are open to aesthetic appropriation (Becker 1982). This is the aesthetic basis of the shift from the elitist exclusive snob to the elitist inclusive omnivore.

Generational politics. Before the third quarter of the twentieth century youngsters were expected to like pop music and pop culture generally but to move on to more "serious" fare as they matured. Beginning in the 1950s, however, young White people of all classes embraced popular African American dance music styles as their own under the rubric of rock'n'roll (Ennis 1992), and by the late 1960s what was identified as the "Woodstock Nation" saw its own variegated youth culture not so much as a "stage" to go through in growing up but as a viable alternative to established elite culture (Lipsitz 1990; Aronowitz 1993), thus, in effect, discrediting highbrow exclusion and valorizing inclusion. One of the lasting impacts of this view is that not as many well-educated and well-to-do Americans born since World War II patronize the elite arts as did their elders (Robinson 1993; Peterson and Sherkat 1995), and many say they like a wide array of musical forms (Schaefer 1987; Peterson

[10] Essentialist arguments are still often made concerning certain behavioral differences between the sexes and as explanations for sexual orientation (the latter are made both by advocates for and opponents of gay men and lesbians).

and Sherkat 1995).

Status-group politics. Dominant status groups have regularly defined popular culture in ways that fit their own interests and have worked to render harmless subordinate status-group cultures (Sennett and Cobb 1972; Shiach 1989). One recurrent strategy is to define popular culture as brutish and something to be suppressed or avoided (Arnold 1875; Elliot 1949; Bloom 1987); another is to gentrify elements of popular culture and incorporate them into the dominant status-group culture (Leonard 1962; Tichi 1994). Our data suggest a major shift from the former strategy to the latter strategy of status group politics.

While snobbish exclusion was an effective marker of status in a relatively homogeneous and circumscribed WASP-ish world that could enforce its dominance over all others by force if necessary, omnivorous inclusion seems better adapted to an increasingly global world managed by those who make their way, in part, by showing respect for the cultural expressions of others. As highbrow snobbishness fit the needs of the earlier entrepreneurial upper-middle class, there also seems to be an elective affinity between today's new business-administrative class and omnivorousness.

Richard A. Peterson *is Professor of Sociology at Vanderbilt University. With Roger Kern, Michael Hughes and others, he is exploring the changing ways that tastes are used in signalling status differences. In connection he is editing a forthcoming special issue of* Poetics: Journal of Empirical Research on Literature, the Media and the Arts. *With Narasimhan Anand, he is researching the role of information in structuring industrial fields. In addition, he is completing a monograph for the University of Chicago Press on the fabrication of authenticity and the institutionalization of the field of "country music."*

Roger M. Kern *is a Ph.D. student in Sociology at Vanderbilt University. He is currently completing his dissertation, which explores the relationships between cultural capital and social stigma acquired in adolescence and the attainment of social status as an adult. Other projects include an analysis of countervailing relationships between parental social class and juvenile delinquency (with Gary Jensen), and a content analysis of the use of personal resources by upper-middle-class elites in personal advertisements appearing in the* New York Review of Books.

REFERENCES

Abramson, Paul R. and Ronald Inglehart. 1993. "Generational Replacement and Value Change in Eight West European Countries." *British Journal of Politics* 22:183–228.

Aronowitz, Stanley. 1993. *Roll over Beethoven: The Return of Cultural Strife*. Hanover, MA: Wesleyan University Press.

Arnold, Matthew. 1875. *Culture and Anarchy*. New York: Smith, Elder.

Becker, Howard S. 1982. *Art Worlds*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Beisel, Nicola. 1990. "Class, Culture, and Campaigns against Vice in Three American Cities, 1872–1892." *American Sociological Review* 55:44–62.

Blau, Judith. 1989. *The Shape of Culture: A Study of Contemporary Cultural Patterns in the United States*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bloom, Allan. 1987. *The Closing of the American Mind*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Bourdieu, Pierre. [1979] 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Reprint, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

———. [1965] 1990. *Photography: A Middle-Brow Art*. Reprint, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Clifford, James and George E. Marcus. 1986. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Davis, Fred. 1992. *Fashion, Culture, and Identity*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

DiMaggio, Paul. 1987. "Classification in Art." *American Sociological Review* 52: 440–55.

———. 1991. "Social Structure, Institutions and Cultural Goods: The Case of The United States." Pp. 133–55 in *Social Theory for a Changing Society*, edited by P. Bourdieu and J. Coleman. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

DiMaggio, Paul and Francie Ostrower. 1990. "Participation in the Arts by Black and White Americans." *Social Forces* 63:753–78.

DiMaggio, Paul and Michael Useem. 1978. "Social Class and Arts Consumption in America." *Theory and Society* 5:109–32

Elliot, T.S. 1949. *Notes toward the Definition of Culture*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.

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

Goldberg, Isaac. 1961. *Tin Pan Alley: A Chronicle of American Popular Music*. New York: Ungar.

Gouldner, Alvin W. 1979. *The Future of Intellec-*

tuals and the Rise of the New Class. New York: Seabury.

Inglehart, Ronald. 1990. *Culture Shift in Advanced Industrial Society.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

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

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

Leonard, Neil. 1962. *Jazz and the White Americans.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Levine, Lawrence W. 1988. *Highbrow/Lowbrow: The Emergence of Cultural Hierarchy in America.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lipsitz, George. 1990. *Time Passages: Collective Memory and American Popular Culture.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Lynes, Russell. 1954. *The Tastemakers.* New York: Harper.

Malone, Bill C. 1979. *Southern Music/American Music.* Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky Press.

Murphy, Raymond. 1988. *Social Closure: The Theory of Monopolization and Exclusion.* Oxford, England: Clarendon.

Nanry, Charles. 1972. *American Music.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Peterson, Richard A. and Roger M. Kern. 1995. "Hard-Core and Soft-Shell Country Music Fans." *Journal of Country Music* 17(3):3–6.

Peterson, Richard A. and Darren E. Sherkat. 1995. *Age Factors in Arts Participation: 1982–1992.* Research Monograph, January, National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, DC.

Peterson, Richard A. and Albert Simkus. 1992. "How Musical Taste Groups Mark Occupational Status Groups." Pp. 152–68 in *Cultivating Differences: Symbolic Boundaries and the Making of Inequality*, edited by M. Lamont and M. Fournier. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Robinson, John P. 1993. *Arts Participation in America: 1982–1992.* Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts.

Robinson, John P., Carol A. Keegan, Terry Hanford, and Timothy A. Triplett. 1985. *Public Participation in the Arts: Final Report on the 1982 Survey.* College Park, MD: University of Maryland.

Rogers, Willard L. 1982. "Estimable Functions of Age, Period, and Cohort Effects." *American Sociological Review* 47:774–87.

Rubin, Joan Shelley. 1992. *The Making of Middlebrow Culture.* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Schaefer, John. 1987. *New Sounds: A Listener's Guide to New Music.* New York: Harper and Row.

Scherman, Tony. 1994. "Country Music: Its Rise and Fall." *American Heritage* 45(7):38–51.

Sennett, Richard and Jonathan Cobb. 1972. *The Hidden Injuries of Class.* New York: Knopf.

Shiach, Morag. 1989. *Discourse on Popular Culture.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Sontag, Susan. 1966. *Against Interpretation and Other Essays.* New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.

Takaki, Ronald. 1993. *A Different Mirror: A History of Multiculturalism in America.* Boston, MA: Little, Brown.

Tichi, Cecelia. 1994. *High Lonesome: The American Culture of Country Music.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

White, Harrison C. and Cynthia White. 1965. *Canvasses and Careers.* New York: Wiley.

Wilensky, Harold L. 1964. "Mass Media and Mass Culture: Interdependence or Independence?" *American Sociological Review* 29: 173–97.

Williams, Raymond. 1961. *The Long Revolution.* London, England: Chatto and Windus.

Zolberg, Vera. 1990. *Constructing a Sociology of the Arts.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.