Music Genres as Historical Artifacts: The Case of Classical Music

Jef Vlegels
Vrije Universiteit Brussel
Brussels, Belgium
Ghent University
Gent, Belgium

John Lievens
Ghent University
Gent, Belgium

Abstract

This article reflects on the use of predetermined genre lists to measure patterns in music taste and, more specifically, classical music taste. Classical music as a whole is in quantitative research typically treated as marker of cultural prestige, although qualitative research suggests great internal diversity within the genre. The use of a predetermined array of genres to measure music taste risks to miss these subdivisions within the classical music genre and thus produces biased results. Therefore, inspired by Lamont's (2010) call to study classification systems 'from the ground up', we present an alternative strategy to measure classical music taste using an open question about artist preferences. We build a two-mode network of classical music artists and respondents and use Infinite Relational Models to identify clusters of respondents that have similar relationships to the same set of artists. We detect no less than five distinct listening patterns within the classical music genre. Two of these preference clusters focus only on very central, popular classical artists. Another cluster combines these popular artists with more contemporary artists. One cluster focuses on only one very accessible artist and, finally, there is a cluster of respondents that distinct themselves by having a real connoisseur taste. Furthermore, we find that expert taste in classical music is not related to social distinction. Instead, knowledge of the most central and popular artists (e.g. Bach, Beethoven, Mozart) is typical for respondents with a high socio-economic background. Social distinction seems more related to knowledge of popular artists in classical music than to distinctive, connoisseur taste. Our findings show the potential of social network analysis for the problem of music taste classification and cultural sociology in general.

Keywords: *Music genres, music taste, two-mode cluster analysis and cultural sociology*

Authors

***Jef Vlegels**,* is a post-doctoral researcher at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussels, Belgium and Ghent University, Gent, Belgium. His research focuses on cultural tastes, cultural participation, social networks, cultural policy and cultural education.

John Lievens, is an associate professor at the Department of Sociology of Ghent University, Gent, Belgium. He teaches several courses in statistics and demography. His research focuses on culture and art participation/consumption, amateur art participation, perception of culture, lifestyles, sexual behavior, and partner choice in ethnic minorities.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Dr. Sam Werquin for his help with the Mathlab scripts.

Correspondence concerning this work should be addressed to Jef Vlegels, Vrije Universiteit Brussel and Ghent University, jef.vlegels@vub.ac.be.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17266/35.1.4

1. Introduction

The classification of social phenomena is central in theoretical and empirical sociology ever since the beginning of sociology as a discipline. In cultural sociology too, the classification of artworks into categories and consumption patterns is omnipresent. In research on music taste, e.g., researchers use music genres to measure the music preferences of their respondents. Subsequently, researchers use these genre preferences to identify taste patterns that can be linked to the socio-cultural distinctions of their interest. Best known examples of this approach are applications of Bourdieu's highbrow-lowbrow dichotomy (Bourdieu, [1979] 1984) and Peterson's omnivore-univore these (Peterson, 1992; Peterson & Kern, 1996).

Although numerous studies use music genre preferences to construct music taste patterns, possible limitations of measuring music taste by genre categorizations are rarely discussed. We argue that music taste measurements based on a pre-defined list of music genres may suffer from validity issues. These measurement methods assume that genres are rigid and stable concepts. However, in reality, music genre boundaries are 'fuzzy' and there is no guarantee that a presented music genre list is universally interpreted. In addition, the differential interpretation of a presented music genre might be related to the social background of the respondents. If this is true, research on the social structure of music taste patterns might be hampered since at least part of the social structuring happens already in the measurement process itself.

In this article, we investigate this potential validity issue by focusing on the case of classical music. In research on music taste, classical music is often treated as one broad music genre (Lena & Peterson, 2008). Nevertheless, some research suggests great internal diversity within the classical genre (e.g. Savage & Gayo, 2011). Classical music preferences can go from mainstream accessible artists to avant-garde, expert taste. Bourdieu ([1979] 1984, p. 16), for example, famously uses the Well-Tempered Clavier, Rhapsody in Blue and Blue Danube in his research to distinguish between "legitimate", "middle-brow" and "popular" taste in classical music. A traditional broad genre preference measurement will not capture all these subtypes and will potentially miss distinction within the classical music genre. Therefore, we propose to adopt a ground-up perspective on music taste to investigate if and to what extend there is ambiguity among respondents in interpreting the classical music genre, and whether this ambiguity is socially structured. We do this by analyzing the artists, bands and composers that are classified by respondents as classical music and by looking for the social structure behind this classification process. We conclude this paper with a discussion on the possible consequences of using broad genre labels in research on music taste. If music preference measurements based on genre classifications suffer from validity issues, the question arises if and to what degree current insights on the social structure of music taste patterns are biased.

2. Theory

2.1 Genre Preferences and Music Taste

Music genre classifications are central in quantitative research on music taste patterns (Beer, 2013). Cultural researchers typically use a pre-set array of genres to measure the music taste of their respondents. There is, however, no validated and widely accepted measurement instrument for music genres. Researchers seem to develop their own list of genres and instructions for the respondents in function of their research question, knowledge of the music field and characteristics of their respondent sample. This results in a high degree of variation in operationalization between studies (Peterson, 2005). Nevertheless, researchers heavily rely on these genre preference lists, genres are a priori organizing tools that allow them to classify people and to draw links between these classifications and socio-demographic characteristics. Roy & Dowd refer to this process as musical bounding: "Bounding is one mechanism that shapes a society's system of alignment between conceptual distinctions (e.g., how music is classified into genres) and social distinctions (e.g., race, class)" (Roy & Dowd, 2010, p. 194). The boundaries created by classifying the music preferences of respondents into genres are thus inevitably reflected in research that links culture and social divisions. Music genres "ultimately feed into sociology's conception of difference, class and inequality" (Beer & Taylor, 2013, p. 2).

The validity of measuring music taste by genre preferences is, however, seldom questioned. Cultural researchers that use genre preferences implicitly assume that their genre list reflects the natural divisions within music taste and that these genre labels are universally interpreted. Yet, the diversity in methodologies used in different publications and the observation that most studies hardly motivate the selection of genre labels, questions this assumption. Furthermore, there are several reasons to suspect that taste measurements based on genre preferences are 'historical artefacts' that suffer from validity issues.

2.2 Genre Labels as Historical Artifacts

The main problem we see is that cultural research that uses a priori genre lists makes the assumption that genres are rigid and stable concepts (Beer & Taylor, 2013; Lena & Peterson, 2008). This is at odds with the prevailing conviction that music genres continually emerge, evolve and disappear (Beer, 2013; Lamont & Molnár, 2002; Lena & Peterson, 2008). Music genres are lively concepts, and boundary drawing around genres happens continuously within the dynamics of the field and in the specific historic context of the moment (Bourdieu, [1979] 1984; Frow, 2006; Savage & Silva, 2013). The emergence of decentralized social media seems to accelerate the dynamics even more. The field of music genres shows signs of 'declassification' and becomes more "differentiated and characterized by a plethora of genres" (Beer, 2013; Dimaggio, 1991; van Venrooij, 2009, p. 317).

An a priori grid of genres is unable to deal with this vibrancy in music genres (Beer, 2013; Bottero & Crossley, 2011). It assumes that researchers can keep up with the unremitting dynamics of genre boundary drawing. In practice, it is almost unfeasible for an "uncool," as Beer (2009, p. 1151) puts it, cultural researcher to grasp all the emerging, evolving and disappearing (sub)genres in an a priori grid (Lamont, 2010). Dimaggio (1987) already drew attention to the fact that survey questions make fewer distinctions among cultural forms than users of culture do. More in particular, broad genre definitions tend to overlook important "sub-divisions into genres, periods, styles, authors etc." (Bourdieu, [1979] 1984, p. 16; Savage, 2006). Furthermore, a priori genre lists leave no room for 'fuzzyness' in interpretation (Beer, 2013; Bottero & Crossley, 2011). As Savage and Gayo (2011) suggest, it is possible that respondents who indicate they prefer the same music genre may actually have different aspects of that particular music genre in mind. A-priori genre lists thus have the potential to conceal not only subdivisions within music genres, but also the different audiences that are associated with these subdivisions.

2.3 The Case of Classical Music

These issues are perhaps the most tangible in the case of classical music. Most sociologists of culture agree that there is a hierarchy in music genres and that classical music is high up on the social status ladder. The touting of classical music as superior to popular music has a long history and this "institutionalized hierarchy remains surprisingly robust" (Roy & Dowd, 2010, p. 193; van Venrooij, 2009). The preference for classical music is still widely treated in empirical research as marker of cultural prestige (Peterson, 2005; Savage & Gayo, 2011). Classical music in general, either as part of an omnivore taste pattern or as opposite to more popular genres, is seen as a marker of elite taste, and as an important part of the cultural capital that gains access to scarce economic, educational and occupational resources.

The use of classical music as broad music genre, however, was already questioned by Bourdieu ([1979] 1984), who insisted that classical music cannot simply be categorized into one cultural genre, as there will be differences in the specific types of musical works that are part of the classical music genre. Bourdieu's own analysis on music taste differentiated between 'easy listening' and more esoteric or avant-garde forms of classical music (Bourdieu, [1979] 1984, pp. 16-17; DeNora, 2000). This corresponds with recent research that emphasizes the importance of within-genre diversity. Atkinson (2011), for example, claimed the existence of a polarization between legitimate/artistic and popular/commercial within every music genre. Furthermore, respondents can have different understandings of what kind of music is entailed in the classical music genre (Beer & Taylor, 2013; Holt, 1998; Savage, 2006). The results of Savage & Gayo (2011), for example, show that respondents distinguish 'light classical' music from more 'esoteric' or 'avant garde' forms of classical music. The increasing popularity of the former, especially in (the lower regions of) the middle classes, implies according to them that classical music as a whole is not an exclusive marker of 'highbrow' anymore. "We need to avoid the conflation of 'highbrow culture' with a priori liking for classical music" (Savage & Gayo, 2011, p. 341). An analysis based on the preference for the broad classical music genre thus risks missing important subdivisions made by the respondents, but not by the researchers. Furthermore, these subdivisions within the classical genre might comprehend specific subgroups of the population. As long as cultural researchers rely on broad a-priori genre grids, they ignore this potential social diversity within the classical music genre.

2.4 The Duality Between People and Artist Preferences

Therefore, we propose no longer using broad music genre preferences, but instead using an open and more specific question on artist preferences instead. More specifically, we ask the respondents for the groups, singers, artists, and composers they prefer to listen to. We view artist preferences as a middle ground between specific musical works and genre categories. As argued in the previous paragraphs, music genres are too broad, while an open question for music works may be too specific to find any overlap and systematic links between respondents and their music taste. By asking respondents to consider specific artists in an open question, we avoid problems of interpretational variety (Savage, 2006). Furthermore, by using an open question instead of an ad hoc genre list, we tackle problems of hidden dimensions and strong dynamics in music genre boundaries. Researchers will not have to produce a list of genres anymore, which eliminates the risk of using genre grids that are out of date or incomplete, and which do not capture all the dimensions in the music taste of respondents. This approach fits into Lamont's call to find ways to study "classification systems comparatively and from the ground up" (Lamont, 2010, p. 132) and relates to Beer's (2013) concept of 'classificatory imagination', in which genre boundaries are formed continuously through 'negations in actions'. Rather than treating music genres as a stable set of classifications, cultural research should focus on how "boundaries are drawn and redrawn in a changing cultural context" (Beer, 2013, p. 157; Beer & Taylor, 2013). An open question on listening preferences for specific groups, singers, artists, and composers allows us to study music taste from the bottom up, within the context of everyday social interaction.

Traditional data reduction techniques, as factor analysis, latent class analysis or even multiple correspondence analysis are not able to deal with the resulting data since the list of artists will be too long for them. Therefore, we argue for adopting a relational view on respondents and their music artist preferences. We agree with other scholars that a focus on what is termed the duality between people and cultural products can offer new insights for cultural researchers (Breiger, 1974; Dimaggio, 2011). If we consider people and their artist preferences as a two-mode network, we can use network theory and methodology to analyze the interrelationships between different cultural items and their connection with people. As Dimaggio put it, in a two-mode network of artists and people, "genres consist of those sets of works which bear similar relations to the same sets of persons" (Dimaggio, 1987, p. 441, footnote 3). This means that if we construct a two-mode matrix with people on the first mode and artists on the second, we can identify clusters of artists that are strongly connected and are often associated together by a group of respondents (see also Mark, 2003). In other words, a first mode will reveal artist clusters 'from the ground up' and a second mode will reveal groups of respondents that have similar relationships to the clusters of artists in the first mode. Finally, the clusters of people can be linked to sociological indicators, thus allowing us to detect the social distinctions in the detected clusters of respondents.

In the following paragraphs, we apply this analytical strategy to our dataset. More specific, we want to answer two main research questions:

1. Can we detect internal diversity within the classical music genre if we use artist preferences instead of genre preferences?
2. If we find these sub-dimensions, are they socially structured?

3. Data

We use data from the 'Participation in Flanders 2009' survey (Lievens & Waege, 2011), a research project of the policy research centre "Culture, Youth and Sport". Flanders, the Dutch speaking part of Belgium, has about 6 million inhabitants. In this survey, 3,144 randomly selected from the National Register respondents between 14 and 85 years old were questioned about their sociodemographic characteristics and their cultural behavior in a broad range of domains (arts, everyday culture, leisure activities, sport and recreation). Each of these were measured in detail, providing a detailed picture of cultural participation in Flanders and giving insight into the motives, expectations, or thresholds for participation and broader attitudes towards culture and society. The response rate in the sample was 68.00% of the eligible respondents. The data are weighted by gender, age, and schooling level in order to make them representative of the population of Flanders aged 14–85. This paper focuses on the socio-demographics and on an experimental open question on the favorite artists of the respondents. A random half of the respondents in the sample (n=1523) was selected to answer the question "Give, only for the genres you listened to in the past month, about three names of groups, singers, artists or composers you prefer to listen to. This question is only about what you prefer to listen to, there are no 'wrong' answers". This question was then followed by a list of 17 different music genres. For this study, we focus only on the classical music genre. Respondents could fill up to three names per genre or indicate "I did not listen to this genre". The list of 17 music genres was used to provide some structure for the respondents, analogous to a semi-structured interview. It provided a framework for the respondents, but was not meant to be a constraint for them in any way.

As social structuring variables, we include age, gender, education, socio-economic status of the parents and cultural participation of the parents. These five variables are well known correlates of cultural taste. Age and gender are two widely used control variables to link with cultural taste differences. Their effect is often at least as important as predictors of social class (Bennett, Silva, Warde, Gayo-Cal, & Wright, 2009, p. 2). Furthermore, in line with Bourdieu's ([1979] 1984) well known theory of social reproduction and Dimaggio's (1982) ideas on cultural mobility, we included measurements of personal educational capital, socio-economic status of the parents and cultural participation of the parents. Univariate descriptive statistics of these categorical variables are presented in table 1.

4. Methods and Results

4.1 Constructing a Two-Mode Cultural Network

First, we construct a two-mode matrix with respondents on the first mode, and their favorite classical groups, singers, artists, or composers on the second mode. We end up with a 480 x 276 matrix, with respondents shown in the rows and the artists in the columns. Only artists that are mentioned at least two times by different respondents provide meaningful information for cluster analyses. In addition, we want to use a minimum degree threshold to avoid ending up with large meaningless rest clusters in the next step of analysis. Therefore, we reduce the original two-mode network by selecting only artists with a minimum indegree of three. By using this minimum indegree of three, we risk missing clusters of more alternative genres that are less popular in general, but still might be important as a listening pattern. However, alternative analysis on the two-mode network with lower indegree thresholds revealed similar results to those presented in this paper. In the end, the new reduced matrix (456 x 80) represents 28.99% of all the artists named in the open question, but because they are the most popular artists, they comprise 95.00% of all respondents. The density in this two-mode network is 0.043, which means that 4.3% of all the potential ties between artists and respondents are actually present. In addition, the average indegree for artists is 5.79, indicating that an artist is mentioned by almost 6 respondents on average.

4.2 Infinite Relational Model (IRM)

In the next step, we fit an IRM to the reduced two-mode matrix of respondents in the first mode and artists in the second mode (Kemp, Griffiths, & Tenenbaum, 2004; Kemp, Tenenbaum, Griffiths, Yamada, & Ueda, 2006). IRM is a technique used to identify latent classes in relational data and simultaneously reveals the number of classes of each domain in the matrix. This process starts by assigning each node of the two modes to a cluster according to the Chinese Restaurant Process (CRP). The CRP works in analogy to assigning customers to tables in a restaurant. It begins by assigning the first customer (node) to a table, and the next arriving customers (nodes) to existing tables with a probability proportional to how many customers are already sitting at the table and at a new table. Second, the probability for a link between two clusters is calculated. Finally, based on this information, the clustered network is formed.

The advantages of an IRM are, first of all, that it is a relational technique that clusters the two modes simultaneously. This is clearly different from traditional one-mode data reduction techniques such as latent class analysis or factor analysis. Secondly, it is efficient enough to be used on relatively large networks. Other relational data-reduction techniques such as two-mode block modeling are not able to deal with large networks. Finally, it does not require the number of classes to be specified in advance. The inference produces a posterior likelihood, so it is possible to select the most appropriate amount of clusters in the two modes. More information on the method is available in Kemp et al. (2004; 2006) and an example application in Larsen et al. (2013).

Table 1: Univariate descriptive statistics of Age, Gender, Education, Socioeconomic status of the parents and cultural participation of the parents.

		Freq.	%
Age	-24	46	9.8
	25-34	42	9.0
	35-64	263	56.2
	65+	112	23.9
	missing	5	1.1
Gender	male	214	45.7
	female	249	53.2
	missing	5	1.1
Education	student	40	8.5
	no/lower primary	88	18.8
	secondary	90	19.2
	higher education	244	52.1
	missing	6	1.3
SES parents	low	93	19.9
	medium	140	29.9
	high	229	48.9
	missing	6	1.3
Parental participation	no	173	37.0
	receptive and/or active	285	60.9
	missing	10	97.9

We select the IRM with the highest log probability and end up with 5 clusters of respondents and 10 clusters of artists. In table 2, we show the standardized residuals based on the observed between-cluster links between the clusters of respondents (horizontal) and artists (vertical). We blurred out cells with an expected cell frequency lower than 5. Table 3 presents a detailed view of all the artist clusters together with their average indegree. The indegree of an artist is a measurement of popularity and centrality; it counts how many times respondents reported to like a particular artist.

The horizontal respondent clusters in table 2 are the most relevant for our research questions. The rows in these tables show the five different respondent clusters identified by the IRM. Each of these clusters represents a group of respondents that has a similar relationship to the vertical artist clusters. There are five different preference patterns within the classical music genre. We use the standardized residuals of each cell combined with the information in table 3 for a substantive interpretation of the preference patterns. In cells where the standardized residual is higher than two, we can say that the cell frequency is significantly higher than expected by chance ($p<0.05$). We focus on the positive significant standardized residuals, a negative significant standardized residual represents a lower frequency than expected but this does not necessarily imply a dislike for an artist cluster.

The respondents in the first cluster are linked to artist clusters 2, 5, 8 and 10. This means they prefer to listen to the very popular (in terms of indegree popularity) cluster of Bach, Beethoven and Vivaldi. Also to the cluster of Chopin, Händel, Lehàr, Schubert, Strauss and Tchaikovsky. They also like cluster 8, which contains contemporary classical music artists as Andrea Bocelli, Helmut Lotti, Pavarotti, Wim Mertens, etc. And, to cluster 10, also containing more accessible artists as, e.g., Enya, Hans Zimmer, John Williams and Yann Tiersen. The respondents in this cluster thus combine very central, popular artists with contemporary, more accessible classical artists. The second respondent cluster has a different preference pattern. The respondents in this cluster are only connected to artist clusters 1 and 2. They have a preference for the most popular, well known classical artists in our dataset: Mozart, Bach, Beethoven and Vivaldi. In general, they did not indicate to listen to any of the other artist clusters, they do not like any of the less known classical artists. The respondents in cluster three then are linked to artist clusters 3, 4, 5 and 6. This means they prefer to listen to Verdi, Puccini, the cluster containing Chopin, Händel, Lehàr, Schubert, Strauss and Tchaikovsky, and also the cluster of Bizet, Brahms, Mahler, Purcell and Rossini. All these artists are relatively popular, with average indegree's ranging from 34.2 until 64. They are not the most popular artists, but are still quite central in the classical music genre. In cluster four, the respondents only have a preference for cluster 7. This cluster contains only one artist: André Rieu, a dutch violin player who claims to make classical music accessible to anyone by "getting rid of the ceremonial atmosphere around classical music" (Rieu, 2014) and can be considered as a very accessible artist. His orchestral performances have attracted worldwide audiences and he is most known for his waltz music. These respondents do not have a preference for any of the other artist clusters. Finally, the last cluster of respondents has only one, but very distinct (standardized residual is 10.62) preference, namely for artist cluster 9. The very low average indegree of this artist cluster (17.91) indicates that this cluster contains a number of very specific classical artists that are distinct in a sense that they are unpopular and exclusively liked by the respondents in cluster four. As example of the artists included in this cluster, the five artists with the lowest indegree are Philippe Herreweghe, Saint Saëns, Corelli and Debussy. Furthermore, it is interesting to observe that the respondents of respondent cluster four do not have a preference for any of the other artist clusters. This preference cluster seems to include real connoisseurs of the classical music genre.

Table 2: Standardized residuals based on the observed between-cluster links between the clusters of respondents (horizontal) and artists (vertical).

Preference for	**cluster #**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**n**
Popular and contemporary accessible artists	1	-7.9	**3.5**	-2.1	-3.2	**2.0**	-3.5	-2.0	**6.2**	-2.9	**6.7**	198
Very popular, well known artists	2	**10.1**	**3.1**	-3.2	-2.4	-3.7	-1.3	-4.4	-1.8	-0.7	-3.2	139
Rather popular artists	3	-0.4	-3.5	**6.9**	**5.3**	**2.3**	**4.6**	-3.1	-3.6	0.2	-3.7	62
André Rieu (popular classical music)	4	-2.5	-4.4	-	-0.6	-2.1	-2.0	**24.7**	1.0	-3.0	-	45
Expert taste	5	-2.6	-2.5	-	0.7	0.7	1.9	-1.9	-2.3	**10.6**	-	12

Table 3: Artist clusters and (average) indegree.

Cluster	Artist	Indegree	Average indegree
1	Mozart	73	73.00
2	Bach	75	
	Beethoven	63	
	Vivaldi	57	65.00
3	Verdi	64	64.00
4	Puccini	47	47.00
5	Chopin	41	
	Händel	53	
	Lehár	42	
	Schubert	48	
	Strauss	49	
	Tchaikovsky	36	44.83
6	Bizet	40	
	Brahms	29	
	Mahler	32	
	Purcell	42	
	Rossini	28	34.20
7	André Rieu	31	31.00
8	Andrea Bocelli	21	
	Grieg	32	
	Haydn	32	
	Helmut Lotti	11	
	Il Divo	14	
	Orff	15	
	Pavarotti	29	
	Rachmaninov	20	
	Ravel	29	
	Wagner	32	
	Wim Mertens	29	24.00
9	Arvo Pärt	22	
	Bartók	25	
	Benjamin Britten	14	
	Carl Zeller	16	
	Cecilia Bartoli	14	
	Corelli	12	
	Debussy	13	
	Dirk Brossé	14	
	Dvorak	16	
	Emmerich Kálmán	14	
	Gershwin	20	
	Janácek	15	
	Karlheinz Stockhausen	20	
	La Petite Bande	15	
	Liszt	32	
	Lully	15	
	Maria Callas	17	

Table 3: Cont.

Cluster	Artist	Indegree	Average indegree
	Mendelssohn	22	
	Michael Nyman	13	
	Monteverdi	24	
	Offenbach	24	
	Pachelbel	17	
	Pergolesi	15	
	Philip Glass	24	
	Philippe Herreweghe	5	
	Prokofiev	13	
	Robert Stolz	20	
	Saint Saëns	8	
	Sarah Brightman	13	
	Satie	20	
	Schumann	18	
	Shostakovich	34	
	Stravinsky	24	
	Telemann	21	17.91
10	Albinoni	10	
	Carreras	17	
	Clouseau	2	
	Enya	4	
	Hans Zimmer	11	
	James Last	1	
	John Williams	7	
	Jordi Savall	10	
	Paul Potts	9	
	Plácido Domingo	13	
	Ralph Benatzky	6	
	Samuel Barber	8	
	Sigiswald Kuijken	7	
	Strato Vani	8	
	Viviane Spanoghe	6	
	Von Karajan	7	
	Yann Tiersen	7	7.82

Summarized, our results clearly show that there is internal diversity within the classical music genre and that groups of respondents have a different interpretation of the artists that represent this genre. The IRM identifies five distinct listening patterns, based on specific combinations of artist clusters. Some of these respondent clusters prefer to listen only to popular, central artists (clusters 2 and 3), others combine these central artists with more accessible, contemporary artists (cluster 1). One cluster (cluster 4) focuses only on a Dutch violin player who represents 'popular classical' music. And, finally, there is clearly a group of respondents (cluster 5) that distinguish themselves by listening to a group of very specific artists.

4.3 Social Structure of the Respondent Clusters

Our second research question concerns whether the social background of the respondents is related to these five listening patterns. If we find that the differential interpretation of the classical genre is socially structured, we can say that at least part of the social structuring behind music taste patterns happens already in the measurement process itself. Table 4 therefore reports the results of a bivariate analysis on respondent cluster membership by age, gender, education, socio-economic status of the parents and art participation of the parents. The cell frequencies are too low for a reliable multivariate analyses, so we limit ourselves to a descriptive bivariate analysis. We report valid percentages and standardized residuals for each category. We discuss the categories where the absolute value of the standardized residuals are higher than two, so we can see which social groups are under- or overrepresented in each respondent cluster.

For the first respondent cluster of people who like popular and contemporary, accessible artists, we find a slight overrepresentation of the youngest age category (-24) and also an overrepresentation of people who are still studying. Gender, SES of the parents and the cultural participation of the parents do not influence the distribution of the respondents in this first cluster. The picture is different in the second respondent cluster that contains people who prefer very popular and well known classical artists. First of all, we see that middle-aged people are underrepresented, compared to the age distribution of the sample. Next, we find that respondents with no or only primary education are underrepresented. And finally, we see that respondents whose parents did not participate in any cultural activity are also underrepresented. Again, there is no significant standardized residual for gender. In the third respondent cluster, of respondents that like rather popular classical artists, we find that age is related to cluster membership: people younger than 24 are underrepresented, and respondents between 35 and 64 years old are overrepresented. We also find an indication that education is related: respondents with a higher education are overrepresented in respondent cluster three. For gender, SES of the parents and cultural participation of the parents we do not find standardized residuals with an absolute value higher than two. For respondent cluster four then, that contains people who prefer only André Rieu, we find that people between 35 and 64 are overrepresented. Next, there are strong effects of education: students and people who have no education, only primary or only secondary education are overrepresented. While respondents with a higher education are underrepresented, compared to the general sample distribution. We also find that people whose parents have a low socio-economic status are overrepresented, and respondents with parents that have a high SES are underrepresented. Finally, for cultural participation of the parents, we find that people whose parents did not participate at cultural activities are overrepresented, and for respondents whose parents did participate, it is the other way around. In the fifth respondent cluster of classical connoisseurs, none of the standardized residuals is higher than 2 or lower than -2, which indicates that there is no under- or overrepresentation of any of the categories presented in table 5.

If we study the social structure of the five different listening patterns, it is remarkable that respondents who have the most distinct taste in classical music (respondent cluster 5) are not distinct in terms of their social characteristics. There is no significant bivariate relationship between membership of respondent cluster five and age, gender, education, socio-economic status of the parents or cultural participation of the parents. Apparently, connoisseur taste within the classical music genre is not related to social distinction per se. On the other hand, we do find that social distinction is related to knowledge of central, popular classical artists. In the two respondent clusters that are exclusively linked to very central classical artists as Bach, Beethoven, Mozart, etc. (respondent clusters 2 and 3), we find that higher educated people are over represented, or lower educated people underrepresented. The difference between which specific popular artists are linked to these clusters is due to age; respondent cluster 2 is linked to younger respondents than respondent cluster 3. This finding also relates to the social structure of respondent cluster 4. This cluster is linked to older people with a low education and low socio-economic background, and it has a listening preference that does not include any of the central artists in classical music. People in this cluster lack the knowledge of even the most well-known classical artists and are linked to

Table 4: Bivariate analysis on cluster membership by age, gender, education, socio-economic status of the parents and art participation of the parents.

Cluster		Popular and contemporary accessible artists			Very popular, well known artists			Rather popular artists			André Rieu (popular classical music)			Expert taste		
		freq.	perc.	std. res.	freq.	perc.	std. res.	freq.	perc.	std. res.	freq.	perc.	std. res.	freq.	perc.	std. res.
Age	-24	29	14.8%	2.0	15	10.9%	0.3	1	1.6%	-2.1	1	2.2%	-1.7	0	0.0%	-1.1
	25-34	19	9.7%	0.3	16	11.6%	1.0	3	4.9%	-1.1	1	2.2%	-1.5	2	16.7%	0.1
	35-64	111	56.6%	0.0	86	62.3%	-2.1	29	47.5%	3.5	24	53.3%	2.5	4	33.3%	0.7
	65+	37	18.9%	-1.5	21	15.2%	0.9	28	45.9%	-0.9	19	42.2%	-0.3	6	50.0%	-0.3
Gender	male	93	47.4%	0.2	58	42.0%	-0.7	37	60.7%	1.7	14	31.1%	-1.5	7	58.3%	0.6
	female	103	52.6%	-0.2	80	58.0%	0.7	24	39.3%	-1.5	31	68.9%	1.4	5	41.7%	-0.6
Education	student	26	13.3%	2.1	13	9.4%	0.2	1	1.6%	-1.9	0	0.0%	-2.0	0	0.0%	-1.0
	no/only primary	33	16.8%	-0.6	16	11.6%	-2.0	8	13.1%	-1.0	27	60.0%	6.4	1	8.3%	-0.8
	secondary	39	19.9%	0.2	23	16.7%	-0.8	8	13.1%	-1.1	15	33.3%	2.1	3	25.0%	0.4
	higher	97	49.5%	-0.6	86	62.3%	1.5	44	72.1%	2.1	3	6.7%	-4.3	8	66.7%	0.7
SES parents	low	29	14.8%	-1.5	19	13.8%	-1.5	13	21.3%	0.3	25	55.6%	5.5	2	16.7%	-0.1
	medium	60	30.6%	0.1	34	24.6%	1.9	25	41.0%	1.5	14	31.1%	0.1	3	25.0%	0.2
	high	107	54.6%	0.8	85	61.6%	-1.2	23	37.7%	-1.4	6	13.3%	-3.5	6	50.0%	-0.2
Parental participation	no	63	32.1%	0.0	30	21.7%	-2.2	20	32.8%	0.0	29	64.4%	3.9	4	33.3%	0.0
	receptive and/or active	131	66.8%	0.0	106	76.8%	1.5	41	67.2%	0.0	15	33.3%	-2.7	8	66.7%	0.0

only one very accessible artist who is on the boundary of classical and pop music.

5. Conclusion and Discussion

In this paper, we argue why music taste measurements based on genre preferences are out of date and incapable of capturing all the subdivisions in music taste among respondents. We focus on the case of classical music, a music genre historically treated as marker of cultural prestige although previous research suggests great internal diversity within the genre. We adopt an innovative relational perspective based on the duality between respondents and their classical music taste which allows to use an open question on the artist preferences of respondents and eliminates the use of a priori genre lists. We use a two mode cluster analysis to study the internal diversity within the classical music genre from the ground up and detect five distinct listening patterns within the classical music genre. Two of these preference clusters focus only on very central, popular classical artists; another cluster combines these popular artists with more contemporary artists; one cluster focuses on only one very accessible artist. Finally, there is a cluster of respondents that distinct themselves by listening to a set of very specific classical artists and can be described as real connoisseurs. Furthermore, our analysis shows that there are clear differences in the social structure of the five listening patterns. Most remarkably, we find that expert taste in classical music is not related to social distinction. Instead, knowledge of the most central and popular classical artists (e.g. Bach, Beethoven, Mozart) is typical for respondents with higher education and high socio-economic background. Social distinction seems more related to knowledge of popular artists in classical music, than to distinctive, connoisseur taste.

Our findings show the importance of looking into the constant redefining of boundaries around music genres (cf. Frow, 2006; Holt, 1998). Classical music as a whole can no longer be treated as a synonym for elite taste. Differentiation between different types of classical music is important because of the different social groups related to these subtypes within the classical music genre. This corresponds to the findings of, for example, Savage (2011) who shows the importance of distinguishing between 'light classical' forms of music alongside more familiar forms of classical music. It is also in line with Bourdieu's methodology in La Distinction, where he makes a clear distinction between different types of classical works (Bourdieu, [1979] 1984).

Moreover, our analyses confirm that the ever-changing boundaries around music genres require more dynamic research practices that consider the 'battleground' around musical fields and use 'classificatory imagination' instead of rigid classification systems (Beer, 2013; Savage & Silva, 2013). 'Traditional' methods as, for example, factor analyses, latent class analysis or even multiple correspondence analyses (MCA) are not suitable for research that wants to take into account the fluidity of genre boundaries, since they rely on a pre-defined list of music genres or, in the best case, music works. A relational perspective, combined with a two-mode cluster analysis offers a way to study music preference from the bottom up.

Finally, our research results show that music preferences do not follow traditional music genre boundaries, and that there is a clear social distinction within genre categories. Consequently, cultural research that uses music genre preferences to construct taste patterns might be biased. Sociological differences that are found between different (combinations of) music genres could actually be the result of the classification of music into predetermined genres by a researcher. Volume and even compositional measurements of omnivorousness are therefore possibly artifacts of the 'classification culture' among researchers. Cultural omnivore measurements that use music genre preferences can overlook important genres and subdivisions within these genres. The number and thus the breadth of the genres labels used by the researcher influences how easily cultural omnivores can be detected. The more narrow genre labels researchers use, the more easily they can detect omnivorousness by volume or composition. Contrary, researchers that use too broad genre categories risk to overlook subdivisions within genres that are important for the respondents, thereby missing omnivores that cross borders within these broad genre categories.

References

Atkinson, W. (2011). The context and genesis of musical tastes: Omnivorousness debunked, Bourdieu buttressed. Poetics, 39(3), 169-186. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2011.03.002

Beer, D. (2009). Can You Dig It?: Some Reflections on the Sociological Problems Associated with Being Uncool. Sociology, 43(6), 1151-1162. doi: 10.1177/0038038509345699

Beer, D. (2013). Genre, Boundary Drawing and the Classificatory Imagination. Cultural Sociology, 7(2), 145-160. doi: 10.1177/1749975512473461

Beer, D., & Taylor, M. (2013). The Hidden Dimensions of the Musical Field and the Potential of the New Social Data. Sociological Research Online, 18(2), 14.

Bennett, A., Silva, E. B., Warde, A., Gayo-Cal, M., & Wright, D. (2009). Culture, class, distinction. London: Routledge.

Bottero, W., & Crossley, N. (2011). Worlds, Fields and Networks: Becker, Bourdieu and the Structures of Social Relations. Cultural Sociology, 5(1), 99-119. doi: 10.1177/1749975510389726

Bourdieu, P. ([1979] 1984). Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste. Londen: Routledge.

Breiger, R. L. (1974). The Duality of Persons and Groups. Social Forces, 53(2), 181-190. doi: 10.2307/2576011

DeNora, T. (2000). Music and Everyday Life. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dimaggio, P. (1987). Classification in Art. American Sociological Review, 52(4), 440-455.

Dimaggio, P. (1991). Social structure, institutions, and cultural goods. In P. Bourdieu & J. Coleman (Eds.), Social Theory for a Changing Society (pp. 130-157). Boulder: Westview Press.

Dimaggio, P. (2011). Cultural Networks. In J. Scott & P. Carrington (Eds.), The Sage Handbook of Social Network Analysis (pp. 286-310). London: Sage Publications.

Dimaggio, P., & Useem, M. (1982). The arts in class reproduction. In M. W. Apple (Ed.), Cultural and economic reproduction in education: Essays on class, ideology and the state (pp. 181-201). London: Routledge.

Frow, J. (2006). Genre: The New Critical Idium. London: Routledge.

Holt, D. B. (1998). Does Cultural Capital Structure American Consumption? Journal of Consumer Research, 25(1), 1-25. doi: 10.1086/209523

Kemp, C., Griffiths, T., L., & Tenenbaum, J., B. (2004). Discovering latent classes in relational data. AI Memo 2004-019.

Kemp, C., Tenenbaum, J., B., Griffiths, T., L., Yamada, T., & Ueda, N. (2006). Learning systems of concepts with an infinite relational model. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 21st national conference on Artificial intelligence - Volume 1, Boston, Massachusetts.

Lamont, M. (2010). Looking back at Bourdieu. In E. B. Silva & A. Warde (Eds.), Cultural Analysis and Bourdieu's legacy: settling accounts and developing alternatives (pp. 128-141). London: Routledge.

Lamont, M., & Molnár, V. (2002). The Study of Boundaries in the Social Sciences. Annual Review of Sociology, 28, 167-195.

Larsen, J. E., Sapiezynski, P., Stopczynski, A., Morup, M., & Theodorsen, R. (2013). Crowds, bluetooth, and rock'n'roll: understanding music festival participant behavior. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 1st ACM international workshop on Personal data meets distributed multimedia, Barcelona, Spain.

Lena, J. C., & Peterson, R. A. (2008). Classification as Culture: Types and Trajectories of Music Genres. American Sociological Review, 73(5), 697-718. doi: 10.1177/000312240807300501

Lievens, J., & Waege, H. (2011). Participatie in Vlaanderen: basisgegevens van de participatiesurvey 2009. Leuven: Acco.

Mark, N. (2003). Culture and competition: Homophily and distancing explanations for cultural niches. American Sociological Review, 68(3), 319-345.

Peterson, R. A. (1992). Understanding Audience Segmentation, from Elite and Mass to Omnivore and Univore. Poetics, 21(4), 243-258.

Peterson, R. A. (2005). Problems in comparative research: The example of omnivorousness. Poetics, 33(5-6), 257-282. doi: DOI 10.1016/j.poetic.2005.10.002

Peterson, R. A., & Kern, R. M. (1996). Changing highbrow taste: From snob to omnivore. American Sociological Review, 61(5), 900-907.

Rieu, A. (2014). The official André Rieu website. Retrieved 26/06/2014, from http://www.andrerieu.com/

Roy, W. G., & Dowd, T. J. (2010). What Is Sociological about Music? Annual Review of Sociology, 36(1), 183-203. doi: doi:10.1146/annurev.soc.012809.102618

Savage, M. (2006). The musical field. Cultural Trends, 15(2-1), 159-174. doi: 10.1080/09548960600712975

Savage, M., & Gayo, M. (2011). Unravelling the omnivore: A field analysis of contemporary musical taste in the United Kingdom. Poetics, 39(5), 337-357. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2011.07.001

Savage, M., & Silva, E. B. (2013). Field Analysis in Cultural Sociology. Cultural Sociology, 7(2), 111-126. doi: 10.1177/1749975512473992

van Venrooij, A. (2009). The aesthetic discourse space of popular music: 1985–86 and 2004–05. Poetics, 37(4), 315-332. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2009.06.005