

All That Jazz:

The Success of Jazz Musicians in Three Metropolitan Areas

Diogo L. Pinheiro¹ & Timothy J. Dowd

Department of Sociology, Emory University

1555 Dickey Drive, Atlanta, Georgia 30322, United States

Abstract

We draw on a survey of jazz musicians to examine their economic success (annual amount of money earned through music) and critical success (national recognition of their talent). In doing so, we bring together literatures that are not normally in dialogue – one addressing generalism and the careers of creative personnel and the other addressing the circulation of capitals (e.g., social capital) in fields of cultural production. We find, among other things, that aesthetic generalism (being conversant in a wide range of genres) has a positive impact on both earnings and national recognition – with veteran musicians particularly benefitting from the relationship between aesthetic generalism and critical success. Those musicians with much social capital (e.g., number of local musicians known by name) and much human capital (years of musical experience) enjoy heightened economic, but not critical, success. Technical generalism (playing a wide range of musical instruments) has no bearing on economic success but has a negative impact on critical success – particularly for veteran jazz musicians. We discuss how such findings demonstrate the analytical utility of heeding the resources and “signaled competencies” that creative personnel have for negotiating fields of cultural production.

¹ Corresponding author.

1. Introduction

The careers of creative personnel are marked by a common pattern: relatively few obtain ongoing success, while many enjoy fleeting (if any) success. This is especially true for those who work on a freelance basis, where their careers unfold across temporary projects and / or contracts rather than as permanent employees within organizations (see Menger, 1999). Of the 442 soundtrack composers involved in Hollywood films released from 1964 to 1975, 10% of these freelancers composed 40% of the 1,355 soundtracks while 57% created only a single soundtrack (Faulkner 1983). Of the more than 32,000 actors involved in films released from 1992 to 1994, only 30% of these freelancers were involved in a second film (Zuckerman, Kim, Ukanwa, and von Rittmann, 2003). This pattern is not limited to field of motion pictures, as it plays out in various ways in such fields as literature (Anheier, Gerhards and Romo, 1995) and the visual arts (Giuffre, 1999).

When considering two types of success – economic versus critical – the common pattern becomes more complex. Economic and critical success can co-occur for some creative personnel – as Faulkner (1983) and Uzzi and Spiro (2005) find for freelance composers – but not for all. Bourdieu (1993) points to “restricted” fields of cultural production that stress art for art’s sake and, in the process, elevate aesthetic concerns at the expense of business concerns. In such fields, financially successful artists are sometimes branded “sell outs” while critically successful artists who push boundaries and redefine the field may struggle financially. This inversion of critical success with commercial success is a hallmark in fields of “independent” music and film (Hesmondhalgh, 1998; Zuckerman and Kim, 2003). Within fields of cultural production that are clearly oriented to business concerns – what Bourdieu labels “large-scale”

production – economic success does not always lead to critical success or vice versa. Indeed, a common argument is that the major firms which dominate such fields are ultimately focused on the bottom-line – thus favoring works and personnel that generate substantial sales rather than creative breakthroughs (Dowd, 2004). Small wonder that those films and albums that attain blockbuster sales are sometimes hampered in garnering subsequent critical acclaim (Allen and Lincoln, 2004; Schmutz, 2005). It remains an empirical question, then, whether economic and critical success operate in similar or dissimilar fashion.

Why does success, both economic and critical, flow to some creative personnel and elude others? The resources that creative personnel possess could play a role in this, with success accruing to those who have extensive expertise, experience and/or connections. The ability of creative personnel to signal competence to key gatekeepers – such as employers and critics – could also play a role. Indeed, success may stream towards those personnel that gatekeepers deem to be accomplished and away from those that deemed as lacking in some real or imagined fashion.

This paper examines the impact of such resources and signaling on the success of jazz musicians in and around three U.S. cities. We do so by bringing into dialogue two literatures that are not normally paired. The first is a small, but insightful, literature that addresses how creative personnel negotiate the challenges of working in a few genres, “specialization,” versus working in many genres, “generalism” (Faulkner, 1983; Zuckerman, et al., 2003). While its contributors acknowledge a range of factors at play, they emphasize that, in certain fields of cultural production, employers evaluate creative personnel in an ad hoc fashion – relying on their “track records” of past work rather than evaluating systematically the abilities of such personnel, as these abilities may not be

readily observable. Specialization initially offers a way for creative personnel to signal competence to potential employers – thereby offering a pathway to early success. On the other hand, specialization across the years can limit success – as veterans who deal only in a few genres are seen as incapable of doing anything else, particularly when compared to veteran generalists. The second is the expansive literature inspired by Bourdieu's (1986, 1993) seminal work on fields of cultural production. Its proponents view creative personnel as engaged in a competitive struggle made dynamic by the circulation of particular resources – such as economic capital (financial resources), social capital (relational resources, such as membership in networks and organizations) and cultural capital (symbolic resources, such as familiarity with high culture). The success of creative personnel, in this view, results from the combination of capitals that they respectively possess and deploy within a given field (see Anheier, Gerhards, and Romo, 1995).

Inspired by these literatures, we turn to a survey conducted by the Research Center for the Arts and Culture (RCAC) at Columbia University. Under commission from the National Endowment of the Arts, the RCAC contacted jazz musicians in New Orleans, New York, and San Francisco. The resulting survey is unique in terms of its coverage: it captures hundreds of musicians who vary greatly in their respective levels of training, pursuits and success (Jeffri, 2003b).

We proceed analytically in the following fashion. First, we discuss the arguments offered by Faulkner (1983) and Zuckerman et al. (2003) and then suggest how portions of them may be applied to the realm of jazz. This includes distinguishing between the aesthetic generalism of jazz musicians (the varied range of genres that they address) and their technical generalism (the varied range of instruments that they employ). Second, we

turn to work that engages the scholarship of Pierre Bourdieu. This allows us to situate the success of jazz musicians amidst a broad range of factors. Consequently, when examining the impact of generalism on success, we simultaneously consider the human, social, and cultural capitals respectively accrued by jazz musicians of various races and genders, as well as the particular locations in which these musicians operate. Finally, when offering regression analyses, we use measures of generalism that take into account the “clumping” of certain genres and instruments – where some easily go together due to overlapping historical trajectories (e.g., blues and rhythm and blues) or due to comparable performance techniques (e.g., alto and tenor saxophone).

2. Success and specialization versus generalism

2.1. The motion picture field

Faulkner, Zuckerman, and colleagues offer comparable arguments that are temporal in nature – ones that consider the ongoing careers of actors and soundtrack composers in the field of motion pictures. This comparability is not surprising given that Zuckerman (2005; Zuckerman et al., 2003) explicitly builds on Faulkner’s (1983) work. Two general points bear mention. First, their arguments are not simply about the individual attributes of creative personnel (e.g., track records) but, instead, are about linking those attributes to the broader context in which these creative personnel operate. This context includes the widely shared classifications in which creative personnel find themselves – particularly the classifications of genre (e.g., action films, comedy). This context also includes the professional relationships (e.g., pairing of actors with directors) that enable creative personnel to develop experience and expertise within (if not across) these extant classifications. Second, these arguments do not apply to all fields of cultural

production but only to those in which formal credentials and systematic evaluation do not typically figure in hiring decisions – such as the field of motion pictures.

Specialization clearly has its benefits for actors and soundtrack composers (Faulkner, 1983; Zuckerman et al., 2003). It fosters strong collaborative ties when creative personnel working in similar genres come together on repeated occasions – such as those actors and directors involved in low-budget horror films. These ties, in turn, facilitate the securing of future employment within these same genres via familiarity and recommendations. On-going specialization allows motion picture personnel to bolster their position. By working repeatedly in the same few genres, not only do they gain visibility, they arguably enhance their repertoire of capabilities and knowledge (i.e., human capital) and thus augment their appeal to future employers. This final benefit is particularly important because it resonates with societal-wide prescriptions to hone specialized expertise – prescriptions that can be traced back to Adam Smith (1965 [1776]) and that are common in contemporary academia and business (Dobbin, Sutton, Meyer, and Scott, 1993; Leahy 2007).

Specialization has its drawbacks, however, for actors and soundtrack composers. It may become, in Faulkner's (1983) terminology, a "trap." This can result from employer preferences. When qualifications and skills are not readily measurable, employers rely on the past work of creative personnel as a metric for hiring. This often devolves into "typecasting" – where employers limit these personnel to a one or a few genres based on what these personnel *have done* rather than what they *can do*. Consequently, a number of veterans tell Faulkner (1983) and Zuckerman et al. (2003) of the frustration and alienation that flow from an inability to take their careers in new directions.

By trucking in many genres, creative personnel can expand the types of jobs for which they are considered. Yet there are sizable barriers to becoming a generalist (Faulkner, 1983; Zuckerman et al., 2003). For those who have enjoyed a modicum of success as specialists, they must somehow escape the typecasting that traps so many. Furthermore, as they move beyond their area of specialization, actors and soundtrack composers are leaving behind those collaborative ties that served them well in the past and led to “bread and butter” jobs – regular work that is especially enticing given the economic vagaries of the film industry. Finally, from the perspective of an employer looking to fill a specific need, an emergent generalist with a weak track record in a particular genre looks like someone who is inexperienced. “[Generalists] face the threat of being confused with the unskilled, thus becoming ‘non-entities’ in the sense of not being recognized as fit for *any* job, and having an weak attachment to the labor market” (Zuckerman, 2005: 173). In other words, potential generalists must overcome the label of “jack-of all trades, master of none.”

Some do succeed in becoming generalists, thereby enjoying the benefits that accompany this breadth. The transition to generalists is especially important for motion picture personnel who are veterans. Employers and colleagues expect those with years of experience to be accomplished – that is, adept at multiple genres. Consequently, they likely view veterans who are less accomplished to be operating at the limit of their capabilities. Small wonder that veteran actors who specialize in a few genres are less liable to find subsequent work than are novice specialists. In contrast to veteran specialists, veteran generalists are in a position to be selective about future work – choosing those projects that bring them into contact with highly productive collaborators. Their selectivity partly results from the far-flung networks that generalists enjoy by virtue

of their varied activities – with information and opportunities moving along these connections. It also results from the heightened visibility of working across multiple areas (Faulkner, 1983; Zuckerman et al., 2003).

2.2. The jazz field

We take inspiration from the arguments of Faulkner (1983) and Zuckerman et al. (2003), particularly in light of scholarship on jazz musicians. At the most basic level, this scholarship suggests that freelance jazz musicians often (but not always) secure employment through an informal process (e.g., referrals) rather than a formal evaluation of musical skills and credentials (Berliner, 1994; Dempsey, 2008; MacLeod 1993). Track records may likewise serve as important signals for employment in the field of jazz – possibly leading to a musical “typecasting.” This scholarship also reveals that generalism matters for jazz musicians in two distinctive ways – one that resonates with Faulkner and Zuckerman’s research, which we call “aesthetic generalism,” and one that moves beyond their arguments, which we call “technical generalism.”

Previous research shows that familiarity with a wide range of musical genres (aesthetic generalism) offers economic benefits to freelance and jazz musicians (Berliner, 1994; Dempsey, 2008; Faulkner, 1985; MacLeod, 1993). Given that genres tend to have distinctive patrons, audiences, and venues (Lena and Peterson, 2008) – and given that jazz has experienced a proliferation of genres from within (e.g., be-bop) and beyond (e.g., rock, hip-hop) (Dempsey, 2008; Lopes, 2002; Schuller, 1986) – musicians who exhibit stylistic dexterity should fare well with job opportunities. Aesthetic generalism will likely spur critical success, as well. Research on other fields of cultural production shows that well-regarded and well-situated artists often span genres (Anheier and Gerhards, 1991;

Giuffre, 1999, 2001; Rao, Monin and Durand, 2005), while jazz scholarship shows that celebrated musicians often ushered in new genres and / or blurred boundaries between genres (DeVeaux, 1997; Lopes, 2002; Radano, 1993).

Previous scholarship also suggests that familiarity with a wide range of instruments (technical generalism) will work against the economic and critical success of jazz musicians. Certain musical fields inspire a tight linkage between musicians and their respective instruments – such as classical music, whereby command of and devotion to one instrument is commonplace and rewarded (Alford and Szanto, 1996; Bijsterveld and Schulp, 2004). The jazz field likewise places emphasis on expertise for a single instrument or for instruments that require similar skills (e.g., alto and tenor saxophone). On the one hand, jazz musicians note that the selection and subsequent mastery of a particular instrument shapes how one approaches music in general (Berliner, 1994; Curran, 1996; Gibson, 2006; MacDonald and Wilson, 2005; Monson, 1996). On the other hand, it takes much time and effort to develop sufficient expertise in a single instrument, let alone in a grouping of disparate instruments. As one musician described to Berliner (1994: 115), “I played and practiced the guitar constantly five hours a day. At one point, I went down to the Jersey shore and locked myself in a room for a month.” We suspect that technical generalism (rather than aesthetic generalism) is what will draw the “jack of all trades, master of none” designation – especially if employers gravitate toward jazz musicians with accomplished instrumental skills (i.e., economic success). Moreover, the pantheon of jazz (i.e., critical success) is populated more by virtuosos on single instruments than those who pursue a wide range of instruments.

Jazz musicians thus provide an interesting case for examining the varieties of generalism and success. These musicians operate in a well-established field with

numerous genres that range from the relatively simple and popular, such as traditional or cool jazz, to the complex and esoteric, such as avant-garde or free jazz (Berliner, 1994; Dempsey, 2008; Lena and Peterson, 2008; Lopes, 2002). In fact, the RCAC survey tracks the engagement of jazz musicians in more than twenty genres. Thus, jazz musicians have clear potential for engaging in aesthetic generalism. Moreover, scholarly work on the amateur phase shows that would-be jazz musicians grapple with both cognitive and corporal issues while gaining mastery. That is, they learn to think in terms of genre, and they acquire the physical technique to play their instruments (Berliner, 1994; Curran, 1991; Sudnow, 1978). Even for professional jazz musicians, familiarity with genres and development of instrumental technique (“chops”) continue to be prominent foci across their careers (Berliner 1994; Dempsey 2008). Finally, as is true for the motion pictures field (Baumann 2001), jazz is not limited to commercial entertainment; it too has enjoyed aesthetic mobility, whereby some of its works are widely deemed to be “art” (Lopes, 2001). Hence, economic *and* critical success may each be concerns for jazz musicians.

In drawing inspiration from research on generalism in the motion picture field, we make two caveats. Given the cross-sectional nature of the survey that we analyze, we are unable to capture the temporal aspects that lie at the heart of Faulkner (1983) and Zuckerman’s (2005) arguments. Nevertheless, it remains useful to see how various levels of generalism matter for jazz musicians at a particular point in time. Likewise, we concede that “technical generalism” departs from their arguments to the extent that such physical skills require years of careful practice that can precede employment and, as a result, may lack an analogue in the motion picture field. Consequently, we would not be surprised if this type of generalism is more germane for the jazz field than the motion picture field.

3. Success and capitals

Of course, other factors could likewise shape the success of creative personnel. We have already mentioned one such alternative – human capital. People who possess extensive training and experience should do relatively well in a given field. However, Zuckerman and colleagues (2003) are not completely convinced by this argument. If experience is so highly valued, then employment opportunities should flow towards older (rather than novice) film actors who are specialists. Instead, they find that work opportunities flows away from these experienced actors. Mindful of this, we consider the impact of human capital.

Other alternative factors spring from work associated with Pierre Bourdieu – including that which takes issues with his theory and empirics. We do not offer an extended discussion of either Bourdieu’s scholarship or those who respond with correctives. Instead, we sketch several factors that could also spur or inhibit success among creative personnel.

The concept of “field” is central to Bourdieu’s (1986, 1991, 1993) theoretical framework. It is often the given field – rather than society as a whole – that provides its participants with particular logics by which to operate. What is deemed desirable in one field (e.g., financial success in fields of large-scale cultural production) can be very distinct from what is deemed desirable in another (e.g., artistic integrity in fields of restricted cultural production). Despite the potentially divergent logics of various fields, they are alike in two important ways. First, fields are sites of competitive struggle in which relatively few dominate, receiving a disproportionate share of resources and opportunities. Second, this competitive struggle is made dynamic by the circulation of

particular currencies. Just as one can use cash and coin to secure opportunities and position within many fields, Bourdieu notes that social capital is likewise a currency that can be exchanged for such positive outcomes. “Who you know” can matter very much for success. Likewise, he notes that prestigious types of knowledge – such as familiarity with high culture – can both signal one’s advantaged position in a given field and open up opportunities for maintaining that position. “What you know” can have tremendous implications for success. Position in a given field thus results from a combination of capitals that one possesses and deploys. We thus consider the three types of capital that the RCAC survey allows – human, social and cultural capital.

While Bourdieu alludes to additional factors that may shape the circulation of capitals, other scholars bring such factors to the fore. For instance, McCall (1992) argues that gender is not secondary to various forms of capital but, instead, is a pervasive division that shapes both positioning within fields and the logics by which field participants operate. Her argument resonates with research that shows the breadth displayed by females in fields of consumption. Some research finds that female students possess more cultural capital than their male counterparts and that they convert this symbolic resource to educational success more than males (DiMaggio, 1982; Dumais, 2002). McCall’s argument also jibes with research demonstrating the challenges that constrict women’s involvement in fields of cultural production (Bielby and Bielby, 1996; Dowd, Liddle, and Blyler, 2005). Such challenges include pervasive assumptions that women are not as adept as men at playing musical instruments. The legacy of these assumptions is an array of musical fields that continues to place women at a disadvantage – steering them away from particular instruments, from employment opportunities, and from critical success (Allmendinger and Hackman, 1995; Clawson, 1999; DeNora, 2002;

Schmutz, 2009). We examine, then, whether male jazz musicians are more successful than female musicians.

Annette Lareau (2002; Lareau & Horvat 1999) and others deal with another fundamental factor – investigating race and its relationship to cultural capital in the U.S. Some of this research shows the breadth displayed by high-status African Americans in both past and present fields of consumption. Simultaneously situated in what Karyn Lacy (2007) calls the “black world” and “white world,” these individuals possess symbolic resources that serve as currency in each world – including, but not limited to, traditional notions of high culture (DiMaggio and Ostrower, 1990; Fleming and Roses, 2007; Higginbotham, 1993). Yet, in fields of cultural production, African Americans have historically faced a narrow range of opportunities due to blatant and subtle racism. In the field of early jazz, for instance, economic and critical considerations were intentionally diverted from black to white musicians (Dowd, 2003; Lopes, 2002; Phillips and Owens, 2004). While the situation in music fields has improved since those early days (Dowd and Blyler, 2002; Negus, 1999), it remains to be seen whether African American musicians still face particular hurdles to success in the field of jazz. However, given long-standing associations of jazz with African American (Lopes, 2002), both employers and critics of the present may actually favor black musicians over white musicians – thereby paralleling the situation in Chicago blues clubs, whereby black musicians garner more opportunities than their white counterparts (Grazian, 2004).

Finally, a stream of research complicates Bourdieu’s arguments (sometimes intentionally) by reminding us that fields are located in *physical* spaces that contain their own respective configurations – with such spaces including clubs (Thornton, 1999), neighborhoods (Blasisus and Friedrichs, 2008), cities (Prieur, Rosenlund and Skjott-

Larsen, 2008), regions (Lamont, 1992), and nations (Katz-Gerro 2002). What passes for various capitals – as well as the logic of a given field – is ultimately rooted in place. Affluent businessmen in Indianapolis tend to have different ideas about what constitutes symbolic resources than their counterparts in New York City (Lamont, 1992). This emphasis on place strikes a chord with much scholarship that, though not always cast in Bourdieuan terms, brings together musical consumption and production (see Bennett 2004). Such scholars examine how creators and fans cobble together local musical traditions that connect to broader fields but are nevertheless unique in some regards. Hence, Chicago is where the blues live and parts of England are hot spots for dance music (Grazian, 2004; Hesmondhalgh, 1998).

Jazz is likewise place-based and sprawls across many U.S. cities – wherein idiosyncratic combinations of neighborhoods, venues and resources shape the opportunities afforded to jazz musicians (see Becker, 2004). The RCAC Survey addresses three such cities. New Orleans is noted for being the birthplace of jazz, and city officials promote its jazz scene aggressively for purposes of tourism and commerce. It is likewise home to a notable jazz festival and the French Quarter that houses renowned jazz venues, as well as numerous universities that tap into the jazz tradition (Jeffri, 2003a; Miller, 2009). New York City contains the world’s largest jazz community – complete with an extensive network of musicians, a vibrant nightlife of clubs and bars, and a confluence of educational music programs (Berliner, 1994; Jeffri, 2003a). San Francisco benefits from a healthy supply of venues, as well as the nearby Monterey Jazz Festival, but it lacks the tradition of New Orleans and the scope of New York City’s jazz scene (Jeffri, 2003a). Consequently, we expect that New Orleans and New York – by dint of their respective jazz scenes – are more conducive to success than is San Francisco.

4. Data and methods

The RCAC survey makes visible a group of creative personnel. Heckathorn and Jeffri (2001: 308) note,

Jazz musicians fall into the category of “hidden populations” in that (1) no sampling frame exists, so the size and boundaries of the population are unknown, (2) there are strong privacy concerns...because of the tight but informal networks which outsiders find hard to penetrate, and (3) the population constitutes a small proportion of the general population.

They reveal the “hidden” by relying on respondent-driven sampling (RDS) – a sophisticated technique using referrals from known musicians to locate other (oftentimes “unknown”) musicians. By employing multiple waves of recommendations – as well as statistical weighting – this RDS technique can adjust for biases that are common in simple chain-referrals (e.g., survey respondents recommending other respondents who are like themselves and / or part of their own social network). A detailed discussion of these adjustment techniques is found in Heckathorn and Jeffri (2001). Suffice it to say that this technique leads to a sample that is representative of jazz musicians in New Orleans, New York and San Francisco. The data are not without limitations. Most notably, we are dealing with a cross-section of jazz musicians and might miss some time-dependent aspects of relationships we are about to explore.

4.1. Dependent variables

We measure success in these three metro areas primarily by way of two dependent variables – income earned from music by survey respondents in the year 2000 (economic success) and acknowledgement that the respondent’s talent “has been recognized...nationally” (critical success). The income variable ranges across 8

categories: \$0-500; \$501-3000; \$3001-7000; \$7001-12,000; \$12,001-20,000; \$20,001-40,000; \$40,001-60,000; and \$60,001+. We code this economic success variable as the logged midpoint of each of the first 7 categories – with the log of \$100,000 serving as the midpoint for the 8th category. By logging this variable, we take care of any skewness present in the data. Given the underlying continuous nature of this variable, we model it with OLS regression. The critical success variable, however, is not continuous. It takes either the value of “0” (no national recognition) or “1” (national recognition). Given the dichotomous nature of this dependent variable, we model it with logistic regression. The descriptive statistics reveal that both financial and critical success elude most musicians in this sample (see Appendix A in the online materials). Note that we explicitly explore the connections between these two outcomes by regressing one upon the other as a control variable – investigating whether these types of success are interchangeable.

4.2. Independent variables

The RCAC survey gauges involvement in both genres and instruments in a dichotomous fashion – assessing whether or not a musician is active in a particular category (“yes” vs. “no”) rather than the extent of that activity (see Appendix B in the online materials for the listing of genres and instruments). We could measure generalism by simply counting the number of genres / instruments played by each jazz musician, but that leads to difficulties. A simple counting of instruments yields identical scores for those musicians who play both the trumpet and flugelhorn and those who play trumpet and guitar (i.e., two instruments that “clump” together vs. two that do not). This would mask sizable differences in skills, as the former pairing relies on nearly identical techniques for brass instruments (e.g., how sound is created via the mouth and tongue;

see Sandoval 1995), whereas the latter involves techniques that share little to no overlap and, sometimes, even rely on dissimilar types of musical notation (see Walser 1993 on guitar notation). A simple counting of genres is likewise problematic. Jazz musicians who are active in both ragtime and boogie-woogie would have the same score as those active in ragtime and avant-garde (two genres that “clump” vs. two that do not). We would mistakenly treat as comparable those musicians engaged in old genres with relatively traditional approaches to rhythm and harmony (ragtime and boogie-woogie; see Schuller 1986) and those engaged in two genres that encompass both the traditional (ragtime) and a radically different approach to rhythm and harmony (avant-garde; see Radano 1993).

We avoid these problems by addressing the range of genres / instruments in which individual musicians engage. Like Phillips and Owens (2004), we rely on the data to stipulate what constitutes a narrow or wide range of genres / instruments. This takes several steps. First, we obtain Jaccard similarity coefficients for each and every pair of genres / instruments in the survey – such as a coefficient for the pairing of alto and tenor saxophones and another for the pairing of alto saxophone and guitar. These similarity coefficients address the aggregate level – detailing the extent to which each combination is proximate (“clumpy”) for *all* musicians in the survey. Second, we rely on “1 minus the Jaccard coefficient” to get at *dissimilarity* – thereby taking the inverse of this similarity coefficient and, in turn, highlighting those combinations that are wide-ranging at the aggregate level (“not clumpy”). Third, we then document all pairs of genres / instruments that *each* musician in the sample utilizes. That is, we focus here on *individual* data. Finally, for each particular pair of genres / instruments pursued by a particular musician, we then sum corresponding “1 - Jaccard coefficient” score. The following formula summarizes these steps:

$\sum P_{ij} * \beta_{ij}$, where

P is the ij pair of genres (instruments) played by the musician and β is “1-Jaccard similarity coefficient” for that pair.

The resulting generalism measures tell us the extent to which each individual musician is active in a wide range of genres / instruments – with low scores indicating “specialization” and high scores noting “generalism.” As the descriptive statistics show, the potential for extensive generalism is realized by some of the musicians in the survey – but most fall well short of this potential (see Appendix A in the online materials).

Our measures of human capital are straightforward. The measure of experience is the number of years elapsed since each respondent first began playing musical instrument(s). We interact this measure with the generalism measures, thereby assessing Faulkner and Zuckerman’s arguments that it has different effects on novices than on veterans. We draw upon a categorical variable to gauge the education level of respondents.

We use two measures to gauge social capital. One gets at informal networks by tapping the number of musicians in the metro area that the respondent knows by name. The range of this measure shows the vast connections that some musicians enjoy (see Appendix A of the online materials). We also consider a formal one – membership in the American Federation of Musicians. This union represents the interests of instrumentalists in the US and Canada – and 30% of the sample – and has taken actions that sometime have major implications for musician careers (Dowd 2004; Dowd & Blyler 2002).

Regarding cultural capital, we go with measures that roughly capture the early transmission of cultural capital from parent to child – one that is central to Bourdieu’s theory (Aschaffenburg & Maas 1997). Thus, we use two dichotomous variables to

measure whether musical involvement was, encouraged, on the one hand, by early family attention and, on the other hand, by early financial support.

The treatment of Bourdieu-inspired factors is also straightforward. We rely on self-reported information to assess the gender and race of musicians – comparing men to women and comparing African Americans and other ethnicities / races to whites. In terms of place, we compare musicians in New Orleans (17% of the sample musicians) and New York City (40.7%) to those in San Francisco.

We also employ various control variables to assess additional factors that may or may not shape the success of jazz musicians: the age of the respondents (in years), whether they have marketed their work (yes vs. no), and whether they use the Internet for their music (yes vs. no). . Finally, we control for the “centrality” of a particular musical instrument or genre. Put simply, playing the least common instruments or genres in the sample (cello and ragtime, respectively) may yield different opportunities than playing the most common instruments or genres (piano and bop). To account for such centrality, we first calculate the share of the sample that plays particular instruments / genres in a given metropolitan area. Then, we construct two variables that tap the average share of the sample that play the same instrument(s) and genre(s) as *each* individual respondent in a given metropolitan area (for further elaboration, see Appendix C in the online materials).

5. Results

We now turn to the regression analyses. Given that correlations between the various independent and control variables never exceed .44 (with most correlations less

than .20), we are confident that multicollinearity is not a problem (see Appendix D in online materials).

[Table 1 about here]

Table 1 presents the results for economic success. Equation (1) starts with the Bourdieuan-inspired factors that shape the circulation of capitals in a given field. Place has substantial effects: musicians working in either New Orleans or New York earn more income than those working in San Francisco. These place effects remain significant in all of the models follow. Gender somewhat matters as well: male musicians earn more money than female musicians; this effect eventually becomes insignificant in the presence of control variables (see Equation [6]). Meanwhile, race has no apparent effect on financial success. African Americans and members of other races / ethnicities do not fare any better or worse than whites in the jazz field. We ran another regression that only compared African-Americans to all other races and ethnicity, which also led to insignificant effects.

Equations (2) through (4) explore the net effects of human, social and cultural capital respectively, with Equations (7) and (8) considering them simultaneously. In these final models, two types of human capital have positive effects on musician earnings (private instruction and musical experience) and one type of cultural capital (early family encouragement in music) has a positive effect that disappears in Equation (8). One form of human capital negatively impinges on the earnings of jazz musicians (conservatory training). Social capital has palpable effects that persist in all the models: the number of informal connection to other musicians is a highly significant predictor of financial success, as is formal membership in the American Federation of Musicians.

Equation (5) shows the net effect of generalism. As expected, aesthetic generalism has a highly significant effect on financial success. However, technical generalism fails to attain significance. While we are cautious in interpreting a non-finding, it is revealing that aesthetic and technical generalism are not comparable in their respective impacts.

Equation (6) brings together the range of factors found in the previous models. Aesthetic generalism continues to have a highly significant impact upon financial success – as do variables representing the various capitals and place. We also include control variables in this model. Financial success is augmented both by having one’s work marketed and by using the Internet for one’s music. We also see that critical success – in the form of “national recognition” – has no bearing upon financial success, thus showing that these two outcomes are distinct rather than overlapping.

Equations (7) and (8) include interactions between experience and eclecticism, but those are not significant. Thus, the positive impact of aesthetic generalism plays out similarly for both novice and veteran jazz musicians. Moreover, as Equation (8) reveals, its impact remains even when controlling for the centrality of genres and instruments that jazz musicians play in their respective cities, which are insignificant.

[Table 2 about here]

Table 2 presents results for critical success and continues the logic of presentation found in the previous table. All of the models reveal, once again, that place has an impact on success: those musicians working in New Orleans or New York are more likely to attain critical success than those working in San Francisco. While race remains insignificant for success, as in the previous analysis, we now also see that gender is always insignificant when the success in question is critical rather than financial.

Equations (10) through (12) show that the various capitals have no significant impact on the critical success of jazz musicians. While informal and formal connections within a given locale matter for earnings (Table 1), such connections – regardless of how extensive they are – do not translate into critical success at the national level. These non-findings are even more striking when considering that aesthetic generalism retains its positive effect on success (see Equations [14] through [16]). Centrality measures are consistently insignificant. Meanwhile, as we suspected, technical generalism has a negative effect on critical success. Thus, the critical constituencies for jazz apparently respect those musicians with involvement in diverse and varied genres but prefer that musicians show restraint in technical skills by perfecting the performance of one or a few instruments rather than dabbling in a broad range. These generalism findings persist in the final models (see Equations [15] and [16]). In these models, having one’s work marketed again leads to success – this time in critical terms – but usage of the Internet has no impact. Meanwhile, mirroring the previous results in Table 1: one type of success (here, economic) does not predict another (critical).

[Table 3 about here]

[Table 4 about here]

Equation (16) reveals that the interactions between eclecticism and experience are significant. Tables 3 and 4 include the expected coefficient for eclecticism at difference levels of experience. At low levels of experience, neither aesthetic nor technical eclecticism have an impact on national recognition outcomes. As experience increases, technical generalism acquires a significant negative impact on the likelihood of having one’s talent nationally recognized. To be more precise, technical generalism is insignificant at the 5% level for those with about 24 years or less of experience (which is

slightly less than the average 25.6 years of experience), and it has an increasingly negative effect for more experienced musicians. For musicians who are one standard deviation above the mean experience (around 30 years of experience), technical generalism has an odds ratio coefficient of 0.9. This reinforces the classic economic view: specialization has a strong impact that increases with time – suggesting that in the realm of musical instruments what matters is neither generalism nor movie industry-style typecasting, but Adam Smith-styled specialization. With regards to the realm of genres, however, the more experience one has the more positive is the impact of aesthetic generalism. Although this result comes from cross-sectional data, it does resonate with the Faulkner and Zuckerman arguments: among inexperienced musicians, aesthetic generalism has a negative, but insignificant, impact on critical recognition, as it is difficult to differentiate between the eclectic and the incompetent. As experience increases, however, so too does the positive impact of being conversant in a wide range of genres, with the coefficient becoming statistically significant at the 5% level around the 25 year mark.

6. Conclusions

Relatively few musicians in the survey have enjoyed much success. Only 28% of respondents earned \$20,000 or more from their music in 2000, and merely 21% of them had ever received national recognition for their musical efforts.

We turned to two literatures to situate that pattern. One emphasizes the resources that creative personnel have at their disposal – the various forms of capital that are, likely, well understood if not measurable. After all, the very notion of cultural capital rests on the recognition of its merit and currency by both those who are advantaged and

disadvantaged in a given field. That said, the logic behind the exchange of these capitals, and hence the positioning of creative personnel, can vary from field to field. The other literature emphasizes the “signaling” that creative personnel do, as indicated by how generalized or specialized their track record is. This matters because certain fields of cultural production lack clear metrics – as creative skills are not well understood and / or easily measured. Therein, the ability to signal skills in a shorthand fashion arguably matters as much as their actual possession. We also turned to scholarship on jazz and musicians. Our reading of it suggested that two types of generalism matter – aesthetic and technical – as do two types of success – economic and critical.

We find that generalism and success play out in multiple fashions – with aesthetic generalism having the most robust effects. Jazz musicians who are conversant in a wide range of genres enjoy heightened earnings at the local level and greater odds of critical success at the national level. Furthermore, veteran musicians especially benefit from the positive effect of aesthetic generalism on national recognition. Technical generalism matters only for critical, and not economic, success; it has a negative effect on the odds of national recognition, which grows more pronounced among veteran musicians. We interpret this as “signaling” in action – but we realize this may also reflect the particular logic of the jazz field, whereby, for instance, aesthetic generalism is valued in a fashion akin to cultural omnivorousness (van Eijck, 2001).

The logic of the jazz field comes into focus when considering the effect of various capitals – especially given its known emphasis on family support, mentorship, and affiliation (see Berliner 1994; Dempsey 2008; Sudnow 1978). Regarding cultural capital, those musicians raised in a family that encourages its young to explore music go on to enjoy increased economic success relative to those lacking such cultural capital.

Musicians receiving lessons from private teachers are also those who enjoyed heightened salaries (human capital). Those who are formally connected to the musicians' union and those who are informally connected to a sprawling network of musical friends (social capital) make more money than their isolated counterparts, as do those who market their work or use the internet for musical purposes. However, a notable segment of jazz musicians has some ambivalence about the merits of higher education instruction in jazz – particularly because of what they see as its cerebral and dry approach to such a corporal and lively musical genre (Berliner 1994; Dempsey 2008; MacLeod 1993). We find that jazz musicians with conservatory training face dampened earnings in these three cities. It bears repeating that the logic of the jazz field is sensitive to place. Both economic and critical success flow to those musicians who are in a jazz locale with a long history and rich tradition (New Orleans) or in a locale that contains the world's largest infrastructure for jazz (New York City). While many musical scholars have focused on the uniqueness of particular locales (Bennett 2004), our results show how opportunities compare across locales

Interestingly enough, apart from those associated with place, the effects of these various capitals only apply to economic success; none of them lead to the critical success of jazz musicians. In the latter type of success, it is generalism that is crucial. Thus, these well-understood resources work well when converting one type of capital (e.g., cultural) into economic capital. In the pursuit of the slightly more ephemeral critical success, it is the signaling via track record – both positively via aesthetic generalism and negatively via technical generalism – that matter. Such findings show not only the utility of bringing the above two literatures together but they also call for further exploration of their overlap.

Acknowledgement

We thank Michaël Berghman, Dan Cornfield, Koen van Eijck, Kathy Giuffre, Larry Isaacs, Jenn Lena and Pete Peterson for the helpful feedback. We also thank the anonymous reviewers and the editors, Susan Janssen and Marc Verboord, for sharing insights that improved this paper.

Appendix: Supplementary data

Supplementary data associated with this article can be found, in the online version, at doi: **. {**ELSEVIER PERSONNEL: PLEASE INSERT THE APPROPRIATE DOI HERE AND POST THE ONLINE MATERIALS THAT WE HAVE SENT WITH THIS ARTICLE**}

References

- Alford, R.R., Szanto, A., 1996. Orpheus wounded. *Theory and Society* 25, 1-44.
- Allen, M.P., Lincoln, A.E., 2004. Critical discourse and the cultural consecration of American films. *Social Forces* 82, 871-894.
- Allmendinger, J., Hackman, R.J., 1995. The more the better? *Social Forces* 74, 423-460.
- Anheier, H.K., Gerhards, J., 1991. The acknowledgement of literary influence. *Sociological Forum* 6, 137-156.
- Anheier, H.K., Gerhards, J., Romo, F.P., 1995. Forms of capital and social structure in cultural fields. *American Journal of Sociology* 100, 859-903.
- Aschaffenburg, K., Maas, I., 1997. Cultural and educational careers. *American Sociological Review* 62, 573-587.
- Baumann, S., 2001. Intellectualization and art world development. *American Sociological Review* 66, 404-426.
- Becker, H., 2004. Jazz places. In: Bennett, A., Peterson, R.A. (Eds.), *Music Scenes*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, Nashville, TN, pp. 17-27.

- Bennett, A., 2004. Consolidating the music scenes perspective. *Poetics* 32, 223-234.
- Berliner, P.F., 1994. *Thinking in Jazz*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Bielby, D.D., Bielby, W.T., 1996. Women and men in film. *Gender & Society* 10, 248-270.
- Bijsterveld, K., Schulp, M., 2004. Breaking into a world of perfection. *Social Studies of Science* 34, 649-674.
- Blasisus, J., Friedrichs, J., 2008. Lifestyles in distressed neighborhoods' hypothesis. *Poetics* 36, 24-44.
- Bourdieu, P., 1986. The forms of capital. In: Richards, J.G. (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. New York: Greenwood, New York, pp. 241-258.
- Bourdieu, P., 1991. Genesis and structure of the religious field. *Comparative Social Research* 13, 1-43.
- Bourdieu, P., 1993. *The Field of Cultural Production*. Columbia University Press, New York.
- Clawson, M.A., 1999. When women play the bass. *Gender & Society* 13, 193-210.
- Curran, G.M., 1996. From "swinging hard" to "rocking out." *Symbolic Interaction* 19, 37-60.
- Dempsey, N.P., 2008. Hook-ups and train wrecks. *Symbolic Interaction* 31, 57-75.
- DeNora, T., 2002. Music into action. *Poetics* 30, 19-33.
- DeVeaux, S., 1997. *The Birth of Bebop*. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.
- DiMaggio, P., 1982. Cultural capital and school success. *American Sociological Review* 47, 189-201.
- DiMaggio, P., Ostrower, F., 1990. Participation in the arts by black and white Americans. *Social Forces* 68, 753-778.
- Dumais, S.A., 2002. Cultural capital, gender, and school success. *Sociology of Education* 75, 44-68.
- Dobbin, F., Sutton, J.R., Meyer, J.W., Scott, W.R., 1993. Equal opportunity law and the construction of internal labor markets. *American Journal of Sociology* 99, 396-427.
- Dowd, T.J., 2003. Structural power and the construction of markets. *Comparative Social Research* 21, 21:147-201.

- Dowd, T.J., 2004. Concentration and diversity revisited. *Social Forces* 82, 1411–1455.
- Dowd, T.J., Blyler, M., 2002. Charting race. *Poetics* 30, 87-110.
- Dowd, T.J., Liddle, K., Blyler, M. 2005. Charting gender. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations* 23, 81-123.
- Eijck, Koen van. 2001. Social differentiation in musical taste patterns. *Social Forces* 79, 1163-118.
- Faulkner, R., 1983. *Music on Demand*. Transaction Books, New Brunswick, NJ.
- Faulkner, Robert. 1985. *Hollywood Studio Musicians*. University Press of America, Lanham, MD.
- Fleming, C.M., Roses, L.E., 2007. Black cultural capitalists. *Poetics* 35, 368-387.
- Gibson, W., 2006. Material culture and embodied actions. *Sociological Review* 54, 171-187.
- Giuffre, K.A., 1999. Sandpiles of opportunity. *Social Forces* 77, 815-832.
- Giuffre, K.A., 2001. Mental maps. *Sociological Inquiry* 71, 381-393.
- Grazian, D., 2004. The production of popular music as a confidence game. *Qualitative Sociology* 27, 137–158.
- Heckathorn, D.D., Jeffri, J. 2001. Finding the beat. *Poetics* 28, 307-329.
- Hesmondhalgh, D., 1998. The British dance music industry. *British Journal of Sociology* 49, 234-251.
- Higginbotham, E.B., 1993. *Righteous Discontent*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Jeffri, J., 2003a. *Changing the Beat*. NEA Research Division Report #43. Washington, DC.
- Jeffri, J., 2003b. Jazz musicians. *Journal of Arts Management, Law & Society* 33, 40-51.
- Katz-Gerro, T., 2002. Highbrow cultural consumption and class distinction in Italy, Israel, West Germany, Sweden, and the United States. *Social Forces* 81, 207-229.
- Lacy, K., 2007. *Blue-Chip Black*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Lamont, M., 1992. *Money, Morals, & Manners*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

- Lareau, A., 2002. Invisible inequality. *American Sociological Review* 67, 747-776.
- Lareau, A., Horvat, E.M., 1999. Moments of social inclusion and exclusion. *Sociology of Education* 72, 37-53.
- Leahy, E., 2007. Not by productivity alone. *American Sociological Review* 72, 533-561.
- Lena, J.C., Peterson, R.A., 2008. Classification as culture. *American Sociological Review* 73, 697-718.
- Lopes, P.D., 2002. *The Rise of the Jazz Art World*. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- MacDonald, R., Wilson, G., 2005. Musical identities of professional jazz musicians. *Psychology of Music* 33, 395-417.
- MacLeod, B.A., 1993. *Club Date Musicians*. University of Illinois Press, Urbana, IL.
- McCall, L., 1992. Does gender fit? *Theory and Society* 21, 837-867.
- Menger, P-M., 1999. Artistic labor markets and careers. *Annual Review of Sociology* 25, 541-574.
- Miller, M., 2009. *Bounce: Rap Music and the Social Production of Place in New Orleans*. Unpublished Dissertation. American Studies, Emory University.
- Monson, I., 1996. *Saying Something*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Negus, K., 1999. *Music Genres and Corporate Cultures*. Routledge, London.
- Phillips, D. J., Owens, D.A., 2004. Incumbents, innovation, and competence. *Poetics* 32, 281-295.
- Prieur, A., Rosenlund, L., Skjott-Larsen, J., 2008. Cultural capital today. *Poetics* 36, 45-71.
- Radano, R.M., 1993. *New Musical Figurations*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Rao, H., Monin, P., Durand, R., 2005. Border crossing. *American Sociological Review* 70, 968-991.
- Sandoval, A., 1995. *Playing Techniques and Performance Studies for Trumpet*. Hal Leonard.
- Schmutz, V., 2005. Retrospective cultural consecration in popular music. *American Behavioral Scientist* 48, 1510-1523.

- Schmutz, V., 2009. Social and symbolic boundaries in newspaper coverage of music, 1955-2005. *Poetics* 37, 298-314.
- Schuller, G., 1986. *Early jazz*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Smith, A., 1965 [1776]. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Modern Library, New York.
- Sudnow, D., 1978. *Ways of the Hand*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Thornton, S., 1996. *Club Culture*. Wesleyan University Press, Hanover, NH.
- Uzzi, B., Spiro, J., 2005. Collaboration and creativity. *American Journal of Sociology* 111, 447-504.
- Walser, R., 1993. *Running with the Devil*. Wesleyan University Press, Hanover, NH.
- Zuckerman, E.W., 2005. Typecasting and generalism in firm and market. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations* 23, 171-214.
- Zuckerman, E.W., Kim, T-Y., 2003. The critical trade-off. *Industrial and Corporate Change* 12, 27-67.
- Zuckerman, E.W., Kim, T-Y., Ukanwa, K., von Rittmann, J. 2003. Robust identities or nonentities? *American Journal of Sociology* 108, 1018-1074.

Diogo L. Pinheiro is a Ph.D. candidate at Emory University. He specializes in economic sociology and the sociology of culture. His research focuses on the cultural aspects of markets, focusing specifically on how sensemaking by individuals and organizations are shaped by macro-social factors. His dissertation is on the creation and performance of Country Risk Ratings.

Timothy J. Dowd is associate professor of sociology at Emory University and was Erasmus Chair for the Humanities at Erasmus University Rotterdam (2007-2008). He specializes in cultural sociology, with much of his research focusing on such issues as the construction of the orchestral canon in the U.S., the extent of diversity in popular music, the careers of musicians, and the state of music sociology.

Table 1: OLS logistic regression estimates for income earned by individual musicians in three metropolitan areas

COEFFICIENT	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Talent Nationally Recognized (Critical Success)						0.0275	0.0426	0.0349
						(0.153)	(0.154)	(0.155)
New York SMSA	1.165**	1.063**	0.585**	1.211**	1.341**	0.432*	0.436*	0.496*
	(0.147)	(0.152)	(0.151)	(0.149)	(0.155)	(0.173)	(0.173)	(0.195)
New Orleans SMSA	1.676**	1.618**	1.309**	1.665**	1.671**	0.955**	0.967**	1.033**
	(0.187)	(0.187)	(0.178)	(0.188)	(0.186)	(0.182)	(0.182)	(0.187)
Male	0.361*	0.408*	0.310*	0.393*	0.309*	0.175	0.183	0.193
	(0.167)	(0.168)	(0.153)	(0.167)	(0.166)	(0.156)	(0.156)	(0.157)
African American	0.104	0.070	-0.101	0.082	0.052	-0.112	-0.132	-0.108
	(0.155)	(0.155)	(0.143)	(0.155)	(0.155)	(0.147)	(0.148)	(0.151)
Other Race / Ethnicity	0.0126	0.002	0.080	0.034	0.001	-0.012	-0.005	0.012
	(0.207)	(0.205)	(0.187)	(0.206)	(0.205)	(0.184)	(0.184)	(0.185)
Conservatory Training in Music		-0.102				-0.383*	-0.373*	-0.340*
		(0.168)				(0.154)	(0.154)	(0.157)
Certificate Program in Music		-0.057				-0.073	-0.100	-0.099
		(0.130)				(0.115)	(0.116)	(0.118)
Private Teachers of Music		0.073				0.086*	0.084*	0.090*
		-0.046				-0.042	-0.043	-0.043
Educational Attainment		0.127*				-0.033	-0.033	-0.034
		(0.061)				(0.061)	(0.061)	(0.063)
Musical Experience in Years		0.050**				0.045**	0.060**	0.058**
		(0.015)				(0.014)	(0.017)	(0.017)
Number of Musicians Known in Metro Area			2.69E-03**			2.15E-03**	2.13E-03**	2.14E-03**
			(4.57E-04)			(4.65E-04)	(4.65E-04)	(4.74E-04)
AFM Member			0.895**			0.859**	0.854**	0.876**
			(0.143)			(0.142)	(0.142)	(0.144)
Early Family Encouragement of Musical Involvement				0.364**		0.197	0.202*	0.200
				(0.134)		(0.122)	(0.123)	(0.124)
Early Financial Support of Musical Involvement				0.0624		-0.297	-0.353	-0.343
				(0.414)		(0.378)	(0.379)	(0.380)
Technical Generalism					-2.65E-03	8.26E-03	2.99E-02	2.35E-02
					(7.58E-03)	(8.12E-03)	(6.7E-02)	(6.77E-02)
Aesthetic Generalism					0.009**	0.006*	0.028	0.029*
					(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.015)	(0.015)
Age						0.058	0.054	0.048
						(0.050)	(0.050)	(0.050)
Work Marketed						0.487**	0.484**	0.456**
						(0.161)	(0.161)	(0.163)
Uses internet for Music						0.472**	0.480**	0.492**
						(0.130)	(0.130)	(0.131)
Aesthetic Generalism * Experience							-8.43E-04	-8.82E-04
							(5.58E-04)	-0.001
Technical Generalism * Experience							-8.98E-04	-5.64E-04
							(0.003)	(0.003)
Average Genre Centrality								0.326
								(0.595)
Average Instrument Centrality								0.928
								(0.624)
Constant	7.703**	5.507**	7.468**	7.510**	7.544**	6.097**	5.721**	5.367**
	(0.183)	(0.569)	(0.171)	(0.195)	(0.189)	(0.568)	(0.616)	(0.703)
Observations	529	518	503	529	529	467	467	460
R-squared	0.171	0.205	0.328	0.183	0.189	0.394	0.398	0.402

** Significant at the 0.01 level, * significant at the 0.05 level (standard errors in parentheses)

Table 2. Logistic regression estimates for national recognition enjoyed by individual musicians in three metropolitan areas

COEFFICIENT	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
Income Earned as a musician (Economic Success)						1.029	1.030	1.026
						(0.114)	(0.116)	(0.117)
New York SMSA	1.620	1.802*	1.724*	1.734*	2.228**	3.237**	3.472**	2.585*
	(0.435)	(0.520)	(0.525)	(0.477)	(0.654)	(1.318)	(1.463)	(1.220)
New Orleans SMSA	5.589**	6.344**	5.121**	5.695**	6.004**	5.446**	5.952**	5.879**
	(1.639)	(1.950)	(1.612)	(1.685)	(1.824)	(2.157)	(2.442)	(2.448)
Male	0.757	0.880	0.712	0.780	0.728	0.807	0.790	0.790
	(0.201)	(0.250)	(0.193)	(0.209)	(0.199)	(0.264)	(0.260)	(0.263)
African American	1.184	1.311	1.208	1.154	1.120	1.090	1.154	1.106
	(0.300)	(0.344)	(0.318)	(0.293)	(0.290)	(0.342)	(0.366)	(0.356)
Other Race / Ethnicity	1.359	1.446	1.465	1.384	1.360	1.987	1.985	1.921
	(0.478)	(0.522)	(0.523)	(0.489)	(0.487)	(0.775)	(0.780)	(0.761)
Conservatory Training in Music		0.695				0.791	0.726	0.726
		(0.219)				(0.277)	(0.257)	(0.260)
Certificate Program in Music		1.035				0.888	0.943	0.954
		(0.212)				(0.212)	(0.229)	(0.232)
Private Teachers of Music		0.929				0.914	0.912	0.916
		(0.074)				(0.085)	(0.086)	(0.087)
Educational Attainment		1.173				1.265	1.235	1.221
		(0.128)				(0.178)	(0.174)	(0.175)
Musical Experience in Years		1.015				1.031	1.040	1.049
		(0.028)				(0.033)	(0.042)	(0.044)
Number of Musicians Known in Metro Area			0.999			0.998*	0.998	0.998
			(9.15E-04)			(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
AFM Member			1.282			1.378	1.333	1.283
			(0.329)			(0.421)	(0.410)	(0.399)
Early Family Encouragement of Musical Involvement				1.343		1.497	1.535	1.528
				(0.300)		(0.396)	(0.410)	(0.412)
Early Financial Support of Musical Involvement				1.470		0.802	1.035	1.020
				(0.902)		(0.714)	(0.929)	(0.919)
Technical Generalism					0.948*	0.920*	1.718*	1.742*
					(0.0253)	(0.0319)	(0.407)	(0.414)
Aesthetic Generalism					1.017**	1.015**	0.942	0.940
					(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.033)	(0.033)
Age						1.172	1.181	1.182
						(0.129)	(0.131)	(0.132)
Work Marketed						2.448**	2.386**	2.180*
						(0.768)	(0.758)	(0.704)
Uses Internet for Music						0.896	0.899	0.931
						(0.256)	(0.262)	(0.273)
Aesthetic Generalism * Experience							1.003*	1.003*

Technical Generalism * Experience							(0.001)	(0.001)
							0.976*	0.975**
Average Genre Centrality							(0.010)	(0.010)
								0.272
Average Instrument Centrality								(0.355)
								0.202
								(0.275)
Constant	0.151**	0.0334**	0.166**	0.125**	0.117**	0.00464**	0.00416**	0.0104*
	(0.047)	(0.036)	(0.054)	(0.043)	(0.040)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.019)
Observations	572	557	532	572	572	467	467	460
Pseudo R-Squared	0.067	0.084	0.069	0.071	0.098	0.150	0.167	0.167

** Significant at the 0.01 level, * significant at the 0.05 level

Table 3. Coefficient and 95% confidence interval for aesthetic generalism in the critical success models

Experience value	Coefficient (odds ratio)	Confidence interval
Mean – 1 standard dev.	.9995315	.982241 1.017126
Mean	1.012382	1.001223 1.023666
Mean + 1 standard dev.	1.025398	1.010858 1.040147

Table 4: Coefficient and 95% confidence interval for technical generalism in the national recognition models

Experience value	Coefficient (odds ratio)	Confidence interval
Mean – 1 standard dev.	1.013829	.9362269 1.097863
mean	.9052946	.8463425 .968353
Mean + 1 standard dev.	.8083793	.7086964 .9220833