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One of cultural sociology’s most important contributions to the study of social inequality has been the explication of the role that the possession of cultural resources plays in the ordering of society and social groups. To investigate the relationship between the expression of aesthetic tastes and symbolic exclusion, I analyze original data that measure variation in respondents’ propensity to change their expressed taste about a particular cultural object given information about that object’s typical fans. I find that respondents were likely to change their opinion to approximate the taste expression of a group of high-status others, but did not change their opinion when told the taste of a group of low-status others, except in the case of low-status persons being told that a group of low-status persons taste for the object was negative, in which case low-status respondents (but not high-status respondents) reacted by giving a more positive evaluation. I also analyze respondents’ perception of solidarity with the groups they were told about, and find that differences in taste between respondents and the group are a stronger predictor of the perception of social distance than were differences in status (measured by education and occupation). Finally, with regard to perceptions of social
distance, I find that the possession of cultural capital decreases the propensity for symbolic exclusion.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

One of cultural sociology’s most important contributions to the study of social inequality has been the explication of the role that the possession of cultural resources plays in the ordering of society and social groups. Paul DiMaggio, in particular, has contributed much to the understanding of the ways that non-economic factors pattern social inequality, and specifically, those factors related to capital gained as a result of knowledge of and participation with various forms of culture. For instance, he argues that social boundaries and cultural tastes are mutually reinforcing, as diverse networks lead to broad cultural exposure, which in turn can facilitate further broadening of social networks (DiMaggio 1987). Subsequent research has supported this argument, demonstrating that cultural preferences can spread through social networks (Creed and Scully 2000; DiMaggio and Useem 1978; Erickson 1996; Mark 1998, 2003; Marsden, Reed, Kennedy and Stinson 1982; North and Hargreaves 1999), and that similarities in taste can lead to the formation of social ties (Boer et al. 2011; Lizardo 2006; Long 2003; Ostrower 1998; Rentfrow, McDonald and Oldmeadow 2009).

The first goal of this dissertation is to build on such research by examining the relationship between the expression of aesthetic tastes and the construction of symbolic boundaries. Although the link between tastes and social connections has been clearly identified and adequately theorized, the processes underlying the relationship between aesthetic taste and symbolic boundary work are not well understood. For instance, do
considerations of others’ social characteristics influence individuals to change their taste expressions to align themselves (or not) with those others? This dissertation will investigate individuals’ propensity to use their own taste expressions as markers of symbolic boundaries. Specifically, this study examines the conditions under which individuals modify their own taste expressions in order to express either solidarity with or social distance from others.

Further, relatively little is known about the specific mechanisms that operate in processes of symbolic boundary work. Lamont and Molnar (2002:188) encourage researchers to correct this gap in the literature by expanding the study of symbolic boundaries to examine the “hidden assumptions” embedded in the criteria employed in boundary work. This study seeks to do just that by investigating how perceptions about interpersonal similarity and difference are formed. Therefore, a second goal of this dissertation is to examine some of the processes involved in the construction of symbolic boundaries, particularly with regard to the predictors of exclusive boundary drawing, and in relation to considerations of aesthetic taste, and of cultural capital more generally. For instance, are social ties more strongly predicted by similarities in taste or in socioeconomic status? Does the way that symbolic boundaries are constructed influence their exclusivity? Further, how does the possession of one or more forms of cultural capital influence the propensity to draw inclusive symbolic boundaries? This study investigates these understudied questions about the ways in which people perceive solidarity with others, extending the already rich literature, grounded in Weberian theory, which considers the relationship between intergroup differences and social inequality.
The explanation for the relationship between tastes and social ties has generally been that cultural interests give individuals common ground, acting as a vehicle for the establishment and/or maintenance of social relationships (e.g. DiMaggio 1987, Erickson 1996, Lizardo 2006, Long 2003, Ostrower 1998). Erickson (1996) finds that variety of cultural familiarity is directly related to the variety of network ties. Similarly, Lizardo (2006) finds that engagement with different types of culture leads to different types of network ties, such that the broadest cultural tastes (participation in both highbrow and popular cultural events) result in the most diverse social networks (made up of both weak and strong ties). Further, Long (2003) and Ostrower (1998) both demonstrate that aesthetic tastes lead individuals to form social ties with others that allow them to participate in cultural activities within specific organizational contexts that expand their social networks.

Both Erickson (1996) and Lizardo (2006) base their conclusions about the relationship between cultural familiarity and participation and network density on measures analyzed at the aggregate level, preventing the examination of the relationship between individuals’ tastes and their symbolic boundary decisions. That is, although it is clear from their studies that broad cultural tastes either beget or are begotten by diverse networks (they disagree on the causal order of the relationship), neither can explicate how the process works by connecting particular tastes (or sets of tastes) to specific boundary work decisions. Long (2003) and Ostrower (1998), on the other hand, do connect individual tastes to the formation of particular social ties, but these authors have no information about tastes other than those related to the social ties under consideration. Therefore, while these authors can connect tastes for certain cultural objects to
associations with particular social groups, they cannot discuss how distastes, the breadth of cultural tastes, and/or the relative influence of tastes compared to social status are related decisions about or opportunities for social connections. This dissertation continues this line of research, examining the role that aesthetic tastes play in the construction of symbolic boundaries.

1.1 The role of taste expression on symbolic boundary work

1.1.1 Taste modification in boundary work

Taste expressions and consumption have been shown to be a function of individuals’ desire to differentiate themselves from others (DiMaggio 1982; Simmel 1957). Expression of distastes is a method for communicating social distance from certain social groups, suggesting that individuals communicate personally relevant information about their own identities via their expressions of distaste. More specifically, individuals use the refusal of certain tastes to declare their lack of affiliation with particular social groups associated with those tastes (Bryson 1996, Tampubolon 2008, Berger and Heath 2008). This finding is in line with Bourdieu’s (1984:56) definition of aesthetic taste as a “practical affirmation of inevitable difference” that is expressed as distaste – “disgust provoked by horror or visceral intolerance of the tastes of others.” That is, beyond stating a preference for a given cultural object, Bourdieu argues that expressions of taste have a boundary-defining function that serve not only to communicate about who one is, but also about who one is not.

Bryson (1996) uses the 1993 Culture Module of the General Social Survey (GSS) to examine the relationship between individuals’ expression of musical dislikes and their social distance from various groups. She concludes, for example, that highly-educated
respondents express dislike for genres of music generally associated with non-college educated audiences\(^1\) (such as heavy metal and country music), while the expression of dislike for rap music is associated with racist attitudes. She suggests that her findings validate Bourdieu’s conceptualization of tastes as expressions of difference with dissimilar others and of intolerance for their tastes. Further, findings from recent social psychological research suggest that individuals may adapt their own self-image to match the characteristics they perceive to be associated with fans of particular genres that they like (Rentfrow, McDonald and Oldmeadow 2009). It is likely that this attempt at identity development works in similar ways for genres that individuals dislike as well.

Researchers in the subfields of sociology of music, consumption studies, and social psychology have conducted empirical studies that allow for an examination of changes in consumption patterns. Hebdige (1987) and Thornton (1995) find that members of subcultures abandon particular cultural tastes and goods that once conferred subcultural capital when it is discovered that outsiders have adopted them, resulting in the inability of such tastes or goods to signal unique group membership. Similarly, Escalas and Bettman (2005) and Berger and Heath (2008) find that once individuals learn that cultural or material goods that they favor or consume are consumed by dissimilar others, they are likely to abandon or back away from those tastes. For instance, Berger and Heath (2008) found that college-aged respondents reported that they would discontinue the use of a new catch phrase if they discovered that middle-aged janitors were using it, and that other undergraduate respondents stopped wearing a particular armband once the residents of the “geeky” academic dorm began to wear it. In all of these studies, changes

\(^1\) Bennett et al’s (2000) findings corroborate this conclusion for a European audience.
in taste expression and consumption behavior happened and were meaningful because identity claims were at stake.

In addition, musical tastes have been found to be useful in communicating both membership in particular groups, and non-membership in others (Frith 1981). Consumers actively avoid objects associated with outgroups (Berger and Heath 2007, 2008; White and Dahl 2006, 2007), and individuals experiencing social isolation are likely to make consumption decisions that are detrimental to their own personal or financial self-interests in the pursuit of social inclusion (Mead et al. 2001). Such findings illustrate that the attractiveness of a particular object is dependent on the characteristics of its consumers, that people use taste expressions and consumption to communicate to others about themselves and the social groups to which they belong or wish to belong (see also Belk 1988, DeNora 1999, Forman 2002), and are likely to abandon tastes, even those that they previous publicly endorsed, in order to maintain social distance from dissimilar others or groups.

Based on Bourdieu’s (1984) argument that tastes are expressions of difference, and the empirical findings discussed just above about the symbolic nature of tastes (e.g. Thornton 1995, Berger and Heath 2008), one should expect that individuals will employ taste expressions as symbolic boundary markers, or as statements of perceived similarities or differences with others. This dissertation examines this idea.

The study discussed in Chapter 3 builds on the work of Hebdige (1987), Thornton (1995), Berger and Heath (2008) and others who find evidence for taste abandonment following the discovery of similarity in taste with members of meaningful outgroups. This study will examine how changes in a stated preference for a given cultural object are
related to perceptions of similarity with others whose preference for the same object they are privy to, either approximating the taste of others they perceive as similar, or distancing themselves via taste from those they perceive as different from themselves\textsuperscript{2}. To that end, respondents will be given the opportunity to express their opinion about a painting twice, once before and once after receiving information (taste and/or status) about others who have seen the same painting. I will interpret a change in opinion will as an attempt to mark a social boundary with regard to those others, in response to information about their taste and/or social status. I will not consider the second opinion about the painting as an index of respondents’ taste, but rather as their attempt to express solidarity with or social distance from others. I predict that respondents will use their second taste expression as an opportunity to either align themselves with alters with whom they perceive similarity, or distance themselves from alters with whom they perceive difference. Examining how respondents change their taste expressions given the information they receive about alters’ taste and social location will help clarify the role that expressions of aesthetic taste play in processes of symbolic boundary construction.

1.1.2 Taste differences and boundary work

In addition to examining how individuals mark boundaries via modifications of their own taste expressions, this dissertation tests how dissimilarity in cultural tastes and/or status influences the propensity to draw inclusive symbolic boundaries. Much has been written about the influence of homophilic status, values, and other characteristics on the formation of social ties (e.g. Lazarsfeld and Merton 1954; McPherson, Smith-Lovin

\textsuperscript{2} Such a finding would also be expected by the social psychological “identification principle” (Argo, Dahl and Morales 2008; Chaiken 1979; Eagly and Chaiken 1993; Lowry 1973; Shalev and Morwitz 2012; Strodtbeck, James, and Hawkins 1957).
and Cook 2001), illustrating that homophily leads to network connections. Therefore, it is uncontroversial to predict that similarities of either taste or status will lead to the perception of solidarity with others. But, what happens when individuals match on one but not the other? Can individuals who share cultural tastes but not status find common ground, and vice versa? Further, which type of discordance (status or taste) is a stronger predictor of perceiving social distance with others?

Bourdieu (1984) suggests that taste differences between two people evoke a visceral, negative reaction, and that it is through the rejections of others’ aesthetic tastes that individuals engage in the symbolic boundary work that separates them. This idea leads to the prediction that a mismatch in taste decreases the likelihood that a social bond will form or be maintained. Further, Illouz (1997) and Kern (1997) discovered evidence in various contexts demonstrating that individuals are more likely to draw symbolic boundaries based on similarities (or the lack thereof) in cultural preferences than in status or moral characteristics. Therefore, I test the hypothesis that taste discordance will be a stronger predictor of the perception of social distance than will status discordance in Chapter 4. More specifically, I will examine variation in the propensity to draw exclusive boundaries (to report the perception of dissimilarity between oneself and a hypothetical group of others) by dissimilarity in taste and/or status to determine which type of dissimilarity, taste or status, is a stronger predictor of exclusive boundary drawing. Results from this investigation of the relationship between tastes and boundary drawing will bring more specificity to the current understanding of cultural influences on relationship formation and maintenance.
1.1.3 Taste salience in boundary work

Another goal of this dissertation is to examine how considerations of other people’s tastes influence individuals’ perceptions of social solidarity with those others, with a particular focus on the influence of the considerations of taste specifically, and the possession of cultural capital more generally, \textit{relative} to considerations of social status. It is clear from previous studies of symbolic boundary work that common strategies for the construction of boundaries include the use of socioeconomic, cultural and moral distinctions, and that individuals draw symbolic boundaries using the type of capital that provides their own status superiority relative to other groups (DiMaggio 1987, Espiritu 2001, Kefalas 2003, Lamont 1992, Newman 1999). However, relatively little is known about the specific mechanisms that operate in processes of symbolic boundary work, particularly with regard to how people judge the social distance between themselves and others with regard to those others’ tastes.

Individuals use the criteria that are most relevant to their own personally-significant form of dominance to perform symbolic boundary work. For instance, Lamont (1992) provides evidence that individuals with the highest volume of cultural capital (cultural specialists) are more likely than those with the highest volume of economic capital (for-profit workers or economic specialists) to employ cultural boundaries in the formation of symbolic boundaries. Similarly, Erickson (1996) finds that knowledge of highbrow culture was of little relevance relative to “business culture” in network expansion for the economic specialists in her study. Likewise, Bryson (1996) finds that racist individuals express social distance from blacks through their rejection of
rap music, and those with college degrees express distaste in heavy metal music, which is often associated with a non-college-educated fan base.

Evidence of boundary work that privileges particular types of capital has been found in studies of individuals with low cultural capital as well. Newman (1999) and Kefalas (2003) find that working-class individuals use the economic stability that their jobs and homes provide to define themselves against lower-class and unemployed alters, Lamont (2000) finds that white working-class men in the United States and France draw boundaries between themselves and non-whites based on what they perceive to be moral differences between themselves and these others. Similarly, Espiritu (2001) finds that Filipina women in the United States whose social status is subjugated by race assert moral superiority over white women whose sexual behaviors they consider deviant. Further, adolescents have been found to structure social relations using criteria related to the activities, characteristics and behaviors that are meaningful to them (Tarrant and North 2001a, Tarrant and North 2001b).

Bourdieu (1984) explains this reliance on personally-relevant criteria with regard to taste expression by suggesting that shared social space results in a shared aesthetic disposition and common cultural preferences. Finding commonalities of tastes (or other relevant characteristics) with others is, therefore, a short cut for identifying fellow members of social groups, or co-residents of a particular social space.

These studies make clear that individuals rely on personally-relevant criteria in the construction of symbolic boundaries such that the form of capital that supports their own (relative) status is privileged in considerations of solidarity. It is not clear from this previous research, however, if the use of a particular type of boundary (cultural,
economic, moral, etc.) is likely to lead to more inclusive boundary work than is the use of another type. Are people who attend to others’ tastes rather than their status in decisions about the desirability of social connection more likely to draw inclusive symbolic boundaries than people who pay no attention to tastes? Determining the relative influence of the consideration of tastes on boundary-drawing decisions will help clarify one way in which cultural tastes “work” to shape and modify the social world.

To this end, this study examines if the consideration of others’ tastes instead of or in addition to their status leads to either more inclusive or exclusive boundary work than the consideration of status alone (in Chapter 4). That is, after learning about a group of hypothetical others’ taste in the painting and/or status, respondents will be asked how similar they think that they are to members of that group, and then will be asked if they made this social boundary decision based on the others’ taste, status, or both. It is predicted that individuals for whom tastes are more salient in boundary construction decisions than is status will be those whose strongest social asset is their cultural capital. Such individuals are likely to have broader cultural tastes than those whose social positions are supported by some other form of capital, and will, therefore, be likely to have the ability to connect with a diverse group of others (Erickson 1996, Lizardo 2006). Therefore, this study tests the hypothesis that inclusive boundary drawing will be more likely for respondents who attend to taste rather than status in their considerations of social distance with others.

The work in this dissertation builds on existing theory and literature which identify the link between taste and social stratification by clarifying how tastes operate in symbolic boundary decisions. Results demonstrating the ways in which individuals alter
their own taste expressions in order to mark symbolic boundaries, and the specific ways in which they take tastes into considerations in their construction of symbolic boundaries, will further explicate the social psychological mechanisms that translate specific cultural affinities into patterns of social ordering.

1.2 The role of the possession of cultural capital on symbolic boundary work

Related to the connection between tastes and boundary drawing, I also expect that the possession of cultural capital will be related to the propensity to draw inclusive boundaries, and that the possession of multiple forms of cultural capital will confer a cumulative advantage in terms of the ability to perceive similarity between oneself and others. Bourdieu’s (1996) theory of cultural reproduction suggests that distinctions in class position are the result of unequal access to cultural capital, due in large part to educational institutions that reward students who demonstrate possession of cultural capital associated with the dominant class. This theory predicts that when non-dominant-class individuals gain access to such cultural capital, they are less able to capitalize on it than are those from the dominant class. DiMaggio (1982) provides support of this for females in terms of academic ability (but finds evidence for cultural capital’s ability to promote social mobility for males), as does McClelland (1990), in terms of entrance into high-status careers.

Therefore, this study tests the hypothesis that respondents who possess various and multiple forms of cultural capital will be the most likely to draw inclusive boundaries. I measure cultural capital in this study in three ways: college degree completion, parental college degree completion, and broad musical taste. Parental educational and musical tastes are both forms of embodied cultural capital that should
increase respondents’ capacity to find common ground with a wide range of others. Children whose parents have college degrees are often given the opportunity to interact with adults and other children in a range of social and cultural activities (Lareau 2003), making them more likely than children whose parents did not graduate from college to make social connections with a diverse group of others.

Likewise, broad musical taste develops from an aesthetic disposition that has been cultivated in such a way to allow for the appreciation of a wide variety of music. A disposition such as this is developed through experiences in the formal education system, participation in a wide variety of cultural and leisure activities, and through membership in a diverse set of social networks (Bourdieu 1986). The result of the broad cultural taste borne of a well-developed aesthetic disposition is a “common cultural currency” (DiMaggio 1987), or the ability to communicate the possession of “multicultural capital” (Bryson 1997) or “openness to diversity” (Ollivier 2004) that allows its possessors to form and successfully navigate relationships in a wide array of social experiences and situations. Therefore, the possession of embodied cultural capital, measured by both cultural privilege inherited from one’s parents and by broad musical taste, should increase respondents’ capacity to draw inclusive symbolic boundaries. Further, I will test the hypothesis that the possession of multiple forms of cultural capital will confer a cumulative advantage to their possessors in terms of the propensity to draw inclusive symbolic boundaries.

Finally, the relationship between the possession of cultural capital and the propensity to draw exclusive boundaries will be examined with regard to individuals’ position in social space relative to others. Bourdieu (1984) suggests that the lack of
cultural capital is even more significant in the creation and reproduction of social inequality than is the lack of economic capital. Individuals who lack the requisite cultural capital to move successfully through social institutions are unlikely to be successful. Significantly, this failure, partially determined by a mismatch of cultural value and competences (Stephens et al 2012), will be understood as the result of personal shortcomings rather than the outcome of structural obstacles to equality of opportunity (Bourdieu 1996). The invisible nature of the power of cultural capital to shape individuals’ occupational and relationship success is precisely what allows it to continue to operate (Bourdieu and Passeron 1990). Cultural capital mismatch between two people is communicated most easily via recognition of differences in position in social space, which is determined primarily by education and occupation. Bourdieu suggests that such differences in social position can be prescriptive, such that the re-shuffling of social space is made very difficult by the strong but invisible stratifying power of cultural capital. This idea will be tested in this idea with an examination of how specific pairings of respondent and alter social locations influences the exclusivity of boundary drawing.

1.3 Overview

The consideration of others’ tastes is meaningful in the process of symbolic boundary formation, just as the considerations of economic and moral characteristics are (Lamont 1992). However, while economic capital is understood as an achieved or earned resource, cultural capital is perceived as natural, or an innate aspect of one’s personality. Bourdieu (1996) argues that this second assumption masks the structural nature of the reproduction of social privilege. That is, when individuals are given access to resources or opportunities for mobility based on their cultural competence, the role that location in
social space played in the accumulation of such competence is often hidden or
overlooked, masking the process of rewarding social privilege with more privilege, and,
conversely, punishing the lack of privilege with the refusal of future privilege. Such
processes of reward and punishment are misrecognized, therefore, as operating outside of
the structural system of inequality.

In order to fully understand the processes at work in the social constructions of
divisions between people and groups, it is necessary to understand the mechanisms that
underlie the transference of social and economic benefits from cultural capital. The
primary goal of this dissertation is to examine some of the ways in which cultural capital
plays a role in the construction of symbolic boundaries. To this end, I will test
hypotheses regarding the construction of symbolic boundaries that are associated with
various expressions and perceptions of aesthetic taste. Certainly, cultural capital
encompasses far more than aesthetic tastes, but taste expression is a clear manner through
which individuals communicate their possession of cultural capital, and how they
interpret the cultural competences of others.

First, I suggest that individuals’ own taste expressions can be understood as
statements of perceived differences with others, or as attempts at symbolic boundary
work. That is, by stating a preference for a given cultural object, individuals make a
statement about their perceived similarity with or difference from others based on those
others’ tastes for the same object. Data collected for this dissertation will allow for the
analysis of individuals’ propensity to take others’ tastes into consideration in the
construction of symbolic boundaries to determine how similarities in taste can potentially
lead to the formation of social ties. This interdependence between aesthetic taste and
social structure has been found in other sociological studies (DiMaggio 1987, Erickson 1996, Lizardo 2006, Long 2003, Ostrower 1998). The unique contribution of this dissertation is its focus on the manner in which the consideration of others’ tastes influence one’s own taste expression and boundary work.

In Chapter 3 I test the hypothesis that tastes are expressions of perceived differences, and therefore act as symbolic boundary markers. I test this hypothesis by asking survey respondents for their opinions about a painting twice, once before and once after they learn the taste and/or social location of others who have seen the same painting. Unlike most previous studies of the relationship between taste expression and symbolic boundary work, this design allows for the examination of change in taste expressions, allowing for the examination of individuals’ alteration of taste expressions in order to express social distance between themselves and dissimilar others. This study examines respondents’ propensity to use their own taste expressions as markers of symbolic boundaries. Results demonstrating that taste expressions serve as cognitive bridges uniting individuals with others and/or fences separating them will help explain how tastes shape boundaries by illustrating the types of differences between themselves and others that individuals communicate via their expressions of aesthetic taste.

While Chapter 3 discusses the idea that individuals use their own taste expressions to draw symbolic boundaries, Chapter 4 presents results of a study designed to examine relative differences in the influence of others’ taste expressions and social location on symbolic boundary construction by asking respondents how similar they perceive themselves to be to a group of others based on information about those others’ taste expressions and social location. Results of previous studies suggest that similarity
in social location (Lazarsfeld and Merton 1954; McPherson, Smith-Lovin and Cook 2001) and taste (Mark 1998) facilitate perceptions of social proximity. This study’s contribution is the comparison of the effects of social location and taste to determine which is a stronger predictor of symbolic boundary work.

The analyses discussed in Chapter 5 test hypothesizes that respondents’ possession of cultural capital will be negatively related to the behavior of exclusive boundary drawing. That is, the possession of various forms of cultural capital, and particularly multiple forms of cultural capital, will draw on the ability that such capital gives them to relate with a wide range of people in order to draw inclusive symbolic boundaries. However, analyses in Chapter 5 also test the hypothesis that individuals will respond to a mismatch in the possession of cultural capital between themselves and others with exclusive boundary drawing.

Results supporting the hypotheses in these chapters will suggest that structural differences in the ability to cultivate cultural capital and the aesthetic disposition, which lead to the cultivation of particular tastes, have meaningful and significant implications for processes that result in social inequality. As Bourdieu (1996) explains, while differences in economic resources are visible sources of inequality that can be mitigated under the right set of circumstances, differences in cultural resources, competencies and tastes appear as results of idiosyncratic, individual differences unconnected to social structure, and therefore unrelated to people’s location in social space. If considerations of taste are found to be more meaningful than are considerations of social location in symbolic boundary decisions, it can be concluded that attempts to mediate social
inequality will fail without a conscious effort to address disparities in the valuation of cultural competencies, particularly those found in formal education systems.
CHAPTER 2

METHODS

This dissertation examines the relationship between aesthetic taste expression and symbolic boundary work in several ways. The study discussed in Chapter 3 investigates respondents’ modification of their own taste expressions given about a particular painting in response to information given to them about a group of others (specifically, these others’ opinion of the painting and indicators of their social status) in order to either align themselves with or distance themselves from those others. Next, in Chapter 4, I assess the extent to which, and how, respondents utilize information about others’ aesthetic tastes in their own symbolic boundary work by asking respondents how much similarity they find between themselves as these (hypothetical) others. Finally, variation in the exclusivity of boundary drawing by the possession of cultural capital is discussed in Chapter 5.

2.1 Procedure

An online experimental survey with a 4x3 fractional factorial design was conducted to examine how aesthetic tastes operate in symbolic boundary decisions, particularly as they interact with social location. The experimental design altered the information that respondents received about a group of (fictional) other survey respondents’ taste in a particular painting (like, dislike, or no information given) and social location (3 categories plus a condition in which no information was given) in order to determine how knowledge of such information would influence respondents’ own taste
expressions and their symbolic boundary work. Data for this study were collected via an online survey created using Qualtrics Labs Inc. survey software, version 12.18 of the Qualtrics Research Suite. The entire survey can be found in the Appendix.

Respondents first answered a block of demographic questions (age, gender, geographic region of residence, college completion and race/ethnicity). Answers to these questions determined whether or not respondents were eligible to participate in the study (individuals younger than 18 were filtered out), and if respondents with their demographic characteristics were still needed for the sample. A series of quota settings helped to achieve a sample that is approximately representative of the U.S. adult population, as discussed in Section 2.3. Next respondents read the informed consent document and provided their consent for participation in the study by clicking “Agree.” Those who did not agree to the terms in the informed consent statement were filtered out.

Next, respondents viewed an image of a painting, and then were asked to give their opinion of it. All respondents viewed an image of the same painting -- Nocturne: Battersea Bridge, by Whistler (Whistler 1872). An image of this painting is included in the survey instrument, which can be found in the Appendix. This painting was chosen based on feedback gathered from an online pilot study of this survey given in June 2011, which showed images of eight paintings to a convenience sample of respondents. The Whistler painting was chosen for use in the current study because it had the highest variation in opinions in general and across all measured demographic characteristics.

3Before being shown the image of the painting, respondents were asked if they were taking the survey from a smart phone. The image best suited for a traditional computer or laptop monitor is too big to fit onto a phone screen, so those who indicated that they were using a smart phone were shown a version of the painting suited for smaller screens.
Respondents in the current study gave their first impression of the painting on a 1–7 scale ranging from “like it very much” to “dislike it very much.” This first impression expression of taste serves as a baseline measure of taste, uninfluenced by information that came next about others’ opinions of the same painting. After viewing the image and giving their opinion of it, respondents were told that the group of people most likely to say that they either liked or disliked the painting they had just seen had one of three sets of education and occupation characteristics (with the exception of “no alter” control respondents, who were not given any information about other survey respondents). By random assignment, half of respondents who received taste information were told that these other individuals liked the painting, while the other half were told that these individuals disliked the painting.

In addition, respondents in treatment conditions were given information about the alter group members’ education and occupation (social location). Respondents in the treatment condition were randomly sorted into one of three groups based on the characteristics of these alters. Each of these three groups were designed to represent one of three social location groupings that was also used to categorize respondents themselves: Low Cultural Capital (LCC, as discussed in Holt 1998), Economic Specialist [(ES, identical to Lamont’s for-profit workers, (1992)], and Cultural Specialist [(CS, as in Lamont’s study, and consistent with Bourdieu’s description of cultural intermediaries (1984)]\(^4\).

After reading the information about the alter group’s education and occupation and/or taste, respondents were asked how similar they think they are to the members of

---

\(^4\) For a complete description of the social location variable, see section 2.2.3.
this other group on a 5-point scale (1=very similar, 3=just a little similar, 5=not at all similar). This question provides one measure of respondents’ symbolic boundary-drawing attempts. Next, respondents in the treatment condition were asked on which criterion they based this similarity judgment (education/occupation, taste, or both). Respondents in the “no alter” control group were not asked these two questions about perceived solidarity (as they had no alters with which to compare themselves).

Next, all respondents were asked another block of demographic questions (degree attainment, major, parents’ degree attainment, employment status, occupation, income, and self-perception of social class), and then were asked a series of questions about their musical tastes. Finally, respondents were shown the same image of the painting that they had seen earlier in the survey, and were asked for their opinion of it again. For respondents in the treatment condition who had been given information about other people’s social location and opinion about the painting, this second opinion serves not as a measure of taste, but as a measure of whether or not, and in what manner, respondents are influenced to change their taste expression given knowledge of others’ opinion of it, interacted with those others’ social location. For “taste only” control respondents (who are told alters’ opinion but not social location), the second taste expression serves as a measure of how much respondents are influenced by simply knowing what a group of other people, regardless of their characteristics, think of the painting. For “no alter” control respondents (those not given any information about others’ opinion of the painting), this second taste expression serves as a check on the stability of opinions about the painting.
2.2 Measures

2.2.1 Outcomes

Several research questions are tested in this dissertation. The analyses in Chapter 3 examine if and how individuals use their own taste expressions as tools in boundary work. In these analyses, I will examine respondents’ change in opinion about a painting over the course of the survey relative to the information given to them about the (hypothetical) group of people most likely to either like or dislike that painting, and how respondents’ own characteristics and taste compare to those of the members of this group. I will interpret changes in this opinion between measurements as an attempt to either align or distance oneself with/from this group of others, in an attempt to draw a symbolic boundary either around themselves and those others, or between themselves and those others.

The analyses in Chapters 4 and 5 examine research questions related to respondents’ sense of perceived solidarity with this hypothetical group of other people, examining variation in respondents’ perception of how similar or different they are to the group of people whom they are told are the most likely to either like or dislike the painting they saw. The first set of research questions in Chapter 4 investigates the relative effects of differences in taste and location in social location (education and occupation) in forming exclusive boundaries. In addition, analyses in Chapter 4 investigate if and how the outcomes of this symbolic boundary decision are influenced by the information individuals use to make them. More specifically, respondents in the treatment condition are given information about these others’ social location (education and occupation) and opinion about the painting. Respondents are asked which of these
factors were most influential to them in making their decision about how similar or
dissimilar they are to these others (with the option to choose both).

Finally, in Chapter 5, variation in boundary construction by differences in the
possession of cultural capital, as well as whether and to what extent the effects of cultural
capital on boundary work are cumulative. That is, if the possession of one type of
cultural capital (measured as college degree completion, parental college degree
completion, breadth of musical taste, and the genre category of respondents’ favorite
genre of music) either increases or decreases, on average, respondents’ sense of solidarity
with particular types of others, are these effects compounded by the cumulative effect of
possessing more than one type of cultural capital? In addition, I test the hypothesis that
the perception of social distance is most likely for respondents paired with alters who are
greatly different from them in terms of the possession of cultural capital in Chapter 5.

**Alters’ social location**

To determine if and how respondents’ boundary work attempts would be
influenced by knowledge of others’ social status, and its interaction with knowledge of
their taste, respondents were randomly selected into one of four groups by the social
status of the alters with which they were paired (three treatment groups and one “no
alter” group). Low cultural capital (LCC) alters were described as having completed a
high school diploma but not attending college, and working in a food service job;
Economic Specialist (ES) alters were described as having a Bachelor’s degree in business
but no additional degrees, and working at a financial investment firm; and Cultural
Specialist (CS) alters are described as having completed several advanced degrees,
including a PhD, and having a job in higher education. This classification scheme is
consistent with social class distinctions made elsewhere (i.e. Bourdieu 1984; Holt 1997; Lamont 1992).

The classification of high cultural capital (ES and CS) alters into social location categories followed Lamont’s (1992:151-152) classification of her middle and upper-middle class interviewees. She grouped into one category those whose occupations are “instrumental to, and dependent on, profit making,” and into another category those whose jobs “require that they maintain a certain independence from commercialism,” who “are oriented toward attaining cultural, spiritual, or humanitarian goals.” Lamont reasoned that individuals’ choice of career and the attitudes and behaviors required by those careers might be related to their motivations for and the outcomes of their boundary-drawing decisions.

Survey respondents and the alters with whom they are paired are classified with the same three social location categories (see further discussion of this classification scheme in Appendix C). This design allows for the examination of the influence of social location concordance and discordance on various outcomes in the study. For instance, a CS respondent paired with a CS alter group is considered concordant on social location. The same respondent paired with an ES alter group is discordant on social location, but shares a high level of cultural capital (based on college degree attainment). Respondents paired with alters who are classified with the same location category as they are were coded as being concordant on social location, while being paired with alters in different social locations resulted in a coding of social location discordance.

*Alters’ taste*
To determine the effect that knowing others’ taste, in interaction with their social location, would have on respondents’ potential change in their own taste expression, respondents were randomly selected into one of three groups by the taste of the other (two treatment groups and one “no alter” group). Respondents who were given information about others’ taste were either told that these others liked the painting, or that they did not.

Incomplete factorial design

The crossing of these two manipulated variables, alters’ social location and taste, resulted in an incomplete 4x3 factorial design. That is, not all possible 12 conditions were populated in this study (see Table B.1 in Appendix B). The two taste conditions (like and dislike) were matched with the three treatment social location conditions (LCC, ES, CS) resulting in 6 treatment groups in which respondents were given information about both alters’ social location and taste. In these groups, the second measure of respondents’ opinion about the painting was not a measure of their tastes, but rather a measure of their reactions to the information they received about the alters. In addition, two control groups of respondents (“taste only”) were given information about alters’ taste (like or dislike), but not their social location (in order to measure the effect of knowing others’ opinion about the painting on respondents’ second taste opinions, independent of those others’ social location). Finally, the design included one other control group in which respondents were not given any information about alters. Instead, these respondents were simply asked for their opinion about the painting twice, without any intervening information. The second opinion, therefore, served as a control to
measure the stability of taste expressions over time during the experiment. Therefore, the experimental design had a total of 9 groups – 6 treatment and 3 control.

This design can be considered “incomplete” because although there were two “taste only” groups, there were no corresponding “status only” groups. Adding these three groups would have completed the 4x3 design. However, cost constraints limited the number of participants who could be invited to participate in the study. In order to maximize available resources, the decision was made to eliminate the three “status only” groups. Including these groups would have allowed for the examination of the possible influence that knowing that individuals of a particular social location had viewed the painting (without knowing their opinion of it), serving as a sort of priming effect that could have influenced respondents to change their taste expressions in particular ways (or not) that are unmeasured in this study. That is, it’s conceivable that being told that others in a particular social status had viewed the painting could either improve or diminish respondents’ liking for the painting. Therefore, not having control groups to measure change in opinion for respondents who are only told about alters’ social status misses the chance to examine this “status only” effect, and potentially leads to attributing too much influence to alters’ tastes in changes in opinion for status + taste groups. However, it’s also possible that telling respondents that a group of others with particular status characteristics had seen the same painting might seem too contrived or artificial, diminishing experimental realism.

2.2.2 Predictor variables

*Respondent social location*
Lamont’s coding scheme was following as closely as possible in the current study in the classification of respondents into social location categories. Respondents were first separated by the completion of a college degree or not. Respondents who had not (or not yet) completed a four-year college degree were classified as LCC (low cultural capital), regardless of occupation. Those who had completed college were classified as HCC (high cultural capital). Within the HCC group, respondents who had completed college degrees were divided into CS and ES categories according to occupation⁵ -- profit-centered, white-collar occupations were classified as ES (mean annual income above $78,000), and not-for-profit, white-collar occupations were classified as CS (the mean annual incomes for these occupations were between $45,000 and $73,000).

**Respondent characteristic variables**

Respondents answered questions measuring gender (male, female), race (Asian, black, Hispanic, white, more than one race, other), age (18-19, and then categories in 4-year increments from 20 to 79, and 80 and older), and self-reported social class (lower class, working class, middle class, upper class). Table D.1 in Appendix D summarizes respondents’ answers to these questions. In addition to acting as filters for entry into the survey (in the case of gender, race, and age), these variables serve as controls in the multivariate analyses discussed in Chapters 3 - and 5.

In addition, respondents were asked if one or both of their parents completed college (yes/no). This survey item serves as a measure of cultural capital in the models presented in Chapters 4 and 5, in which respondents’ boundary-drawing attempts with regard to other people are predicted by respondents’ characteristics in interaction with the

---

⁵ See Appendix C for a detailed description of the coding of specific occupations.
characteristics of those others. Another measure of cultural capital used in the analyses in Chapters 4 and 5 is breadth of musical taste, measured by the number of genres (out of a list of 20) respondents like. While parental education level gives an indicator of the cultural capital present in the environment in which respondents were raised, the musical breadth variable indicates the range of their engagement with cultural products.

2.3 Participants

2.3.1 Selection of participants

The survey was disseminated online by Survey Sample International (SSI) between February 28 and March 6, 2012. SSI is a private firm that specializes in sampling, data collection, and analysis. This firm maintains a member database from which it constructs a sample of adults targeted to match clients’ needs. For this survey, the sample was generated to approximate the current U.S. adult population with an oversample of college educated persons. Respondents indicated that they gave informed consent for their participation in the study before beginning the online survey, and were paid $3.92 for completion of the survey. Funds to compensate respondents were provided by NSF Doctoral Dissertation Improvement Grant (Award ID SES-1203426) and the University of Notre Dame Institute for Scholarship in Liberal Arts Graduate Student Research Award. All payments to respondents were handled by SSI.

In total, 3,782 respondents accessed the survey. Of these, 85 were filtered out because they did not agree to the terms in the informed consent document given at the beginning of the survey, 12 were blocked from taking the survey because they indicated that they were younger than 18 years of age, and another 1,394 were filtered out because at the time they accessed the survey, enough respondents with their demographic
characteristics (age, gender, race/ethnicity, educational attainment, and/or geographic region of residence) had completed the survey. Of the remaining 2,291 respondents, 16 stopped participating in the survey in the first few screens, so their data were not usable, leaving 2,275 complete (or mostly complete) records.

Respondents were assigned to control and treatment groups by a randomizing function built into the survey. Five hundred twenty-nine respondents were assigned to control conditions, and 1,746 to experimental conditions. Table E.1 in Appendix E gives a detailed count of the number of respondents in each condition.

### 2.3.2 Demographic characteristics of respondents

Table D.1 in Appendix D details respondents’ demographic characteristics. The survey was constructed using filters to ensure that the sample approximated the U.S. population as closely as possible, with the exception of degree attainment. One of the primary independent variables for this study is respondent’s social location, measured by occupation and education. Because two of the three social location categories are defined, in part, by the completion of a Bachelor’s degree, it was necessary to oversample college graduates to ensure that cell sizes would be large enough for multivariate analysis. I separate demographic information by group assignment (treatment vs. control) to illustrate that randomization resulted in comparable groups.

As a result, only one quarter of respondents completed their education before taking any college courses, compared with 44% in the U.S. adult population. Other consequences of this college oversample include a slight underrepresentation of 18 – 19 year olds (who comprise only 2.6% of the sample compared to 3.9% of the U.S. adult population, U.S. Bureau of the Census 2012b), and an overrepresentation of men aged 70
and older (who are 8.4% of the sample but 4.9% of the American adult population, U.S. Bureau of the Census 2012b). Respondents are probably also unrepresentative of the national population in ways not measured by survey questions. For instance, surveys were taken online, resulting in a probable underrepresentation of individuals without reliable internet access. Additionally, the primary motivation for completing the survey was a financial reward of $3.92, meaning that the sample likely underrepresents those of high income and/or wealth, for whom $3.92 is not a great enough incentive to respond to an online survey.
CHAPTER 3

TASTE EXPRESSIONS AS SYMBOLIC BOUNDARY MARKERS

Taste expressions can be seen as useful communicators of in-group/out-group boundaries as well as social distance between oneself and others (DiMaggio 1982, Simmel 1957). Therefore, taste expressions are vehicles for making claims about one’s own identity and identification with particular social groups (Bryson 1996, Tampubolon 2008, Berger and Heath 2008, Rentfrow, McDonald and Oldmeadow 2009). Further, changes in taste expressions and consumption patterns have been shown to reflect desires to either associate or avoid association with others with similar tastes and consumption behavior (Hebdige 1987; Thornton 1995; Escalas and Bettman 2005; Berger and Heath 2007, 2008; Frith 1981, White and Dahl 2006, 2007; Mead et al. 2001). These findings support Bourdieu’s theoretical argument and empirical evidence suggesting that tastes are expressions of difference. In this chapter, I examine this idea by analyzing how changes in a stated preference for a given cultural object are related to perceptions of similarity with others whose preference for the same object they are privy to, either approximating the taste of others they perceive as similar, or distancing themselves via taste from those they perceive as different from themselves.

I investigate the propensity to modify one’s own expression of taste to either align oneself with or distance oneself from others on the basis of those others’ social location and/or status group in this chapter to determine if and how individuals use their own taste expressions to draw symbolic boundaries. Respondents were given the opportunity to
use their taste expressions as a tool in symbolic boundary construction by giving their opinion of a painting twice, once before and once after receiving information about others’ opinions of the same painting. The first taste expression is an index of a respondent’s opinion about the painting, while the second is an expression of symbolic boundary work, or lack thereof – an attempt to either include or exclude him/herself from the (hypothetical) group of others based on information given about them.

The amount and type of information given about these others was experimentally manipulated so that respondents in the treatment condition received information about alters’ education, occupation, and their taste in the painting. In addition, respondents in one of the control conditions received information only about alters’ taste (“taste only”), while respondents in the second control condition received no information about alters (“no alter”). Treatment and “taste only” respondents whose second opinion was different than their first opinion are considered to have changed their opinion of the painting during the course of the survey as a result of this information given to them about the alter group with which they were paired. Those whose second opinion was more in line with alters’ opinion of the painting than was their own first opinion are considered to have aligned themselves with those alters, while respondents whose second opinion moved away from the alters’ opinion in comparison with their first opinion are considered to have distanced themselves from members of the alter group. For instance, a change in opinion from “like” to “slightly like” when alter group members dislike the painting indicates alignment with alters, but if alter group members also like the painting, this second opinion of “slightly like” indicates distancing from alters. I predict that knowledge of the alter group’s social location and taste will influence respondents to
change their opinion. More specifically, I predict that social location (education and occupation) concordance elicits alignment with alters, and discordance elicits distancing behavior.

3.1 Research Question: Do individuals use their taste expressions as tools to align themselves with and/or distance themselves from others?

I test Bourdieu’s claim that aesthetic taste serves as a proxy for class/social position in boundary placement decisions by an examination of how knowledge of others’ social location (education and occupation) influences respondents’ taste expressions. I expect that respondents will utilize their own taste expressions either to distance themselves from class discordant others, or to align themselves with social location concordant others, based on their knowledge of those others’ social location.

Hypothesis 1: Respondents who are given information about others’ education, occupation, and taste in a painting will be more likely to change their initial opinion of that painting than will respondents not given information about others.

Hypothesis 2: Respondents will modify their taste expression to align (distance) themselves with (from) alters from class concordant (discordant) positions.

Data analysis strategy

Respondents in the treatment condition are asked for their opinion about a painting, and then are told that the group of people most likely to either like or dislike that painting (alters’ taste is assigned randomly) have one of three social location descriptions (education and occupation, group assignment determined randomly). Control treatments are either told that others who had recently seen the painting liked/disliked it, without receiving information about this group’s social location (“taste
only” control group), or are not told anything about a group of others (“no alter” control group). Then, respondents are asked for their opinions about the same painting again. To determine if respondents use taste expression as a marker of distinction, I will examine the difference in their two opinions about the painting. I hypothesize that respondents will change their opinion of the painting in order to either align themselves with or distance themselves from the members of the alter group based on the social location of the members of the group with whom they are paired. Therefore, I will consider the second taste expression as an index of boundary drawing between respondents and the members of the alter group.

To determine if respondents’ second taste expressions are more like the alters’ taste expressions than were their first, I compare each respondent’s change in taste expression scores (if any) to the alter group’s taste expression. I will code changes that move in the direction of the alter group’s taste as aligning with alter, and those that move in the opposite direction of the alter group’s taste as distancing from alter. Every respondent, therefore, will be coded in one of three ways regarding the alter group’s influence on his/her change in opinion: alignment, distancing, or no change.

As specified in Hypothesis 1, I predict that respondents who are given information about alters’ social location and taste in the painting will be more likely to change their taste expression of that painting (treatment condition) than will be respondents who are not given any information about others (“no alter” control condition). A statistically non-significant difference between these two groups would
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6 For instance, a respondent whose taste in the painting changes from “I like the painting” to “I like the painting a little” after discovering that a group of others dislike the painting will be coded as aligning with the group. Likewise, if this respondent instead changes her opinion to “I like the painting very much,” she will be coded as having distanced from the alter group.
indicate that respondents in the treatment condition, who will receive information about alters’ social location and taste, are no more likely to change their opinion about the painting than are “no alter” control respondents, who will be told nothing about any others. This would suggest either that changes in taste expression are due to random and/or unmeasured factors, not the intervening variable of information about alters’ social location and taste, or that the treatment (information about others’ social location) was not strong enough in this experiment to elicit a response. A statistically significant difference between these two groups will suggest that having access to information about others’ social location and taste is a meaningful predictor of manipulating one’s own taste expression in an effort to delineate a symbolic boundary.

To test this difference between respondents in treatment and “no control” conditions, I use a binary measure of respondents’ change of opinion (either alignment with or distancing from alter vs. no change) as the outcome variable in both bivariate and multivariate regression models in which membership in either the “no alter” control or treatment group is the predictor variable. I use a t-test to compare the percentage of respondents in the treatment and control conditions who changed their opinion in the painting. I then use logistic regression models to examine the relationship between group membership (treatment vs. control) on the likelihood of changing one’s taste expression, holding constant respondent characteristics (such as social location, initial taste expression, gender, race/ethnicity, age, etc.).

I predict that alignment via taste expression will be influenced by social location concordance between respondents and alters, while distancing via taste expression will be influenced by social location discordance (Hypothesis 2). Results supporting this
hypothesis will indicate that taste expressions can be used as communicators of similarity or differences in social location. The alignment and distancing outcomes are both dichotomous, as described above. Social location⁷ and taste for both respondents and alters are predictors in a series of logistic regression models in which the propensity to either align with or distance from members of the alter group are the outcomes.

3.2 Measuring the influence of knowledge of social location and taste

Hypothesis 1: change in taste expression

To verify that changes in opinion were not due solely to unmeasured and/or random influence, a small group of respondents in the control condition was asked for their opinions of the painting twice without being given intervening information about a group of alters – neither taste nor status group. A t-test comparing the percentage of respondents in the treatment condition who changed their opinion (either closer to or farther away from alters’ opinion) to the percentage of these “no alter” control respondents who did the same reveals that respondents in the treatment condition were only slightly more likely to change their opinion (27% of respondents in the treatment condition vs. 21% in the “no alter” control condition; t=1.45, p=.073). This suggests that a combination of status group and taste information about others has a slight influence on respondents’ propensity to use taste expression to perform boundary work – that is, either to align themselves with or to distance themselves from others. Therefore, I find weak

⁷To determine if respondents and alter group members have concordant social positions, each respondent is given a social location category based on their level of education and occupation: LCC (low cultural capital – did not complete a college degree), ES (economic specialist – completed a bachelor’s degree and is employed in a “for-profit” occupation, and CS [cultural specialist – completed a post-graduate degree and is employed in an occupation in line with Bourdieu’s concept of cultural intermediaries (educators, artists, etc.)]. The three alter group descriptions are coded according to the same logic, and social class concordance with the alter group will be coded dichotomously for each respondent.
support for Hypothesis 1 in these data, confirming that expression of one’s own aesthetic
taste for a particular cultural object functions, partially, as a response to knowledge about
others’ tastes for the same object, particularly when those others’ social location is
known.

Results of multivariate analyses of the probability of changing one’s opinion
about the painting throughout the course of the survey are shown in Table 3.1. Model 1
regresses respondent characteristics on a binary score indicating change of opinion (or
not), including both treatment and “no alter” control respondents. In addition, I added
respondents’ race/ethnicity and self-perception of social class to the models whose results
are reported in Table 3.1, as well as a binary measure of whether or not either of
respondents’ parents completed a college degree, but these were excluded from the table
to conserve space as their coefficients were all statistically non-significant.

The positive and significant effect of respondents’ low cultural capital social
position across models in Table 3.1 illustrate that respondents with low cultural capital
are statistically significantly more likely to change their opinion than are respondents
with high cultural capital. Further, the positive and significant effects of respondents’
dislike of the painting in the models in Table 3.1 suggests that negative opinions are less
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8 The reference category in this table for respondents’ social location is Cultural Specialist, and for
respondents’ taste is no opinion.
TABLE 3.1

LOGISTIC REGRESSION OF GROUP CHARACTERISTICS ON MODIFICATION OF TASTE EXPRESSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW CULTURAL CAPITAL</td>
<td>0.306*</td>
<td>0.398*</td>
<td>0.402*</td>
<td>0.583*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.151)</td>
<td>(0.160)</td>
<td>(0.160)</td>
<td>(0.269)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC SPECIALIST</td>
<td>-0.217</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>0.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.173)</td>
<td>(0.183)</td>
<td>(0.183)</td>
<td>(0.333)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIKE PAINTING</td>
<td>-0.090</td>
<td>-0.196</td>
<td>-0.196</td>
<td>-0.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.135)</td>
<td>(0.143)</td>
<td>(0.143)</td>
<td>(0.143)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISLIKE PAINTING</td>
<td>0.366*</td>
<td>0.340*</td>
<td>0.337*</td>
<td>0.329*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.162)</td>
<td>(0.169)</td>
<td>(0.169)</td>
<td>(0.170)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>0.216*</td>
<td>0.191+</td>
<td>0.193+</td>
<td>0.195+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.107)</td>
<td>(0.113)</td>
<td>(0.113)</td>
<td>(0.113)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alter group characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIKE PAINTING</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.111)</td>
<td>(0.111)</td>
<td>(0.111)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMILARITY</td>
<td>0.321**</td>
<td>0.328**</td>
<td>0.316**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.123)</td>
<td>(0.124)</td>
<td>(0.125)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL SPECIALIST</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.135)</td>
<td>(0.329)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
stable than are more positive opinions. Finally, the positive and significant coefficient for female indicates that women’s opinions are more open to influence than are men’s.

Model 2 adds alters’ opinion of the painting, as well as a binary measure of whether or not respondents perceived homophily between themselves and alter group members\(^9\),\(^10\),\(^11\). The effect of alters’ taste is not statistically significant, indicating that alters’ taste itself is not a statistically significant predictor of respondents’ propensity to change their

\(^9\) “No alter” respondents are excluded from this and subsequent models in Table 4.1 because alter characteristics are included in the analysis.

\(^10\) Dislike is the reference category for alters’ taste expression, and similarity is a binary measure of respondents’ perception of being similar (or not) to members of the alter group with which they were paired.

\(^11\) This sense of perceived solidarity was measured by asking respondents “Given only what you know about this group’s education, occupation, and opinion about the painting, how similar do you think you are to the people in this group?” Answers of “very similar” and “somewhat similar” were coded 1 and answers of “not very similar” and “not at all similar” were coded 0 in this perceived solidarity variable.
opinion\textsuperscript{12}. However, the positive and statistically significant effect of respondents’ perception of similarity with alter group members, perhaps based in part on these others’ taste, is a statistically significant predictor of change. This effect holds through Model 4, in which both alters’ social location and taste are included; indicating that perceived homophily is a greater influence of change of taste expression than is perceived social distance. That is, respondents who perceived similarity with members of the alter group with which they were paired were more likely to change their opinion about the painting than were respondents who did not perceive such similarity. I add the social location of members of the alter group in Model 3,\textsuperscript{13} and interactions between respondent and alter social location in Model 4. In neither model did alters’ social location have a statistically significant impact on the likelihood of respondents changing their initial taste expressions.

Analysis of the predictors of the use of one’s own taste expression in symbolic boundary work reveals that such change in tastes was most likely for respondents with low cultural capital, those with negative initial opinions of the painting, women, and those paired with others with whom they feel a sense of solidarity. This suggests that those most likely to employ their taste expressions in the performance of symbolic boundary work are low cultural capital respondents matched with alters with whom they perceive homophily, particularly if they are female and/or have an initially negative opinion of the painting. These multivariate results will be given more context in the next

\textsuperscript{12} Interactions between respondent and alter tastes were added to Model 2, both with and without the variable for perceived homophily, and no statistically significant interaction effects were found (data not shown). Therefore, the positive effect of expressing an initial negative opinion of the painting is not mediated by alters’ tastes.

\textsuperscript{13} The reference category is LCC.
section in which I discuss the propensity to use one’s own taste expression to either align oneself with or distance oneself from others.

3.3 Measuring the use of taste expression as a boundary marking tool

This section provides a more specific analysis of respondents’ changes in taste expression to examine if and how respondents altered their taste expressions to either align themselves with or distance themselves from others. To begin, I conducted a bivariate comparison of respondents in the treatment condition to “taste only” control respondents (respondents who gave their second opinion of the painting after receiving information about alter group members’ taste but not social location) on the direction of boundary work (alignment or distancing). This analysis reveals that knowledge of others’ social location influenced respondents to distance themselves from those others, but not to align themselves.

That is, respondents in the treatment condition were no more likely than were “taste only” control respondents to change their opinion of the painting in a manner that approximated alter group members’ opinions (p=0.129), but they were more likely (t=1.52, p=.065) to distance themselves from alter group members’ opinions. Specifically, 11% of respondents in the treatment condition changed their opinions to match alters, while 8% of respondents in the “taste only” control condition did the same. (An example of such distancing would be a first expression of slight dislike of the painting, and then expressing a stronger dislike of the painting after learning that alter group members liked the same painting.) Because respondents in both groups received information about alters’ taste, but only respondents in the treatment condition were also given information about alters’ social location, it can be concluded from this bivariate
finding that respondents in the treatment condition changed their second taste expressions in order to distance themselves from alters based on the social location of those alters. Multivariate analyses presented in Tables 3.2a and 3.3 confirm these bivariate findings.

3.3.1 Hypothesis 2: alignment

I predicted in Hypothesis 2 that respondents paired with alters who were similar to them in social location would be more likely to align themselves with those alters than would respondents paired with alters in different status groups from themselves. However, a bivariate test of the difference between respondents paired with alters who were concordant on social location and those paired with social location discordant alters on the propensity to use one’s own taste expression to align oneself with those alters reveals no statistically significant group differences. This echoes the bivariate finding presented in section 3.2 which revealed only minimal differences between treatment and “taste only” control respondents on the propensity to use taste expression to align with alters, which indicates that knowledge of alters’ social location is not a reliable predictor of such behavior. Logistic regression models discussed below reveal which alter and respondent characteristics do significantly predict alignment with others via taste expression.

First, the positive and statistically significant coefficient for Cultural Specialist alters in Model 1 in Table 3.2 suggest that respondents were most likely to align themselves with CS (Cultural Specialist) alters, perhaps most likely due to a recognition that alters with a high volume of cultural capital (CS alters were described to respondents as having multiple advanced degrees and a job in higher education) are likely to have had access to “legitimate” art, in Bourdieu’s terms, and are therefore knowledgeable about
art). I added respondent/alter social location interactions in Model 2 with no model fit improvement, and no statistically significant interaction effects, indicating that the tendency to align oneself via taste expression with Cultural Specialist others is not located solely with respondents of any particular status group. This supports the bivariate finding discussion above, leading to the conclusion that Hypothesis 2 is not supported in
TABLE 3.2
LOGISTIC REGRESSION OF GROUP CHARACTERISTICS ON USING TASTE EXPRESSION TO ALIGN WITH ATLERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent characteristics</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Specialist</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>-0.245</td>
<td>-0.212</td>
<td>-0.211</td>
<td>-0.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.178)</td>
<td>(0.324)</td>
<td>(0.327)</td>
<td>(0.328)</td>
<td>(0.329)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Specialist</td>
<td>-0.281</td>
<td>-0.452</td>
<td>-0.418</td>
<td>-0.429</td>
<td>-0.431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.196)</td>
<td>(0.359)</td>
<td>(0.362)</td>
<td>(0.363)</td>
<td>(0.366)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like Painting</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.789*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.760*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.178)</td>
<td>(0.341)</td>
<td>(0.344)</td>
<td>(0.344)</td>
<td>(0.344)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike Painting</td>
<td>0.507*</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.209)</td>
<td>(0.257)</td>
<td>(0.259)</td>
<td>(0.259)</td>
<td>(0.259)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.287*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.141)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.011**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alter group characteristics</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Specialist</td>
<td>0.383*</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>0.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.167)</td>
<td>(0.212)</td>
<td>(0.215)</td>
<td>(0.216)</td>
<td>(0.218)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Specialist</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>0.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.170)</td>
<td>(0.213)</td>
<td>(0.215)</td>
<td>(0.215)</td>
<td>(0.217)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like Painting</td>
<td>0.692***</td>
<td>0.789*</td>
<td>1.576***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.139)</td>
<td>(0.341)</td>
<td>(0.362)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLE 3.2 CONTD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLIKEXALIKE</td>
<td>-1.136**</td>
<td>-1.211**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.403)</td>
<td>(0.406)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDISLIKEXADISLIKE</td>
<td>0.969*</td>
<td>0.910*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.461)</td>
<td>(0.464)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMILARITY</td>
<td>0.527***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.151)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent x Alter interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESRxESA</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.431)</td>
<td>(0.436)</td>
<td>(0.437)</td>
<td>(0.439)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESRxCSA</td>
<td>0.443</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.414)</td>
<td>(0.419)</td>
<td>(0.420)</td>
<td>(0.422)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSRxESA</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.477)</td>
<td>(0.481)</td>
<td>(0.482)</td>
<td>(0.485)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSRxCSA</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.469)</td>
<td>(0.474)</td>
<td>(0.475)</td>
<td>(0.479)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-1.687***</td>
<td>-1.580***</td>
<td>-2.076***</td>
<td>-2.703***</td>
<td>-3.495***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.287)</td>
<td>(0.301)</td>
<td>(0.340)</td>
<td>(0.432)</td>
<td>(0.500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>34.17***</td>
<td>8.77*</td>
<td>19.66***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p \leq .10$, *$p \leq .05$, **$p \leq .01$; ***$p \leq .001$; N = 1731
these data in the case of alignment. That is, social location concordance is not a reliable predictor of alignment with others via taste expression.

I added main effects for respondent and alter taste expressions in Model 3, revealing that alignment via taste expression is most likely when alters like the painting, and for respondents who dislike the painting (as seen by the positive and significant effects of both alters’ and respondents’ tastes), suggesting a tendency to express a positive opinion. This is confirmed in Model 4 when I add interactions between respondent and alter tastes to the model. Figure 3.1 illustrates this interaction graphically; indicating that respondents with no initial opinion of the painting are statistically significantly more likely to align themselves with alters who like the painting than with alters who dislike the painting. The same effect, although weaker, was found for respondents who initially expressed dislike for the painting. Therefore, respondents demonstrated the tendency to change their tastes to approximate the taste expression of others who like the painting, but not those who disliked the painting.

Next, the positive and statistically significant effect of perceived similarity between respondent and alter group’s taste added in Model 5 of Table 3.2 demonstrates that perceived similarity with members of the alter group is a strong predictor of using taste expression to align oneself with those others. This finding lends support to Hypothesis 2 for the case of alignment, suggesting that although concordance on social position (as I measure it here) is not predictive of alignment behavior, the perception of being similar to members of the alter group is a statistically significant predictor of changing one’s taste expression to resemble the opinion of the members of that group.
Finally, the positive and statistically significant effects of gender and age added to Model 5 indicate that alignment via taste expression is more likely for older than younger respondents, and for women compared to men.

In summary, respondents aligned themselves with those with whom they perceive similarity, with Cultural Specialist others, and with others who have positive opinions about the painting. Alignment is most likely for women, older respondents, and those who begin with a negative opinion of the painting. However, respondents’ own social locations were not a reliable predictor of alignment.

I performed additional analyses predicting the propensity to align oneself with alters who like and dislike the painting in order to determine if the taste effects reported in Table 3.2 and Figure 3.1 indicate that alignment might work differently depending on alters’ taste. Table 3.3 reports results of logistic regression analyses predicting the
TABLE 3.3

LOGISTIC REGRESSION OF GROUP CHARACTERISTICS ON USING TASTE EXPRESSION TO ALIGN WITH ALTERS WHO LIKE THE PAINTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent characteristics</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC SPECIALIST</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>-0.504</td>
<td>-0.487</td>
<td>-0.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.219)</td>
<td>(0.415)</td>
<td>(0.416)</td>
<td>(0.404)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL SPECIALIST</td>
<td>-0.108</td>
<td>-0.260</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>-0.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.230)</td>
<td>(0.397)</td>
<td>(0.398)</td>
<td>(0.403)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIKE PAINTING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISLIKE PAINTING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.005)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alter group characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL SPECIALIST</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.199)</td>
<td>(0.255)</td>
<td>(0.256)</td>
<td>(0.259)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC SPECIALIST</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.203)</td>
<td>(0.250)</td>
<td>(0.250)</td>
<td>(0.254)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMILARITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.176)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent x Alter interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESRxESA</td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td>0.593</td>
<td>0.551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.547)</td>
<td>(0.548)</td>
<td>(0.554)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESRxCSA</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td>0.681</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.521)</td>
<td>(0.522)</td>
<td>(0.528)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSRxESA</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
<td>-0.098</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.564)</td>
<td>(0.564)</td>
<td>(0.572)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSRxCSA</td>
<td>-0.459</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.530)</td>
<td>(0.531)</td>
<td>(0.539)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.169</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>-2.055</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.362)</td>
<td>(0.374)</td>
<td>(0.400)</td>
<td>(0.508)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1.962</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>-3.166</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.362)</td>
<td>(0.374)</td>
<td>(0.400)</td>
<td>(0.508)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+p ≤ .10, *p ≤ .05, **p ≤ .01; ***p ≤ .001; N = 1731
TABLE 3.4
LOGISTIC REGRESSION OF GROUP CHARACTERISTICS ON USING TASTE EXPRESSION TO ALIGN WITH ALTERS WHO DISLIKE THE PAINTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent characteristics</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC SPECIALIST</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>0.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.270)</td>
<td>(0.496)</td>
<td>(0.496)</td>
<td>(0.498)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL SPECIALIST</td>
<td>-0.550</td>
<td>-0.906</td>
<td>-0.901</td>
<td>-0.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.336)</td>
<td>(0.774)</td>
<td>(0.775)</td>
<td>(0.776)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIKE PAINTING</td>
<td>0.692*</td>
<td>0.775*</td>
<td>0.692*</td>
<td>0.775*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.337)</td>
<td>(0.341)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISLIKE PAINTING</td>
<td>1.020**</td>
<td>1.011**</td>
<td>1.020**</td>
<td>1.011**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.376)</td>
<td>(0.377)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>(0.218)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alter group characteristics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL SPECIALIST</td>
<td>0.602*</td>
<td>0.679*</td>
<td>0.708*</td>
<td>0.720*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.275)</td>
<td>(0.352)</td>
<td>(0.354)</td>
<td>(0.354)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC SPECIALIST</td>
<td>0.502+</td>
<td>0.403+</td>
<td>0.419+</td>
<td>0.425+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.280)</td>
<td>(0.362)</td>
<td>(0.364)</td>
<td>(0.464)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMILARITY</td>
<td>-0.351</td>
<td>(0.253)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent x Alter interactions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCCRxESA</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.649)</td>
<td>(0.651)</td>
<td>(0.653)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCCRxCSA</td>
<td>-0.327</td>
<td>-0.377</td>
<td>-0.342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.630)</td>
<td>(0.632)</td>
<td>(0.633)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESRxLCCA</td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.904)</td>
<td>(0.906)</td>
<td>(0.906)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESRxCSA</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.946)</td>
<td>(0.947)</td>
<td>(0.949)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.926***</td>
<td>-2.919***</td>
<td>-3.523***</td>
<td>-3.629***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.436)</td>
<td>(0.468)</td>
<td>(0.543)</td>
<td>(0.652)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>8.23*</td>
<td>2.36*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10, *p < .05, **p < .01; ***p < .001; N = 1731
likelihood of aligning oneself with alters who like the painting. I model the propensity to align oneself with alters who dislike the painting in logistic regression analyses whose results are reported in Table 3.4.

As seen by the lack of statistically significant effects of alter group characteristics across models in Table 3.3, alters’ social location has no effect on the propensity to align with alters who like the painting, but Model 1 in Table 3.4 illustrates that alters’ social location does have a statistically significant effect on aligning oneself with alters who dislike the painting. Specifically, respondents are more likely to align themselves with HCC alters who dislike the painting than with LCC alters who dislike the painting. The fact that this effect is only statistically significant for alignment with alters who dislike the painting, but not with those who like it, indicates that the ability of others’ cultural capital to influence respondents to align themselves with alters is only effective in making respondents’ opinion more negative, not more positive.

In addition, perceived similarity is a reliable predictor of alignment with alters who like the painting, but not with alters who dislike the painting, as seen in Model 4 in both Tables 3.3 and 3.4. Again, this is likely due to the fact that respondents showed a general bias toward giving positive opinions about the painting, which inhibited them from identifying with others who do not have such an opinion (except in the case of HCC others with negative opinions, as was discussed just above).

In summary, I predicted in Hypothesis 2 that social location concordance would predict the use of taste expression to align oneself with alter group members. In terms of social class concordance as I measure it in this chapter (similarity on education and occupational status), this hypothesis is not supported in these data. However, the
perception of being similar to members of the alter group (measured with a direct question asking if respondents perceive similarity between themselves and members of the alter group) did significantly predict alignment behavior. Therefore, although not in the way originally expected, Hypothesis 2 does receive support in these data. Therefore, as predicted, respondents changed their expressions of taste for the painting to resemble the opinions of the alter group about which they were given information when they perceived similarity with the members of that group. Such a modification of taste expression can be understood as a method for drawing an inclusive symbolic boundary to identify with or claim similarity with those others. This finding is not surprising given the results of other studies that have shown that network connections are made based on similarities in cultural taste (Boer et al. 2011; Lizardo 2006; Long 2003; Ostrower 1998; Rentfrow, McDonald and Oldmeadow 2009). The next section discusses the lesser-studied phenomenon of drawing exclusive boundaries based on discordance in social position.

3.3.2. Hypothesis 2: distancing

To review, bivariate results discussed earlier in this chapter revealed that alters’ social location did not have a statistically significant influence on respondents’ decisions to change their taste expressions to align themselves with members of the alter group, but it did positively predict the propensity to change one’s opinion in order to distance themselves from alters. I predicted in Hypothesis 2 that social location discordance would influence respondents to distance themselves from alter group members using their second taste expressions. Bivariate and multivariate tests of this hypothesis are discussed next.
A bivariate comparison of social location concordant and discordant respondents on the likelihood of using taste expression to differentiate from others shows a statistically significant negative effect of social location concordance ($t=-2.46$, $p=.007$).

More specifically, 13.9% of respondents paired with social location concordant alters used their taste expression to differentiate themselves from those alters, compared to only 9.9% of respondents paired with social location discordant alters. Therefore, status group similarity has a statistically significant effect on distancing from alter group members, but not in the manner predicted. It was expected that respondents paired with alters in different social locations from themselves would be more likely to change their taste expression to differentiate themselves from those alters than would respondents paired with alters in the same social location as themselves. In fact, however, the opposite is true – respondents who were paired with respondents in similar locations to themselves were more likely to distance themselves from those alters than were respondents paired with alters in different status groups from themselves. This refutes Hypothesis 2 for the case of distancing, and is a puzzle given previous findings that indicate a homophilous relationship between social position concordance and cultural taste (i.e. DiMaggio 1987, Mark 1998). Results of multivariate models, shown in Table 3.5, helps to explain this unexpected finding.

Table 3.5 presents results of logistic regression models regressing various respondent and alter characteristics on the likelihood of respondents using their own taste expressions as tools for distancing themselves from others (i.e. to change their opinion of the painting in a direction opposite alters’ opinion). As shown by the positive and statistically significant effect of low cultural capital social position for respondents in
TABLE 3.5

LOGISTIC REGRESSION OF GROUP CHARACTERSITICS ON USING TASTE EXPRESSION TO DISTANCE FROM ALTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC SPECIALIST</td>
<td>-0.352</td>
<td>-0.381</td>
<td>-0.389</td>
<td>-0.394</td>
<td>-0.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.216)</td>
<td>(0.315)</td>
<td>(0.316)</td>
<td>(0.317)</td>
<td>(0.317)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL SPECIALIST</td>
<td>-0.441</td>
<td>-0.584</td>
<td>-0.611</td>
<td>-0.604</td>
<td>-0.599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.226)</td>
<td>(0.345)</td>
<td>(0.347)</td>
<td>(0.347)</td>
<td>(0.348)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIKE PAINTING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.343</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-0.582</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.189)</td>
<td>(0.237)</td>
<td>(0.239)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISLIKE PAINTING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.231)</td>
<td>(0.378)</td>
<td>(0.378)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.158)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alter group characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL SPECIALIST</td>
<td>-0.450</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-0.534</td>
<td>-0.559</td>
<td>-0.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.184)</td>
<td>(0.230)</td>
<td>(0.231)</td>
<td>(0.231)</td>
<td>(0.231)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC SPECIALIST</td>
<td>-0.572</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-0.584</td>
<td>-0.599</td>
<td>-0.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIKE PAINTING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLIKEXALIKE</td>
<td>0.646</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDISLIKEXADISLIKE</td>
<td>0.479</td>
<td>0.479</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMILARITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent x Alter interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESRxESA</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESRxCSA</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSRxESA</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSRxCSA</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>0.478</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-1.687</td>
<td>-1.667</td>
<td>-1.231</td>
<td>-1.039</td>
<td>-0.932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>15.80</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+p ≤ .10, *p ≤ .05, **p ≤ .01; ***p ≤ .001; N = 1731
Model 1, LCC respondents are more likely to distance themselves from others than are CS respondents. Further, all respondents are less likely to differentiate themselves from others with high cultural capital than from alters with low cultural capital (as seen by the negative and significant effects of CS and ES alter groups, which are compared to the effect LCC alter group in this table). These findings suggest that the pairing of respondent and alter group that is most likely to elicit the use of taste expression to differentiate oneself from an alter group is an LCC respondent paired with an LCC alter group. This is in line with the bivariate finding discussed above, that class concordance predicts differentiation from the alter group. This also echoes results from Table 3.1 illustrating that LCC respondents who perceive similarity between themselves and others
are the most likely candidates for using their own taste expression as a tool for boundary work. Interactions between respondent and alter group social locations included in Model 2 of Table 3.5, and represented graphically in Figure 3.2, verify this conclusion.

The positive and slightly statistically significant coefficient for the main effect of LCC respondents in Model 2 indicates that LCC respondents are most likely to differentiate themselves from LCC alters, the reference category for alters’ social location in this table. This is illustrated in Figure 3.2 by LCC respondents’ higher likelihood of distancing themselves from LCC alters than from HCC alters. I predicted in Hypothesis 2 that LCC respondents would be significantly less likely to differentiate themselves from LCC others than from HCC others, but Figure 3.2 illustrates the opposite finding.

![Figure 3.3](image.png)

**Figure 3.3**
Likelihood of Distancing from Alters by Taste, Given Alters’ Taste
Also of interest in Table 3.5 are the taste effects that echo the positive opinion bias for alignment with others via taste expression discussed previously. As seen by the negative and statistically significant effect of respondents’ taste in Models 3 - 5, respondents who like the painting are less likely to use their taste expression to distance themselves from others. Further, the negative and statistically significant effect of alters’ taste indicate that all respondents are more likely to distance themselves from (be influenced by) alters who dislike the painting than from those who like the painting. The interactions between respondent and alter taste added in Model 4 and illustrated in Figure 3.3 reveal that distancing via taste expression is most likely when respondents are paired with alters who dislike the painting, although respondents who initially liked the painting are protected from this effect by their own positive opinion.

In addition, the statistically non-significant effect of the similarity variable, which I add in Model 5, demonstrates that perceived homophily is not a reliable predictor of using taste expression to differentiate oneself from others. Therefore, perceived solidarity is a statistically significant predictor of alignment with others (as seen in Table 3.2), but lack of solidarity is not sufficient to produce distancing from others (as seen here).

Additional analyses predicting the likelihood of respondents distancing themselves from alters who like and dislike the painting were also performed to further disentangle the taste effects reported in Table 3.5 and Figure 3.3 (results not shown). Neither set of regressions reveal anything new, perhaps most likely because cell sizes were too small for statistically significant effects to emerge. Only 76 of the 1,732 (4%) respondents in the treatment condition distanced themselves from alters who liked the
painting, and 118 (7%) from alters who disliked the painting. Therefore, it is likely that any additional effects related to alters’ tastes were hidden by small sub-sample sizes in these analyses.

### 3.4 Summary

This chapter examined how individuals are influenced by others’ social location and taste to change their own taste expressions to define symbolic boundaries. I hypothesized that social location concordance would predict alignment, and that discordance would predict distancing. Results revealed that social location concordance predicted distancing (contrary to the hypothesized relationship) but not alignment. Further analysis revealed that the source of this pattern was LCC respondents distancing themselves via their taste expressions from the LCC alters with which they were paired, presumably due to the recognition of lack of cultural legitimacy among individuals in this social location. Further, HCC respondents did not distance themselves from LCC individuals, but made distinctions within the HCC stratum suggesting that HCC individuals are secure enough in their cultural capital advantage over LCC individuals not to have to make strong statements about the differences between themselves and people with low cultural capital. I test this proposition in the next chapter, which discusses differences by social location in perceived homophily with others.

Interestingly, however, when I analyzed the relationship between the perception of similarity (between respondent and alter) and boundary drawing (via change in taste expression), I found that perceived solidarity is a statistically significant predictor of alignment, but a lack of solidarity is not sufficient to produce distancing. This suggests
that what people share can unite them (such that homophily begets homophily), but differences between them do not necessarily divide them.

Further, results demonstrating that respondents were more likely to align their taste expressions with others who like the painting, but not with those who do not, suggests that social bonds are formed and maintained with regard to similarity of tastes and interests, but not with regard to dissimilarity of distaste. However, this bias toward expressing a positive opinion was mediated by the consideration of alters’ cultural capital such that respondents expressed tastes in line with opinions more negative than their own when paired with HCC respondents who disliked the painting. This finding suggests that respondents acknowledged HCC alters’ presumed cultural competence, and responded by aligning themselves with these others via a modification of their own taste expressions. LCC alters with negative opinions were not extended the same inclusiveness, however, suggesting that respondents viewed their negative opinions as less valid and/or influential than those of HCC alters.

The next chapter will examine the predictors of perceived homophily in more depth to discover the influence that both similarity of taste and social location have on the propensity for individuals to perceive social distance from others.
CHAPTER 4
THE ROLE OF AESTHETIC TASTES IN SYMBOLIC BOUNDARY WORK

In the previous chapter, I examined how respondents used their taste expressions to perform symbolic boundary work with others in different or equivalent social locations. In this chapter, I take a more direct approach to investigating the predictors of inclusive and exclusive boundary drawing, and in particular the role that aesthetic taste plays in boundary work decisions. I do this by examining how differences in taste and status influences boundary drawing, as well as how the consideration of other people’s taste and/or status influences the decision to construct either inclusive or exclusive boundaries.

Bourdieu (1984) suggested that taste differences between two people evoke a visceral, negative reaction, decreasing the likelihood that a social bond will form or be maintained between the two. This interpersonal dynamic of the refusal of others’ tastes results in a structural advantage for those who possess “legitimate” tastes. Given this, in Chapter 4, I will test the hypothesis that differences in taste will be stronger predictors of perceptions of differences with others than will be differences in status. In addition, I test Bourdieu’s assertion that the consideration of others’ tastes plays a significant role in the construction of boundaries.
4.1 Research Question 1: How do dissimilarities in social location and taste expressions influence boundary work?

Much has been written about the influence of homophilous status, values, and other characteristics on the formation of social ties (Lazarsfeld and Merton 1954; McPherson, Smith-Lovin and Cook 2001), illustrating that homophily leads to network connections. Likewise, similarities in taste can lead to the formation of social ties (Boer et al. 2011; DiMaggio 1987; Lizardo 2006; Long 2003; Ostrower 1998; Rentfrow, McDonald and Oldmeadow 2009). At the same time, others have demonstrated that cultural preferences spread through homophilous networks (Creed and Scully 2000; DiMaggio and Useem 1978; Erickson 1996; Mark 1998, 2003; Marsden, Reed, Kennedy and Stinson 1982; North and Hargreaves 1999), such that social ties can influence aesthetic tastes.

Bourdieu (1984) suggests that aesthetic tastes function to distinguish people from one another in addition to uniting them, particularly among the dominant class. He suggests that the expression of taste is fundamentally an expression of difference, and that taste for a particular set of cultural objects indicates distaste in another set, and by proxy, social distance from fans of this other set.

Bryson (1997) follows Bourdieu in this focus on distaste as an expression of differences from others. She finds that univores (low-status consumers of one or a few types of cultural objects) are more likely than those with higher status and broader taste to use cultural distastes to mark their status positions, and that dislikes are often patterned around race, religious conservatism, and geographic region. Similarly, high-status consumers are likely to draw symbolic boundaries between themselves and lower-status
consumers via the expression of distaste of cultural objects typically associated with these others. Therefore, taste expressions are patterned by perceptions of social proximity and distance between oneself and others, which are predicated on recognition of interpersonal similarities and differences. Bryson concludes, then, that individuals reject the tastes of certain others who are different from them in some meaningful way as a method of communicating this difference.

In this chapter, I examine individuals’ propensity to distance themselves (or not) from others on the basis of mismatched taste and/or status. Survey respondents were given information about a group of other people’s status and tastes, and then asked to evaluate their own social proximity with those others. I expect that discordance will predict perceptions of social distance, such that when respondents are in different social locations and have different tastes than alters, they will be more likely to state that those others are not similar to themselves. However, when respondents are dissimilar on either taste or social location (but not both), I expect that taste discordance will be a stronger predictor of perceived social distance from others than will social location discordance. I base this hypothesis on previous research which has shown that individuals are more likely to employ cultural boundaries than moral or economic boundaries in relationship formation (Illouz 1997, Kern 1997 [but see Lamont 1992]). Respondents who perceive homophily with alter group members will be understood as having drawn inclusive symbolic boundaries with these others. Likewise, perceived social distance will be understood as the mark of a symbolic boundary that excludes alters.
Hypothesis 1: Respondents paired with taste-discordant alters will be significantly more likely to perceive social distance from those alters than will respondents paired with taste-concordant alters.

Hypothesis 2: Respondents paired with social location-discordant alters will be significantly more likely to perceive social distance from those alters than will respondents paired with social location-concordant alters.

Hypothesis 3: Taste discordance will be a stronger predictor of perceived social distance than will be social position discordance.

Data analysis strategy

Respondents’ perceptions of social distance from others will be indexed by a survey item asking respondents how similar they are to these other people: “Given only what you know about this group’s education, occupation, and opinion about the painting, how similar do you think you are to the people in this group?” Respondents who give answers of “very similar,” “similar,” or “just a little similar” will be coded as perceiving homophily with members of the alter group, while respondents whose answers to this question are “not very similar” or “not at all similar” will be coded as perceiving social distance. Thus, social location concordance is a dichotomous variable.

Respondents will be coded as being taste concordant (also a dichotomous variable) with members of the alter group if they are paired with alters whose taste is similar to their own first taste expression. For instance, respondents whose first opinion of the painting is “I like it very much,” “I like it,” or “I like it a little” and who are paired with others who like the painting will be coded as being taste concordant. Likewise,
respondents whose first opinion of the painting was “I dislike it very much,” “I dislike it,” or “I dislike it a little” were coded as being taste discordant if they are paired with others who like the painting.

I will test Hypotheses 1 and 2 first with t-tests that compare perceived social distance scores across categories of these two binary variables (taste concordance and discordance), and then with multivariate tests that hold constant various characteristics of both respondents and the alter groups with which they were paired. Hypothesis 1 will be confirmed if taste concordant respondents perceived significantly less social distance from alters than did respondents who were not taste concordant. Likewise, Hypothesis 2 will be confirmed if social location concordant respondents perceived significantly less social distance from alters than did respondents who were discordant on social location.

Because respondents could differ from alters on both taste expression and social location, some of the effects of each on perceived social distance could be inflated by this dual discordance. To estimate the independent effects of taste and social location discordance on perceived social distance, then, I will remove joint discordance from these individual measures of discordance, leaving only respondents discordant on taste but concordant on social location labeled as taste discordant, and only those discordant on social location but concordant on taste labeled as social class discordant. This operationalization of these variables allows for the test of discordance on taste given social location concordance and vice versa, which is a much more stringent test of the strength of dissimilarity of taste and social location on perceived social distance.

I will compare the percentage of people who fall into each of these categories who perceive social distance from alters with a t-test, and with a series of multivariate logistic
regression models that hold constant several respondent and alter characteristics. Hypothesis 3, in which I predicted that taste discordance will be a stronger predictor of perceived social distance than will be social location discordance, will be confirmed if respondents who match alters on social location but not taste are more likely see themselves as more socially distant than are respondents who match alters on taste but not social location. Said another way, differences in taste are predicted to be a stronger predictor of drawing symbolic boundaries that exclude others than are differences in social location.

4.2 Measuring symbolic exclusion as a function of differences in tastes and status

Hypotheses 1 – 3

In Hypotheses 1 and 2, I predict that taste discordance and social location discordance will both positively predict respondents’ perceptions of social distance with alters. A test of the bivariate relationship between taste discordance and perceived social distance indicates that a mismatch with others on aesthetic taste positively predicts perceiving those others as dissimilar to oneself ($t=9.99$, $p=.000$). That is, 56% of respondents who matched alters on taste perceived social distance from those alters, while 77% of respondents who did not match alters on taste perceived social distance. Therefore, a taste mismatch leads to the perception of social distance from alters. Social location discordance also has a positive and statistically significant, yet weaker, effect

---

14 defined here as the mismatch between respondents’ initial taste expression and the taste expression of the members of the alter group, regardless of a match on social location

15 a binary measure of respondents not matching alters on status, regardless of whether or not there is a taste match
on perceived social distance (67% of respondents who matched alters on taste perceived social distance, while 71% of respondents who did not match alters on taste perceived social distance; t=1.56, p=.059). Thus, perceived social distance is also predicted by a status mismatch. Therefore, both Hypothesis 1 and 2 find support in these bivariate data. The stronger effect for taste discordance in the bivariate tests discussed above suggests, as I predicted in Hypothesis 3, that taste discordance was a stronger predictor of perceived social distance with alters than was status dissimilarity.

It is likely that portions of each of the effects reported above are a result of some respondents being discordant on both dimensions. To get an estimate of the independent effects of taste and social location discordance on perceived social distance, then, I next remove joint discordance from these individual measures of discordance, leaving only respondents discordant on taste but concordant on social location labeled as taste discordant, and only those discordant on social location but concordant on taste labeled as social class discordant.

As expected, the effects of both variables weakened using these more constrained measures of discordance. Taste discordance still has a positive and statistically significant effect on perceived social distance -- 57% of respondents who match alters on both taste and social location perceive social distance with those alters while 67% of respondents who only match respondents on social location but not taste perceive social distance (t=2.49, p=.006). Therefore, taste discordance positively predicts the perception of social distance, even when social location is matched. This finding confirms Hypothesis 1. However, when I test the relationship between dissimilarity of social location and perceived social distance using this more limited operationalization of status
discordance, there is no statistically significant effect on the perception of social distance. That is, respondents who match alters on both taste and social location are just as likely to perceive social distance from those alters as are respondents who match alters on taste but not social location. Specifically, 57% of respondents who match on both perceive social distance with alters compared to 55% of respondents who match alters on taste but not social location, indicating that differences in social location do not inflate the propensity to perceive social distance when compared to matching on social location (t=0.51, p=.305). Therefore, when respondents were similar to the hypothetical others on taste, status discordance was not a contributor in the perception of social distance. As a result, the data do not support Hypothesis 2, indicating that discordant social location alone did not predict perceived social distance. However, these bivariate results give strength to the argument that dissimilarity on taste is a stronger predictor of perceived social distance than is dissimilarity on status, as I predicted in Hypothesis 3.

Results from a series of logistic regression models examining which respondent and alter group characteristics were reliable predictors of respondents’ perceived social distance with those alter group members are given in Table 4, and confirm the bivariate findings discussed above. Dichotomous variables for taste and social location discordance are entered in Models 1 and 2 in Table 4, along with various respondent characteristics. In Model 1, I compare social location discordance, which is social location discordance paired with taste concordance, as discussed above, to being discordant on taste,
TABLE 4

LOGISTIC REGRESSION OF GROUP CHARACTERISTICS ON PERCEIVED SOCIAL DISTANCE WITH ALTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL LOCATION DISCORDANCE</td>
<td>-0.478 ***</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>(0.121)</td>
<td>(0.173)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL LOCATION + TASTE DISCORDANCE</td>
<td>0.880 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.166)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASTE DISCORDANCE</td>
<td>0.762 ***</td>
<td>0.780 ***</td>
<td>0.773 ***</td>
<td>(0.193)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL SPECIALIST</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>-0.142</td>
<td>0.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC SPECIALIST</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td>-0.137</td>
<td>0.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSIC BREADTH</td>
<td>-0.053 **</td>
<td>-0.052 **</td>
<td>-0.049 *</td>
<td>-0.049 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0.217 +</td>
<td>0.224 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>0.016 ***</td>
<td>0.015 ***</td>
<td>0.017 ***</td>
<td>0.017 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARENT COLLEGE</td>
<td>-0.312 **</td>
<td>-0.337 **</td>
<td>-0.317 **</td>
<td>-0.329 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social distance consideration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL LOCATION</td>
<td>0.925 ***</td>
<td>1.126 ***</td>
<td>(0.144)</td>
<td>(0.186)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL LOCATION + TASTE</td>
<td>0.442 ***</td>
<td>0.651 ***</td>
<td>(0.141)</td>
<td>(0.178)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alter characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL SPECIALIST</td>
<td>-0.555 ***</td>
<td>-0.549 ***</td>
<td>(0.140)</td>
<td>(0.140)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4 CONTD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIALIST</td>
<td>-0.371 **</td>
<td>-0.368 **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.140)</td>
<td>(0.141)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIKE PAINTING</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.128)</td>
<td>(0.128)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction terms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSRxSOCIAL LOCATION CONSIDERATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.386)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSRxSOCIAL LOCATION CONSIDERATION + TASTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.372</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.386)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESRxSOCIAL LOCATION CONSIDERATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.498</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.371)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESRxSOCIAL LOCATION CONSIDERATION + TASTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.775 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.364)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.664 +</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>0.044 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.379)</td>
<td>(0.398)</td>
<td>(0.421)</td>
<td>(0.428)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>28.34 ***</td>
<td>58.98 ***</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+p ≤ .10, *p ≤ .05, **p ≤ .01; ***p ≤ .001; N = 1707

Note: Respondents' race/ethnicity, self-perceived social class, and favorite genre of music are also included in Models 1 - 4. Because these variables have statistically insignificant effects across models, they are not included in the table.
regardless of social location, and to being discordant on neither taste nor social location. Echoing the bivariate results presented above, the effect of social location discordance \textit{minus} taste discordance is negative and statistically significant. This indicates that respondents who matched alters on taste but not on social location were less likely to perceive social distance between themselves and others than were respondents who either did not match alters on taste or matched alters on both taste and social location. That is, expressing a taste in line with alters decreases the likelihood of perceiving social distant, even when respondents do not match those alters on social location. This suggests that, in terms of perceiving social distance with alters, the positive effect of being discordant on social location outweighs the negative effect of being concordant on taste.

In Model 2, I added variables for taste discordance only (which is taste discordance and social location concordance) and taste plus social location discordance, with no discordance as the reference group. As suggested by the results of the bivariate tests discussed above, and verified by the statistically non-significant effect of social location discordance in Model 2, respondents who match alters on taste but not status (represented by the social location discordance variable) are no more likely to perceive social distance with those alters than are respondents who match alters on both taste and status (represented by the reference group in Model 2). Said another way, when respondents and alters matched on taste, status dissimilarity did not have a statistically significant effect on the perception of social distance.

However, taste discordance and the combination of taste plus social location discordance are both positive and statistically significant predictors of perceived social
distance, as predicted. A statistically non-significant Wald test indicates that the effects of these two variables are statistically the same, indicating that social location mismatch does not intensify the effect of taste mismatch on perceived social distance. Results from these first two models, then, reveal that perception of social difference is driven by similarities (or not) in taste, not in social location. This effect of taste discordance remains strong throughout the remainder of the models presented in this chapter, providing support for Hypothesis 3.

4.3 Research Question 2: How are the outcomes of symbolic boundary decisions influenced by the way in which they are made?

Previous research has shown that people use the type of capital that supports their own status to evaluate others. For instance, Lamont (1992) found that cultural specialists were more likely to make social connections based on information about cultural resources and consumption than on economic resources, while Erickson (1996) found that economic specialists has little use for such cultural competency information in their own boundary work. Further, in considerations about relative social standing, working class individuals use their own economic stability to define themselves as different from lower class and unemployed individuals (Newman 1999, Kefalas 2003, Lamont 2000), and Filipina women in Espiritu’s (2001) study used their sense of moral superiority to support their perceptions of differences between themselves and white women whose sexual behaviors they considered deviant. Further, adolescents have been found to structure social relations using criteria related to the activities, characteristics and behaviors that are meaningful to them (Tarrant and North 2001a, Tarrant and North 2001b). Therefore, people attend to the characteristics of others that are most meaningful
in their own social location. This use of personally-relevant criteria is a short cut for identifying co-residents of a particular social space, which signals meaningful commonalities (Bourdieu 1984).

To further examine the mechanisms at work in the construction of symbolic boundaries, I investigate the salience of both taste and status information in boundary work decisions to discover the relative strength of each. It is clear from previous research that boundaries are constructed in such a way to privilege the type of capital that supports one’s own (relative) status. However, it is not (yet) clear if the use of a particular type of boundary work is likely to lead to more inclusive boundary drawing than is the use of another type. That is, does the salience of taste information predict the construction of more inclusive boundaries than does the salience of information about status? Because individuals with the broadest cultural taste are likely to be able to make social connections with the most diverse group of others (DiMaggio 1987, Peterson 1997), I predict that the salience of social location information will be a stronger predictor of exclusive boundary drawing than will be salience of taste information.

**Hypothesis 4: Social location salience will be a stronger predictor of perceived social distance than taste salience will be.**

*Data analysis strategy*

After respondents indicated in the survey how similar they think they are to alter group members, they were asked which information they used to make this decision: information about alters’ education and occupation (social location), alters’ taste about the painting, or both. I include categorical variables indicating which criterion/criteria respondents used in their consideration of social distance with alters as explanatory
variables in a logistic regression model predicting perceived social distance. Hypothesis 4 will be confirmed if the use of information about taste (but not social location) is a significantly weaker predictor of perceived social distance than is the use of information about social location.

4.5 Measuring the function of symbolic exclusion in symbolic boundary construction

Based on previous findings of intergroup differences in the motivations for boundary drawing (Bryson 1997, DiMaggio 1987, Espiritu 2001, Illouz 1997, Kefalas 2003, Lamont 1992, Newman 1999), I predict in Hypothesis 4 that respondents who consider only alters’ taste in the painting will perceive less social distance with alters than will respondents who consider status, regardless of whether or not they consider social location as well. Thus, I suggest that people for whom social location is a more salient consideration in boundary-work decisions than is taste will draw symbolic boundaries more exclusively.

Dummy variables for the consideration of only social location and both social location and taste are added to Model 3 of Table 4, and are compared to the use of only taste. As predicted, both of these variables are positive and statistically significant. This indicates that respondents who took only taste into consideration when making the boundary-drawing decision had a lower likelihood of drawing exclusive boundaries.

---

16 Because this model includes both respondents’ and alters’ social locations, the variables for status taste discordance could not be included, as these were created based on the interaction between respondent and alter social locations. Therefore, the measure of taste discordance in Models 3 and all subsequent models represents discordance on taste regardless of the match on social location, and is compared to concordance on taste, again regardless of the match on status.

17 For the alters’ social location variables, LCC is the reference group.
(holding taste and social location concordance constant) than were those who did not consider tastes, or those to who considered social location in addition to taste. Further, a statistically significant Wald test of the effects of social location and social location and taste (Chi-square=9.87, p<.01) indicates that the consideration of taste in addition to social location decreased respondents’ propensity for exclusive boundary drawing compared to considering only social location. These results suggest that the positive effect that the consideration of social location has on drawing exclusive symbolic boundaries can be mediated by the consideration of taste. In addition, these results reveal that attending to an alters’ social location when engaging in symbolic boundary work increases the likelihood that ego will perceive social distance rather than closeness with that alter, compared with not taking social location into consideration. This finding confirms Hypothesis 4.

In Model 4, I interact respondents’ social location with the information about alter that was most influential in the consideration of how similar (or not) members of the alter group were to them. As suggested by Lamont (1992), one might expect CS respondents to find information about taste to be most salient in symbolic boundary work decisions, as their own relative privilege in the social order stems from their high volume of cultural capital relative to ES and LCC others. Likewise, ES respondents could be expected to rely more heavily on information about social location (education and occupation), as their own social privilege stems from educational attainment and the pecuniary dominance of their own occupations relative to CS and LCC respondents’ occupations.

Alternatively, because HCC respondents are distinct from LCC alters based on the mismatch in both education and occupation between themselves and these others, one
might expect that HCC respondents (both economic and cultural specialists) would be more likely to find social location to be more salient than taste, and that LCC respondents would downplay the importance of social location and rely in greater proportion on information about cultural taste in recognition of their own subjugated position in social space with regard to education and occupation.

A bivariate test of the relationship between social location and the criteria respondents used when considering their similarity with alters supports the second line of thought. LCC respondents were the most likely to consider only alters’ taste (28% compared to 22% of ES and 20% of CS respondents), and were the least likely to consider only alters’ education and occupation (36% compared to 41% of ES and 43% of CS respondents). Group differences are statistically significant (Chi-square=15.2, p=.007). When these variables are interacted in the multivariate analysis (Model 4 in Table 4, illustrated graphically in Figure 4), LCC respondents who considered only taste when deciding how similar they were to alters were the least likely to perceive social distance between themselves and others, in line with the bivariate findings discussed previously. In addition, LCC respondents for whom status is most salient are the most likely to perceive alters as unlike themselves (statistically significant at the p=.10 level).
4.6 Summary

This chapter examined differences in the propensity to perceive social distance from others. As expected, differences in taste are stronger predictors of perceived social distance than are differences in status (indeed, results in Chapter 3 revealed only a limited role of status discordance on exclusive boundary drawing). Further, status differences are insignificant in producing perceptions of social distance when tastes are matched. That is, shared taste can compensate for status differences in the formation of social bonds. This suggests that individuals who share aesthetic tastes but not status are likely to form a social connection, but the same is not true for those who share status but not tastes.
Finally, results in this chapter suggest that motivations for and methods of drawing symbolic boundaries vary by status group. Specifically, LCC individuals are more likely than are HCC persons to take cultural taste into consideration when drawing inclusive social boundaries, which is in line with Bryson’s (1997) finding that lower status individuals are more likely than those with higher status to use cultural dislikes to mark their status positions.

This finding is a slight departure from Illouz’s (1997) conclusions about the ways in which individuals draw symbolic boundaries in the formation of romantic relationships. She found that the further individuals’ status group positioned them from the concerns of economic necessity, the more likely they were to reject the idea of drawing symbolic boundaries based on occupation or financial standing. Therefore, her working-class respondents were the most likely to employ socioeconomic rather than cultural boundaries in relationship formation. Although the measure of social location employed here is not a pure measure of socioeconomic standing, it does incorporate occupation and the understanding of particular lifestyle that accompanies that occupation.

However, Illouz’s study was concerned with how individuals enact cognitive categories in the creation of social ties (behavior), while the current study is concerned with how those categories are created in the first place (attitudes). In addition, Illouz was studying a particular subset of boundary decisions (romantic relationships), while the current study examines symbolic exclusion more generally. Therefore, although the specific ways in which the criteria used in boundary work lead to different outcomes in these two studies, the overall finding is the same – individuals draw symbolic boundaries differently by status group.
Further, results in this chapter revealed that respondents who indicated that they considered status in their boundary work decisions were more likely to draw exclusive symbolic boundaries than were those who indicated that they took taste into account. This finding is consistent with previous work that shows individuals using the criteria that are most relevant to their own form of dominance to perform symbolic boundary work (e.g., Lamont 1992, Espiritu 2001, Newman 1999). The finding reported here, that LCC respondents were most likely to employ aesthetic taste as a criterion in inclusive boundary-drawing decisions but were most likely to use status considerations in exclusive boundary-drawing decisions is in line with conclusions drawn from these previous studies. By using different rationales to accept and reject others as similar or different from themselves, LCC respondents downplayed differences in status in the construction of inclusive boundaries, but accentuated those differences in the construction of exclusive boundaries, thereby selectively attending to the form of capital that they are weaker in, relative to HCC individuals.

To the extent that individuals are unaware of these differences in boundary drawing, this finding has implications for concerns of cultural and economic mobility. If individuals assume that out-group individuals make symbolic boundary decisions in ways similar to their own boundary decisions, their attempts to gain membership in that out-group might not only be fruitless, but detrimental. This would be particularly true if individuals stress the form of capital that paints themselves in the best light to members of a differently-located status group whose own status is propped up by a different form of capital.
CHAPTER 5
THE ROLE OF CULTURAL CAPITAL IN SYMBOLIC BOUNDARY WORK

Chapter 4 presented results of analyses that examined the relationship between considerations of taste and status and the propensity to perceive social distance from others. Results demonstrated that differences in tastes are stronger predictors of perceived social distance than are differences in status. This chapter expands on those results with empirical tests of the relationship between the possession of cultural capital and the propensity to draw exclusive symbolic boundaries. I predict that the likelihood of drawing exclusive symbolic boundaries will negatively related to the possession of various forms of cultural capital.

The possession of cultural capital is a key criterion in considerations of homophily and social tie formation, just as the possession of economic capital is. However, economic capital is understood as an achieved or earned resource, while cultural capital is perceived as natural or innate. Bourdieu (1996) argues that this second assumption masks the structural nature of the reproduction of social privilege. For instance, children whose parents have college degrees often receive informal preparation for school in the home before beginning their formal educational careers (Lareau 2003). The return on this parental investment in children’s academic preparation is the children’s academic success. This success is credited to the children’s talent or ability, rather than being interpreted as a result of a home environment that socializes children in ways that
are rewarded by the educational system (Bourdieu and Passeron 1977, Stephens et al. 2012).

Likewise, the propensity to develop broad musical tastes is related to the cultivation of an aesthetic disposition that appreciates a wide range of cultural objects and experiences. Such a disposition is developed early in life through diverse experiences with multiple forms of art and cultural performance, primarily via experiences with one’s family and in the formal education system, participation in a wide variety of cultural and leisure activities, and through membership in a diverse set of social networks (Bourdieu 1984, 1986). That is, broad experience with cultural goods facilitates in individuals a facility with cultural objects and experiences that allows consumers to develop an aesthetic appreciation for not only “fine arts,” but also art forms that are not or have not yet been legitimized – separating form from function, or finding sacred buried within the profane (Bourdieu 1984). The ability to appreciate a wide range of cultural objects has been given the label ‘cultural omnivorousness’ (Peterson 1997) and is related to advantage later in life. The result of the broad cultural taste borne of a well-developed aesthetic disposition is a “common cultural currency” (DiMaggio 1987), or the ability to communicate the possession of “multicultural capital” (Bryson 1997) or “openness to diversity” (Ollivier 2004, 2008; Warde et al 2008) that allows its possessors to successfully navigate and form relationships in a wide array of social experiences and situations.

Social and economic privilege that results from the possession and deployment of cultural capital, then, re-establishes existing patterns of privilege. One predictor of both social and economic privilege is the ability to form relationships with a wide variety of
people (Granovetter 1973). Therefore, persons with the ability to employ a wide range of criteria in the process of tie formation have the greatest ability to activate a wide-ranging network of ties to gain positions of power, prestige and influence. The possession of cultural capital facilitates such inclusive tie formation such that it should be negatively related to the propensity to draw exclusive symbolic boundaries. I test this hypothesis in this chapter.

5.1 Research Question 1: Does the possession of cultural capital influence boundary-drawing decisions?

Cultural capital allows those who possess it to make social connections based on a broad range of criteria, and therefore find similarities with a diverse set of others (DiMaggio 1987; Bryson 1997; Ollivier 2004, 2008; Warde et al 2008). The possession of institutionalized capital, measured by college degree attainments, as well as embodied cultural capital, measured by both cultural privilege inherited from one’s parents and by broad musical taste, should increase respondents’ capacity to recognize/perceive homophily with a wide range of others.

**Hypothesis 1:** HCC respondents, respondents from privileged backgrounds, and cultural omnivores will be less likely to perceive social distance from others.

**Data analysis strategy**

I used three measures of cultural capital to test Hypothesis 1: the completion of a college degree (measured with the social location variable, which combines educational attainment with occupation), having at least one parent with a college degree, and broad musical taste.
First, to test the relationship between institutionalized cultural capital and exclusive boundary drawing, I included categories of the social location variable (for respondents) in a logistic regression model predicting the perception of social distance to determine if respondents’ position in social space is a reliable determinant of the capacity to connect with a wide range of others. Hypothesis 1 will be confirmed for institutionalized capital if HCC respondents are significantly less likely than are LCC respondents to perceive social distance with alters.

Second, I tested the relationship between parental education and exclusive boundary drawing using the survey item that asked respondents if either of their parents (or the people who raised them) completed a college degree. I entered binary responses to this question into a logistic regression model predicting perceived social distance. Hypothesis 1 will be confirmed for inherited cultural capital if respondents whose parent(s) graduated from college are significantly less likely than are respondents whose parents did not graduate from college to perceive social distance between themselves and alters.

Finally, I presented respondents with a list of twenty musical genres, and asked them to indicate which ones they liked. I entered the number of genres liked, centered at the mean, into a logistic regression model predicting perceived social distance in order to test the relationship between cultural omnivorousness and the propensity to draw

---

18 A factor analysis of these data revealed five underlying meta-categories into which the twenty genres could be organized: highbrow (Classical, Opera and Broadway/Showtunes), Urban (Latin/Spanish/Salsa, Rap/Hip-hop, Blues/R&B, Reggae, Dance/Club, and Jazz), Pop (genres Classical rock/Oldies, Contemporary rock, Pop/Top 40, Independent/Alternative, and Heavy metal), Mature (Big band and Easy Listening/Mood) and Folk (Country, Bluegrass, Folk, and Hymns/Gospel). These five genre categories were also entered into the analysis in Models 1 and 2, but are not included in Table 4 as none of their effects were statistically significant.
exclusive boundaries. Hypothesis 1 will be confirmed for broad musical taste if the likelihood of perceiving social distance from alters decreases as musical breadth increases.

5.2 Measuring symbolic exclusion as a function of differences in cultural capital

In Hypothesis 1, I predict that the possession of various types of cultural capital will negatively predict the likelihood of perceiving social distance with alters, based on findings by Lamont (1992), Bryson (1997), and Ollivier (2004), among others, who have demonstrated a direct relationship between the possession of cultural capital and inclusiveness and the tolerance of difference. Models 1 – 4 in Table 4 include measures of several forms of cultural capital, including institutionalized (measured by the education component of the social location variable) and embodied (both inherited, via parents’ education, and acquired, via respondents’ own taste in music) forms.

Respondents’ educational attainment is measured in the models presented in Table 4 in the social location variables, in combination with occupation. All CS and ES respondents have completed a college degree, while none of the LCC respondents have. Statistically insignificant coefficients for the social location variables (cultural specialist and economic specialist) in Models 1 – 4 indicate that respondents’ social location is not a statistically significant predictor of the perception of social distance. This is true in a bivariate test of the relationship between social location and perceived social distance as well (F=0.92, p=.397), indicating that other measures of cultural capital or the effects of taste and/or status discordance also entered in the models is not masking the effect of social location.
Certainly, it could be that institutionalized cultural capital’s combination with occupation in the social location variable suppresses its effect on the perception of social distance. A t-test comparing the likelihood of perceiving social distance with alters across college graduates and non-graduates yields only a marginally significant difference ($t=1.59, p = .056$) – 71% of non-graduates perceived social distance from others compared to 68% of graduates. However, when I enter college completion into Model 3 in place of respondents’ social location (data not shown), its effect is not statistically significant. Likewise, including a measure of completion of one or more graduate degrees instead of the Bachelor’s degree yields the same bivariate and multivariate results. These results reveal a lack of support for Hypothesis 1 with regard to respondents’ college completion, in which I predicted that the possession of institutionalized cultural capital would decrease the propensity to perceive social distance from others.

Next, a dummy variable indicating that at least one of respondents’ parents graduated from college included in the models in Table 4 is consistently negative and statistically significant, indicating that the tendency to draw exclusive symbolic boundaries is lower for those with inherited cultural capital than for those without it. In addition, the coefficient for musical breadth (which is a count of the number of musical genres respondents like, out of a possible twenty, centered at the mean of 8) is also negative and statistically significant, indicating that musical breadth is negatively related to perceiving social distance from others as well. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 is supported in these data with regard to the relationship between exclusive boundary drawing and cultural capital measured by parental education and broad musical taste. These findings
suggest that variation in boundary drawing attempts do not vary significantly by institutionalized cultural capital, but they do vary by the possession of embodied cultural capital.

5.3 Research Question 2: Are the effects of cultural capital on boundary work cumulative?

In the previous section, I tested the relationship between the possession of various forms of cultural capital and the propensity to draw inclusive symbolic boundaries, as specified by Hypothesis 1. Results suggested that inherited cultural capital, measured as having at least one parent who has earned a college degree, and broad musical taste are both significantly and positively related to inclusive boundary drawing, suggesting that those who lack these forms of cultural capital may be at a disadvantage with regard to forming relationships with a wide range of others. Here, I test the cumulative effect of these two types of cultural capital in conjunction with social location to determine if individuals who possess two or more forms of cultural capital have an even greater chance of forming inclusive boundaries than do those who only possess one form. Results confirming this hypothesis will strengthen the finding that the lack of cultural capital disadvantages individuals in network formation.

Hypothesis 2: Respondents with multiple forms of cultural capital will be less likely to distance themselves from others than will be respondents with little or no cultural capital.

Data analysis strategy
To test this hypothesis, I first interact respondents’ social location with parents’ education and with breadth of musical taste to determine if possession of embodied cultural capital has a stronger effect in suppressing the tendency toward exclusivity for HCC respondents than for LCC respondents. Hypothesis 2 will be confirmed if parents’ college education and breadth of musical taste, respectively, have stronger negative effects on the perception of homophily for HCC respondents than for LCC respondents. Next, I interact all three measures of cultural capital (social location, parents’ education, and breadth of musical taste) in a final, three-way interaction term to determine if the possession of multiple forms of cultural capital influences exclusivity differently by social location, as I predicted in Hypothesis 2.

5.4 Measuring cultural capital’s cumulative advantage on inclusiveness

In Hypothesis 2, I predicted that the possession of multiple types of cultural capital confers a cumulative advantage in terms of the propensity to perceive homophily with a wide range of others. Specifically, I predict that inherited cultural capital, measured by parents’ college completion, will have a stronger negative effect on HCC respondents’ perceptions of social distance than on LCC respondents’ perception, suggesting that HCC individuals receive an extra “boost” of inclusiveness from the compounding of inherited plus institutionalized cultural capital that allows them to include a wider range of individuals in their in-groups. Parents’ college completion status was interacted with respondents’ social location in Model 1 in Table 5. This two-way interaction, illustrated graphically in Figure 5.1, reveals that inherited cultural capital influences individuals differently by social location, as predicted, but has a stronger
negative effect on LCC respondents’ than on HCC respondents’ perceptions of social distance, contrary to the prediction in Hypothesis 2.

As seen in Model 1 of Table 5, the effect of having at least one parent who graduated from college on the perception of social distance is not statistically significant for either ES or CS respondents, suggesting that the positive effect of the possession of cultural capital on inclusive boundary drawing has an upper limit. However, LCC respondents with inherited cultural capital are significantly less likely to perceive social distance with others than are LCC respondents whose parents did not go to college (see Figure 5.1 for a graphic illustration of the difference in the probability of perceiving social distance from alters by parents’ education for LCC respondents).

Therefore, with regard to the relationship between the possession of cultural capital and the propensity to draw exclusive symbolic boundaries, the cultural capital that LCC individuals miss by not completing a college degree can be made up for by growing up in a family in which at least one parent did. However, LCC individuals without inherited cultural capital in effect have a double deficit of cultural capital that results in the construction of very narrow boundaries. This suggests that there is a bifurcation within the LCC stratum that divides those with inherited cultural capital from those without.
**TABLE 5**

LOGISTIC REGRESSION OF GROUP CHARACTERISTICS ON PERCEIVED SOCIAL DISTANCE WITH ALTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TASTE DISCORDANCE</strong></td>
<td>0.775***</td>
<td>0.778***</td>
<td>0.776***</td>
<td>0.693***</td>
<td>0.680***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.131)</td>
<td>(0.131)</td>
<td>(0.131)</td>
<td>(0.127)</td>
<td>(0.127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social distance consideration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL LOCATION</td>
<td>0.937***</td>
<td>0.908***</td>
<td>0.910***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.145)</td>
<td>(0.145)</td>
<td>(0.145)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL LOCATION + TASTE</td>
<td>0.453***</td>
<td>0.432**</td>
<td>0.440**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.141)</td>
<td>(0.141)</td>
<td>(0.142)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL SPECIALIST</td>
<td>0.356+</td>
<td>-0.109</td>
<td>-0.118</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>0.470+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.200)</td>
<td>(0.156)</td>
<td>(0.156)</td>
<td>(0.154)</td>
<td>(0.282)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC SPECIALIST</td>
<td>-0.217</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.194)</td>
<td>(0.160)</td>
<td>(0.160)</td>
<td>(0.158)</td>
<td>(0.258)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSIC BREADTH</td>
<td>0.049-*</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.053**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
<td>(0.027)</td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>0.202+</td>
<td>0.218+</td>
<td>0.220+</td>
<td>0.205+</td>
<td>0.199+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.115)</td>
<td>(0.115)</td>
<td>(0.116)</td>
<td>(0.114)</td>
<td>(0.114)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>0.017***</td>
<td>0.016***</td>
<td>0.004***</td>
<td>0.015***</td>
<td>0.016***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARENT COLLEGE</td>
<td>-0.494**</td>
<td>-0.318**</td>
<td>-0.300*</td>
<td>-0.328**</td>
<td>-0.341**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.172)</td>
<td>(0.127)</td>
<td>(0.130)</td>
<td>(0.126)</td>
<td>(0.126)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alter group characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL SPECIALIST</td>
<td>-0.551***</td>
<td>-0.550***</td>
<td>-0.552***</td>
<td>-0.569***</td>
<td>-0.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.140)</td>
<td>(0.140)</td>
<td>(0.140)</td>
<td>(0.138)</td>
<td>(0.180)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction terms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC SPECIALIST</td>
<td>-0.370</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-0.363</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-0.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.141)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.141)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.141)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIKE PAINTING</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.128)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.128)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction terms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESRxPARENTCOLLEGE</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.293)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSRxPARENTCOLLEGE</td>
<td>0.509</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.302)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESRxMUSICAL BREADTH</td>
<td>-0.109</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.118</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSRxMUSICAL BREADTH</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.053)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCLOC#PARENTED#MUSICAL BREADTH</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.037)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCCRxPARENTCOLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.118</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.044)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.047)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESRxPARENTNOCOLLEGE</td>
<td>-0.121</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.049)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESRxPARENTCOLLEGE</td>
<td>-0.118</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.044)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSRxPARENTNOCOLLEGE</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.053)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSRxPARENTCOLLEGE</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.047)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSRxCS ALTER GROUP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 5 CONTD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSR×ES ALTER GROUP</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>-0.395</td>
<td>(0.370)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESR×CS ALTER GROUP</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.489</td>
<td>(0.343)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESR×ES ALTER GROUP</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.509</td>
<td>(0.351)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.586</td>
<td>0.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.422)</td>
<td>(0.423)</td>
<td>(0.425)</td>
<td>(0.411)</td>
<td>(0.416)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>42.41 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .10, *p ≤ .05, **p ≤ .01, ***p ≤ .001; N = 1707

Note: Respondents’ race/ethnicity, self-perceived social class, and favorite genre category are also included in Models 1 – 5. Because these variables have statistically non-significant effects across models, they are not included in this table.
Further, I predict that broad musical taste is a stronger suppressor of the tendency for exclusive boundary drawing for HCC than for LCC respondents. This suggests that the multicultural capital (Bryson 1997) that comes with having eclectic tastes in music is utilized most proficiently in the broadening of social boundaries by HCC individuals, whose institutionalized cultural capital gives them the “cultural mobility” to connect with people from a wide range of social situations (Emmison 2003). I added an interaction between breadth of musical taste and respondents’ social location to the regression analysis in Model 2 of Table 5. Figure 5.2 graphically illustrates the interaction effects.

The interaction of respondents’ social location with breadth of musical taste in Model 2 suggests that musical breadth has a much stronger effect for ES than for CS and
LCC respondents in terms of suppressing the tendency to perceive social distance from others. As Figure 5.2 illustrates, breadth of musical taste has very little influence on how LCC respondents construct symbolic boundaries, and the effect for CS respondents is not much stronger. However, ES respondents with narrow musical tastes have a much stronger tendency to perceive social distance from others than do ES respondents with broad musical tastes (as demonstrated by the steep negative slope of the ES line in Figure 5.2). Therefore, Hypothesis 2 receives partial support in these data – broad musical taste has a suppressor effect on the perception of social distance for ES respondents.
Indeed, 57% of ES respondents who like 9 or more genres perceived social
distance from alters, while 74% of those who like 8 or fewer genres\(^{19}\) did the same. The
infusion of cultural capital that comes from being exposed to a wide variety of musical
styles serves to broaden ES individuals’ capacity to connect with others, but does not do
the same for CS or LCC respondents. In effect, having broad musical taste allows
economic specialists to “catch up” to and even exceed cultural specialists in terms of the
capacity to connect with a wide range of others. For ES respondents, then, embodied
cultural capital, measured by the possession of broad musical taste, is a stronger predictor
of the propensity to draw broad symbolic boundaries than is institutionalized cultural
capital, measured by the attainment of a bachelor’s degree.

As discussed just above, broad musical taste suppresses the tendency to draw
exclusive symbolic boundaries for ES respondents. I predict that this relationship will
vary by parental education, such that the cumulative advantage of having institutionalized
cultural capital, measured by completion of a college degree, embodied cultural capital,
measured by broad tastes in music, and inherited cultural capital, measured by having a
parent(s) who completed a college degree, will result in the tendency to draw highly
inclusive symbolic boundaries. That is, the group of respondents expected to be the least
likely to perceive social distance from others are HCC respondents with broad musical
tastes, and whose parent or parents completed a college degree. To test this prediction, I
added the three-way interaction between respondents’ social location, parental
educational attainment and breadth of musical taste to the analysis in Model 3. The
interaction effects are illustrated graphically in Figure 5.3.

\(^{19}\) 8 is the mean for this variable.
The negative and statistically significant effects for ES and CS respondents interacted with parents’ education and breadth of musical taste in Model 4 suggest that inherited cultural capital combined with embodied cultural capital does serve to decrease exclusiveness for HCC respondents, as hypothesized, but the stronger effects for ES than CS respondents suggests a division within the HCC stratum. This is not surprising, given the finding discussed just above that ES respondents benefitted the most from broad musical taste in terms of avoiding exclusivity in symbolic boundary construction.

Figure 5.3 reveals a striking difference between respondents whose parents do and do not have college degrees. For those whose parents completed college, there is only moderate variation in the relationship between breadth of musical taste and exclusiveness. ES respondents are somewhat more strongly influenced by musical tastes than are CS and LCC respondents. In fact, musical taste has no effect on LCC and CS respondents whose parent(s) graduated from college, and individuals in these two social locations have almost identical boundary-drawing tendencies when parental education is held constant at none (although it should be noted that the potential for variation is much higher for CS than LCC respondents, suggesting that CS and LCC respondents might not be quite as equivalent in this regard as Figure 5.3 suggests).

However, among respondents whose parents did not graduate from college, there is a stark difference between ES and other respondents. As seen in Figure 5.3, ES respondents whose parents did not go to college are influenced significantly by the
possession of embodied cultural capital. ES respondents whose parents did not go to college and who like more than 8 genres of music are only half as likely as ES respondents who did not go to college and who like 8 or fewer genres of music to draw exclusive boundaries. In addition, ES respondents whose parents did not go to college and who like more than eight genres of music are just as likely as CS respondents whose parents did to go college and who also like more than eight genres of music to draw exclusive boundaries. Therefore, as suggested above, having broad musical taste allows
ES individuals to “make up” for their lack of cultural capital compared with CS individuals, in terms of inclusive boundary drawing, by the curation of eclectic tastes.

Therefore, possession of multiple forms of cultural capital has very specific outcomes with regard to the propensity to draw inclusive symbolic boundaries. First, individuals without college degrees and who do not have a parent with a college degree have a double disadvantage in terms of the ability to draw broad, inclusive symbolic boundaries. Lacking both of these forms of cultural capital results in a high propensity to draw exclusive boundaries. Second, economic specialists can make up for differences in cultural competency between themselves and cultural specialists with broad musical taste. That is, economic specialists with broad musical tastes have the same or higher likelihood of drawing inclusive boundaries as cultural specialists. Finally, cultural specialists are not helped in any particular way by the possession of cultural capital. This suggests, as does the statistically insignificant cumulative advantage effect of parental college on both CS and ES respondents, that there is a plateau, or a limit to the influence that the possession of cultural capital can have on one’s ability to conceive of symbolic boundaries broadly.

5.5 Research Question 3: How do differences in social location influence boundary work?

In the previous sections, I tested the relationship between the possession of cultural capital and exclusive boundary drawing as specified in Hypotheses 1 and 2. I found evidence to support the conclusion that the possession of cultural capital is negatively related to the propensity to draw exclusive boundaries. Here I look for evidence of the opposite conclusion -- that respondents’ propensity to draw boundaries
between themselves and others who differ from them in the possession of cultural capital is positively related to the volume of cultural capital that they possess. Therefore, rather than predicting that the possession of cultural capital decreases the likelihood of perceiving social distance, as I did in Hypotheses 1 and 2, here I suggest that in particular instances, the possession of cultural capital, in relation to others’ possession of cultural capital, increases the likelihood of such exclusive boundary drawing. That is, the likelihood of a person perceiving social distance from another increases as the difference between ego and alter’s volume of cultural capital increases. Therefore, I predict that the interaction between social location discordance and the perception of social distance will demonstrate evidence of both horizontal and vertical boundary drawing (Hypothesis 3).

Membership in the dominant class requires institutionalized cultural capital (gained through the completion of a college degree), which separates members of dominant (HCC) from dominated (LCC) social positions (vertical boundary between HCC and LCC persons). In addition, though, members of the dominant classes possess unequal amounts of economic and cultural capital, and this difference is the source of distinction within the HCC stratum, both in terms of group membership and how (horizontal) symbolic boundaries are drawn between HCC groups. In fact, Bourdieu (1984: 60) suggested that taste expressions are formed with the consideration of those who are relatively similar in cultural capital: “Explicit aesthetic choices are in fact often constituted in opposition to the choices of the groups closest in social space, with whom the competition is most direct and most immediate.” In order to construct these boundaries, individuals will utilize the form of cultural capital that they best command as a boundary-drawing mechanism (DiMaggio 1987, Espiritu 2001, Kefalas 2003, Lamont
Given all of this, I predict that CS respondents will perform both horizontal and vertical boundary drawing (differentiating themselves from both ES and LCC others), and that ES respondents will construct vertical boundaries. Further, LCC respondents will not draw boundaries between themselves and alters based on social location discordance.

**Hypothesis 3: Respondents’ propensity to draw exclusive boundaries will vary directly in relation to the volume of cultural capital that they possession in comparison to the cultural capital possessed by others.**

**Data analysis strategy**

To examine respondents’ propensity to perform horizontal and/or vertical boundary drawing, I enter alter characteristics as well as respondent and alter social location interaction terms into logistic regression models predicting perceived social distance. Hypothesis 3 will be confirmed in the case of CS respondents if CS respondents have a greater likelihood of perceiving social distance between themselves and either ES and/or LCC alters than between themselves and CS alters. Further, Hypothesis 3 will be confirmed for ES respondents if ES respondents are significantly more likely to draw boundaries between themselves and either CS and/or LCC alters than between themselves and ES alters. Finally, Hypothesis 3 will be confirmed for LCC respondents if social location discordance is a statistically insignificant predictor of the perception of social distance.
5.6 Measuring horizontal and vertical symbolic boundary drawing

Results discussed in Chapter 4 suggest that differences in status between respondents and alters are not reliable predictors of the perception of social distance when similarities in cultural taste are held constant. However, the analyses in Chapter 4 aggregated all differences in social position, possibly masking meaningful relationships in particular respondent-alter social location pairings. I predicted in Hypothesis 3 that isolating CS respondents and examining their social distancing behavior when paired with ES and LCC alters will reveal evidence of both vertical (between CS respondents and LCC alters) and horizontal (between CS respondents and ES alters) boundary drawing. In addition, I predicted that ES respondents would draw exclusive boundaries between themselves and LCC alters.

To test this hypothesis, I added alters’ characteristics, including social location and taste, to the analysis in Model 4 in Table 5. First, echoing the results from Hypotheses 1 – 3 in Chapter 4 and Hypothesis 1 in this chapter, the effects of respondents’ own social location are statistically non-significant, suggesting that respondents’ social locations, themselves, are not independent factors in exclusive boundary drawing. Next, the negative and statistically significant coefficients for both CS alters and ES alters in Model 4 indicate that respondents were less likely to perceive social distance with HCC alters than with LCC alters. This finding is consistent with the finding in Chapter 3 that respondents were less likely to use their second taste expression to distance themselves from HCC alters than from LCC alters. This suggests that LCC individuals are more often on the receiving end of exclusive symbolic boundary drawing than are HCC individuals, regardless of the boundary drawer’s characteristics.
This finding that respondents were most likely to perceive social distance from LCC alters suggests that it is possible that one or more particular pairings of respondent and alter social location might produce a statistically significant effect. Indeed, Bourdieu’s (1984) discussion of how individuals distinguish themselves from one another leads to the prediction that the propensity to recognize social distance between oneself and individuals in a particular social location depends on one’s own social location, and in particular, the type of cultural capital that defines one’s membership in that social location. The status group interactions added in Model 5 and presented graphically in Figure 5.4 indicate that respondents’ perceptions of social distance with alters varies by their own and by alters’ social location in a couple of specific cases.

First, Figure 5.4 demonstrates that alters’ social location had no effect on perceptions of social distance for LCC respondents, demonstrating support for Hypothesis 3 for LCC respondents. Second, Figure 5.4 demonstrates that HCC respondents do engage in horizontal boundary drawing (as predicted by Hypothesis 1 for both CS and ES respondents), perceiving less distance between themselves and HCC alters than between themselves and LCC alters, but that CS respondents make a distinction within the HCC stratum as well, while ES respondents do not. Therefore, social location discordance predicts perceived social distance for CS respondents, who were significantly more likely to perceive social distance between themselves and ES alters than from CS alters (as predicted). ES respondents did not make such horizontal boundary distinctions, as predicted by Hypothesis 1, as the volume of cultural capital that they possess is less than that of CS alters. These results demonstrate support for Hypothesis 1, and suggest that people respond to the recognition of differences between
Figure 5.4
Likelihood of Perceiving Social Distance from Alters by Social Location, Given Alters’ Social Location

their own cultural capital and that of others by distancing themselves from those who have meaningfully less cultural capital than they possess.

5.7 Summary

This chapter examined differences in the propensity to perceive social distance from others by variation in the possession of cultural capital. First, the possession of three types of cultural capital served as predictors of exclusive boundary drawing. Results indicated that having at least one parent who has a college degree and having broad musical taste both have statistically significant, negative effects on exclusive boundary drawing. Second, interactions between social location, parental college and
broad musical taste were used to predict exclusive boundary drawing, and results indicated that the negative relationship between the possession of cultural capital and exclusive boundary drawing has an upper limit. Third, interactions between specific respondent and alter social location pairings were also used to predict exclusive boundary drawing, revealing evidence to suggest that exclusive boundary drawing is a function of the recognition of differences in cultural capital, with perceptions of differences becoming more likely as alters’ possession of cultural capital, relative to ego, decreases.

More specifically, exclusiveness can be moderated by the possession of embodied cultural capital (but not institutionalized cultural capital), particularly for those who are relatively lacking in cultural capital. For instance, embodied cultural capital in the form of having grown up in a family in which at least one parent had a college degree helps LCC individuals (particularly those in their twenties, thirties, and early forties) “make up” for not having college degrees themselves by making them just as likely as HCC individuals to draw inclusive boundaries. The fact that inherited, embodied cultural capital does not have a similar inflationary effect on HCC individuals suggests a slight plateau or ceiling for the effect of cultural capital on the propensity to be inclusive of others.

Further, ES individuals with broad musical tastes behave in symbolic boundary-drawing decisions very similarly to CS individuals with similarly broad tastes, indicating that this form of embodied cultural capital can compensate for the relative lack of cultural capital in ES occupations. Again, the fact that breadth of musical taste does not give a similar boost to CS individuals, who perhaps have the greatest cultural competency to put to use the “multicultural capital” gained by having eclectic tastes in music, suggests a
ceiling effect in the ability of cultural capital to decrease exclusiveness. In addition, the fact that inherited cultural capital serves to make older HCC individuals slightly more exclusive instead of less indicates that there may be an age or cohort effect at work in the relationship between inherited cultural capital and exclusiveness.

Finally, this chapter examined the relationship between the possession of cultural capital and the propensity to draw exclusive symbolic boundaries by examining which respondent/alter social location pairings would result in the most exclusive boundary drawing. Results demonstrated that ES respondents drew exclusive boundaries between themselves and LCC alters, and CS respondents between themselves and both ES and LCC alters, while LCC respondents’ exclusive boundary drawing was not focused on any particular social location. Therefore, HCC respondents engaged in vertical boundary drawing, while CS respondents also constructed horizontal boundaries. To the extent that not claiming similarity with alters is a measure of exclusive boundary drawing, then, this pattern indicates that respondents were reluctant to include alters with lower levels of cultural capital than themselves in their in-groups. That is, exclusiveness is a function of the recognition of differences in cultural capital, with distance between ego and alter increasing as alters’ possession of cultural capital, relative to ego, decreases.

This is an interesting finding given the results presented in Chapter 3 indicating that LCC respondents modified their taste expressions to distance themselves from LCC (but not HCC) alters. Specifically, LCC respondents were most likely to modify their taste expression to distance themselves from LCC alters. Therefore, although LCC respondents do not perceive differences in social location from LCC alters (as seen here), they do use their taste expressions to claim differences between themselves and LCC
alters (as seen in Chapter 3). That is, LCC respondents recognize similarity with LCC alters and respond with attempts to distance themselves via their use of aesthetic taste expression. Taken together, these results suggest that LCC respondents did not distance themselves from LCC alters because they perceived themselves as different from these rather similar others, but because they found something about them with which they did not want to be associated. The fact that this inter-status social distance effect is found only for LCC respondents suggests that LCC individuals likely recognize their own subjugated social position and, rather than identify with others in similar positions, distance themselves from those others in an attempt to distance themselves from negative perceptions (their own as well as others’) of members of the LCC stratum (see Bourdieu 1984 for similar results with regard to working-class individuals).
A primary goal of this dissertation was to examine the relationship between the expression of aesthetic tastes and the construction of symbolic boundaries in order to better understand the processes underlying the relationship between aesthetic taste and symbolic boundary work. Respondents’ propensity to modify their own taste expressions to align themselves (or not) with others was examined to determine if and how they use their own taste expressions as markers of symbolic boundaries.

I found in Chapter 3 that changes in taste expression were most likely for respondents with low cultural capital (defined in this analysis, primarily, as not having graduated from college) who were paired with others in the same social location, suggesting a recognition and response to the lack of cultural legitimacy in taste expressions among individuals with low cultural capital. Results in Chapter 5 suggesting that individuals with low cultural capital will form the most exclusive boundaries, as well as results in Chapter 4 which demonstrated that individuals with low cultural capital are more likely than are those with high cultural capital to construct narrow boundaries, support this conclusion.

Taken together, these results suggest that the process for drawing symbolic boundaries varies by individuals’ social location, not just in their outcomes, but also in their processes. Previous research has shown that individuals will change or abandon their tastes when identity claims are at stake (Hebdige 1987, Thornton 1995, Escalas and
Bettman 2005, Berger and Heath 2008). The results in Chapter 3 which demonstrate that low cultural capital individuals will change their tastes in order to define themselves as unlike others with low cultural capital, are interesting, then, as they extend previous findings to illustrate identity claims within groups in addition to between groups. That is, in addition to abandoning tastes in order to maintain distance from dissimilar others, these results indicate that taste expressions can be used to state claims of difference from those with meaningful similarities as well.

Another interesting finding regarding opportunities to make identity claims via alterations of taste expressions is that respondents with high cultural capital did not use their taste expressions to distance themselves from those with less cultural capital than themselves. This suggests that high cultural capital individuals may be secure enough in their cultural capital advantage over low cultural capital persons not to have to make strong statements about the differences between themselves and those others. This is particularly interesting given results from Chapter 5 which demonstrate that those with high cultural capital perceive social distance from others in direct proportion to the difference in cultural capital between themselves and those others. Therefore, those highest in cultural capital (termed “Cultural Specialists” here) are the most likely to perceive themselves as different from those with low cultural capital. Thus, the fact high cultural capital respondents did not modify their taste expressions to differentiate themselves from low cultural capital others suggests that these others do not pose a threat to their identities.

A second goal of this dissertation was to examine some of the processes involved in the construction of symbolic boundaries, particularly with regard to the predictors of
exclusive boundary drawing, in order to examine how perceptions about interpersonal similarity and differences are formed. Respondents’ propensity to perceive social distance from others was examined with relation to how similar or different they were to those others on both taste and social location. As discussed in Chapter 4, I found that differences in taste are stronger predictors of perceived social distance than are differences in social location (education and occupation), and that differences in social location do not result in perceptions of social distance when tastes are matched. This finding suggests that individuals who share aesthetic tastes but not social location are likely to form a social connection, but the same is not true for those who share social location but not tastes.

This outcome is not particularly surprising given Bourdieu’s theory of taste, which suggests that taste differences between people evoke negative, visceral reactions, limiting their ability to connect, as well as Illouz (1997) and Kern’s (1997) findings that individuals respond to similarities in cultural preference more often than in status or moral characteristics with inclusive boundary work. Results presented here regarding the link between aesthetic taste and symbolic boundary work suggest that cultural influences on relationship formation and maintenance work in a particular way, such that shared taste between two people has the ability to compensate for status differences between them.

On the flip side, however, this finding suggests that differences in taste might be difficult to overcome in the process of relationship formation, which speaks to the powerful role that the expression of aesthetic tastes can play in systems of stratification. That is, while differences between people on factors such as education, income,
occupation, gender and race certainly have the capacity to separate people from each other, potentially resulting in the loss of privilege or opportunity, such differences are observable and quantifiable, and are therefore oftentimes challenged. Differences in aesthetic tastes and other cultural characteristics are more difficult to challenge, or even to observe, which is precisely what gives them their social power (Bourdieu and Passeron 1990). Although the dozens of attempts to rectify social inequalities through policies and programs that were designed to provide opportunities for various resources across gender, race, income, and other social lines, re-shuffling social space is challenging due to the strong but invisible stratifying power of cultural characteristics, such as patterns in aesthetic taste.

The ways in which respondents construct boundaries were also examined with regard to the characteristics of others that are salient in boundary-drawing considerations. That is, the salience of information about others’ taste information was compared to that of others’ social location to examine their effects on exclusive boundary drawing. I found that taking taste into consideration rather than, or even in addition to, social status (education and occupation) resulted in the construction of less exclusive boundaries. As Bourdieu (1984) explained, overlaps in tastes serve as shortcuts for identifying co-residents of particular niches within social space, and the same is true for commonalities in social status (Lazarsfeld and Merton 1954). The finding reported in Chapter 4 demonstrating that attending to others’ tastes results in less exclusive boundary drawing than does attending to status suggests that communicating with others via taste provides a wider repertoire with which to quickly and easily signal what one is like, or to assess other’s characteristics, than does using information about social status.
When considered in conjunction with the finding discussed just above, that similarities in taste predict a higher likelihood of inclusive boundary work than do similarities in status, this finding that salience of information about taste suggests that those with the greatest potential for broad network formation are those who have similarities in taste with a variety of people (i.e., those with eclectic tastes) and those for whom considerations of aesthetic taste are relevant in decisions about boundary work. Both broad taste and salience of cultural boundaries are products of the cultivation of cultural competency. Broad aesthetic tastes and attendance to the tastes of others, then, “work” to form social relationships in patterned ways that benefit those with broad tastes. Likewise, those whose participation with cultural products is limited are consequently limited in their potential for network formation.

I also discovered that when respondents, particularly those relatively lacking cultural capital, made inclusive boundary decisions, they employed aesthetic taste as a criterion, but when they drew exclusive boundaries, they utilized considerations of status. By using different rationales to accept and reject others as similar or different from themselves, respondents with relatively little cultural capital downplayed differences in status in the construction of inclusive boundaries, but accentuated those differences in the construction of exclusive boundaries, thereby selectively attending to the form of capital that they are weaker in, relative to others with higher volumes of cultural capital. To the extent that individuals are unaware of potential differences in their own boundary work, this finding has implications for concerns of cultural and economic mobility. If individuals assume that out-group individuals make symbolic boundary decisions in ways similar to their own boundary decisions, their attempts to gain membership in that out-
group might not only be fruitless, but detrimental. This would be particularly true if individuals stress the form of capital that paints themselves in the best light to members of a differently-located status group whose own status is supported by a different form of capital.

The relationship between respondents’ possession of cultural capital and their propensity to draw exclusive boundaries was also examined. Bourdieu’s (1996) theory of cultural reproduction suggests that position in social space results from unequal access to cultural capital, such that cultural resources beget other sorts of resources. Analyses presented here suggest that the inherited cultural capital endowed on those whose parent or parents graduated from college have a stronger likelihood of drawing inclusive symbolic boundaries, particularly for those who did not, themselves, graduate from college. In addition, breadth of musical taste also positively predicts inclusive boundary drawing, particularly for those in the for-profit worker segment of the high cultural capital social space. This suggests that deficits in the possession of institutional cultural capital can be compensated for with possession of other forms, but also that a lack of multiple forms of cultural capital can result in a compounded disadvantage in terms of the propensity to form broad relationships.

Therefore, to the extent that cultural capital and patterns of aesthetic taste expression are perceived as innate or idiosyncratic (rather than socially patterned, as demonstrated by dozens of previous studies such as Bourdieu 1984, DiMaggio 1987, Peterson 1992, Erickson 1996, Bryson 1997, Lizardo 2006, and Warde et al. 2008), the structural patterning of the unequal distribution of resources vis a vis differences in cultural resources and tastes is misunderstood as benign. The rewarding of the
possession of cultural resources with further reward is overlooked, and the process of the reproduction of inequality remains intact and unquestioned. Results presented in this dissertation demonstrating the numerous and powerful effects that aesthetic taste expression has on the formation of broad relationship formation, suggesting that attempts to mediate social inequality will fail without a conscious effort to address disparities in the valuation of cultural competencies. Said another way, failures of various social redistribution programs and policies that fail to address access to cultural resources can be understood as incomplete and short-sided in their scope.

**Directions for future research**

This study has focused on cognitive structuring of symbolic boundaries rather than actual social tie formation. That is, the outcome of interest in these chapters has been symbolic boundaries made in the abstract rather than actual behaviors. Future studies could focus on how individuals make boundary decisions (such as whom to invite to a party, add to a work group, or share resources with) based on knowledge of their social location and tastes.

Similarly, the current study could be extended to explore the influence that social location comparisons have on the tendency to modify one’s taste expressions in order to identify (or not) with others in interpersonal interactions (such as consumption decisions made in the context of initial group formation). Such extensions of this study would allow for an examination of the experimental realism of its conditions. Additionally, these sorts of projects would further develop knowledge about the link between social boundary construction and taste expressions (and other indicators of social capital).
More broadly, results reported in this dissertation suggest that persons relatively lacking in cultural capital construct social ties in a manner analogous to the univorous taste pattern associate with their social location (Bryson 1997). That is, while Bourdieu’s theory predicts that those highest in cultural capital have the most to gain/protect by drawing exclusive boundaries [although they have the greatest capacity to draw inclusive boundaries because of the cultural mobility (Emmison 2003) afforded them by the cultural capital they possess], results reported here reveal that low-cultural-capital individuals were the least inclusive (most univorous) in their boundary drawing.

Bourdieu would explain this finding with the suggestion that cultural capital provides individuals with the substance with which to make connections – shared interests, experience, taste, abilities and habits. Those with the greatest amount of cultural capital have the greatest number of potential similarities with others, and hence, the greatest opportunity to find common ground. Likewise, those with very little cultural capital have the least number of potential similarities with others, and thus may struggle to find commonalities with all but a narrow group of others.

Future research could delve into this finding regarding univorous tie formation to discover if there are particular cultural competencies that can overcome most differences in cultural capital (similarities in religious beliefs, or facility with storytelling, perhaps), or vice versa – if the lack of particular cultural or other characteristics make social tie formation highly unlikely.
APPENDIX A
SURVEY INSTRUMENT
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How old are you?

17 or younger
18 – 19
20 – 24
25 – 29
30 – 34
35 – 39
40 – 44
45 – 49
50 – 54
55 – 59
60 – 64
65 – 69
70 – 74
75 – 79
80 or older

Are you male or female?

Male/Female
In what part of the country do you live?

New England: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont

Middle Atlantic: New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania

Eastern Midwest: Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin

Western Midwest: Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota

South Atlantic: Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, Washington D.C., West Virginia

East South: Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, Tennessee

West South: Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas

Mountain West: Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, New Mexico, Montana, Utah, Nevada, Wyoming

Pacific West: Alaska, California, Hawaii, Oregon, Washington

As of today, have you completed a 4-year college degree (BA, BS, etc.)?

Yes/No

Which race/ethnicity group best describes you?

Asian/Black/Hispanic/White/More than one race/Other
You are being invited to participate in a research study about taste in art and music. This study is being conducted by Sara Skiles, a graduate student from the Department of Sociology at the University of Notre Dame, as part of her doctoral dissertation.

You were selected as a possible participant in this study because of your participation in the Survey Sampling International (SSI) Survey Spot program. There are no known risks or costs if you decide to participate in this research study. The information you provide will be used to broaden understanding about issues related to the expression of tastes in art and music. The survey will take about seven minutes to complete. The information collected may not benefit you directly, but the information learned in this study should provide more general benefits to those interested in taste in art and music.

The survey is anonymous. While SSI has access to your identifying information (name, contact information, etc.), this information will not be shared with the researcher, no will the IP address from which you are taking this survey be shared. While absolute anonymity can never be guaranteed over the internet, the researcher will make no attempt to identify you given the information you provide on the survey. No one will be able to identify you or your answers, and no one will know whether or not you participated in the study. Individuals from the University of Notre Dame and the Institutional Review Board may inspect these records. Should the data be published, no individual information will be disclosed.
Your participation in this study is voluntary. By completing and submitting this survey, you are voluntarily agreeing to participate. You are free to decline to answer any particular question you do not wish to answer for any reason by simply terminating the survey.

If you understand these terms and agree to participate in this survey, click Agree below. If you do not agree, simply close the survey or click disagree below to end the survey.

Agree/Disagree
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*Are you taking this survey from a smart phone (iPhone, Android, Blackberry, etc.)*?

Yes/No
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Please look at this painting for a few seconds.
**Give us your first impression of this painting – how much do you like it?**

I like it very much
I like it
I like it just a little
I neither like it nor dislike it
I dislike it just a little
I dislike it
I dislike it very much
I can’t see the image
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*Control 2 respondents:*

Thank you for your response. Other people who have taken this survey recently have said that they LIKE/DISLIKE the painting you saw.

**Given only what you know about these people’s opinion about the painting, how similar do you think you are to them?**

very similar/somewhat similar/just a little similar/not very similar/not at all similar

*Treatment respondents:*

Thank you for your response. Our survey so far indicates that the group of people most likely to say that they LIKE/DISLIKE the painting you saw have completed…

LCC: high school but did not go to college, and work in a food service job.

ES: a Bachelor’s degree in Business but no additional degrees, and work at a financial investment firm.
CS: several advanced degrees including a PhD, and work at a college or university.

Given only what you know about this group’s education, occupation, and opinion about the painting, how similar do you think you are to the people in this group?

very similar/somewhat similar/just a little similar/not very similar/not at all similar

Page 6 (treatment respondents only)

In the last question, when you thought about how similar you are to the people in this group, which factor was most influential?

their education and/or occupation/their opinion about the painting/a combination of both

Page 7

Which of the following diplomas or degrees have you completed? Check all that apply.

No diplomas or degrees

High school diploma, GED, or other equivalent

Some college, no degree

Associate degree

Bachelor’s degree (BA, BS, BBA, etc.)

Master’s degree (MA, MS, MBA, MSW, etc.)

Professional or doctoral degree (MD, PhD, JD, etc.)

If you attended college, what was your major field of study for your highest degree?

Write “none” if you did not attend college. (text box)

Did either of your parents (or the people who raised you) complete a Bachelor’s degree?

Yes/No
Which of the following best describes your current employment status?

- Working, part time or full time, paid employee
- Working, part time or full time, self employed
- Not working, currently enrolled in school
- Not working, temporarily laid off
- Not working, looking for work
- Not working, not looking for work
- Not working, homemaker
- Not working, retired
- Not working, disabled
- Not working, other

Which of the following most closely matches your current occupation (or you most recent paid occupation)?

- Business and financial operations occupations
- Computer and mathematical occupations
- Architecture occupations
- Engineering occupations
- Life, physical and social science occupations
- Community and social service occupations
- Legal occupations
- Education, training, and library occupations
- Arts and design occupations
entertainment, sports, and media occupations
healthcare practitioner occupations
healthcare support occupations
protective service occupations
military
food preparation and serving occupations
building and groups cleaning/maintenance occupations
personal care and service occupations
sales occupations
office and administrative support occupations
farming, fishing and forestry occupations
construction, installation, production, maintenance and repair occupations
transportation and material moving occupations
full-time caregiver inside the home
other

What is your annual, pre-tax income from your job(s)?

less than $10,000
$0,000 - $19,999
$20,000 - $29,999
$30,000 - $39,999
$40,000 - $49,999
$50,000 - $59,999
$60,000 - $69,999
Which of these do you think best describes you?

lower class

working class

middle class

upper class
Next, we have some questions about your tastes in music.

Please give us your opinion about these types of music.

Like/Dislike/Neither like nor dislike/Not familiar with this type of music.

Classical
Opera
Jazz
Broadway or Show tunes
Mood/Easy listening
Big band
Classic rock/Oldies
Country
Bluegrass
Folk
Hymns or Gospel
Latin, Spanish or Salsa
Rap/Hip-Hop
Blues/R&B
Reggae
Top 40/Pop
Contemporary rock
Indie/Alternative
Dance/Club
Heavy metal
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Which of these types of music have you listened to in the last month? Check all that apply.

(same options as above)

Of these types of music, which is your favorite? Choose one.

(same options as above)

Pages 11 - 15

Which of these characteristics describe the typical fans of CLASSICAL music?

Choose all that apply. Note: You can choose both, either or neither male and female, both either or neither white and black, etc.

female
male
white
black
Hispanic
Asian
college graduate
did not attend college
young
middle aged
old
lower class
working class
middle class
upper class
none of these

Note: This question was repeated 19 more times, once for each genre.
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Please look at this painting for a few seconds again.

(same image as before)

Give us your final impression of this painting – how much do you like it?

I like it very much
I like it
I like it just a little
I neither like it nor dislike it
I dislike it just a little
I dislike it
I dislike it very much
I can’t see the image
APPENDIX B

TABLE B.1

EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Alter Group's Social Location</th>
<th>Alter Group's Opinion of the painting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>no status</td>
<td>Like: taste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>taste + status</td>
<td>taste + status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>taste + status</td>
<td>taste + status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>taste + status</td>
<td>taste + status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no status</td>
<td>taste</td>
<td>taste</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C
CODING NOTES: RESPONDENT SOCIAL LOCATION

All respondents who had not earned a four-year college degree were classified as LCC. All respondents with a four-year college degree in one of the following profit-centered, white-collar occupations were classified as ES: business and financial, computer and mathematics, architecture, and healthcare practitioner. Each of these occupations had mean annual incomes in the sample above $78,000. All respondents with a four-year college degree in one of the following not-for-profit, white-collar occupations were classified as CS: engineering, life/physical/social sciences, community and social work, legal, education/training/library, art and design, and entertainment/sports/media. Each of these occupations had mean annual incomes for respondents in this sample between $45,000 and $73,000.

This left college-educated respondents in non-white collar occupations: healthcare support, protective services, military, food preparation and service, building and grounds maintenance, personal care and services, sales, office and administrative, farming/fishing/forestry, construction and installation, transportation, full-time caregiver in the home, and “other.” All respondents in these occupations who had earned at least one graduate degree were classified as CS. In addition, all college-educated respondents in either protective services or farming/fishing/forestry (non-white collar jobs which serve humanitarian/social purposes and seem separated from the pursuit of economic gain) were classified as CS. All other college-educated respondents in these non-white-
collar occupations other than full-time caregiver and “other” were classified as ES.

Finally, caregivers and those in the “other” occupational category were separated into factions of the HCC by their college major, following the same for-profit/cultural division employed by Lamont and discussed above.
## APPENDIX D

### TABLE D.1

**DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>U.S. Population</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>No Alter</th>
<th>Taste Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1463</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one race</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographic region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - 24</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 54</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE D.1 CONTD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>U.S. Population</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>No Alter</th>
<th>Taste Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 64</td>
<td></td>
<td>372</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 - 74</td>
<td></td>
<td>221</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 +</td>
<td></td>
<td>156</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No high school diploma</td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma</td>
<td></td>
<td>474</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college/AA degree</td>
<td></td>
<td>791</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA degree</td>
<td></td>
<td>625</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA degree</td>
<td></td>
<td>217</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral/Professional degree</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCES:** U.S. Bureau of the Census 2012a, 2012b, 2012c, 2012d

**NOTE:** Demographic information is reported for 2,274 of the 2,275 respondents included in the analyses discussed in this dissertation. A momentary survey glitch allowed one respondent to skip the demographic questions.
### APPENDIX E

#### TABLE E.1

**DISTRIBUTION OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS INTO TREATMENT AND CONTROL GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alter Group's Opinions of the painting</th>
<th>Like</th>
<th>Dislike</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alter Group's Social Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taste only</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no alter</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                  |      |         |         |
|                  |      |         |         |
|                  | 347  |         | 586     |
|                  | 588  | 572     |         |
|                  | 182  |         | 2275    |
APPENDIX F

STATA SYNTAX

Chapter 3

Table 3.1, Model 1

logit MOVEMENT LCCR ESR RLIKE RDISLIKE FEMALE AGEMID BLACK HISP WHITE PARENTED LOWER WORKING if CONTROL!=2, nolog

Table 3.1, Model 2

logit MOVEMENT LCCR ESR RLIKE RDISLIKE FEMALE AGEMID BLACK HISP WHITE PARENTED LOWER WORKING ALTERLIKE SIMBIN3 if CONTROL==0, nolog

Table 3.1, Model 3

logit MOVEMENT LCCR ESR RLIKE RDISLIKE FEMALE AGEMID BLACK HISP WHITE PARENTED LOWER WORKING ALTERLIKE SIMBIN3 i.ALTERCLASS if CONTROL==0, nolog

Table 3.1, Model 4

logit MOVEMENT LCCR ESR RLIKE RDISLIKE FEMALE AGEMID BLACK HISP WHITE PARENTED LOWER WORKING ALTERLIKE SIMBIN3 i.ALTERCLASS i.SOCLOC##i.ALTERCLASS if CONTROL==0, nolog
Table 3.2, Model 1

logit TOWARD3 i.SOCLOC i.ALTERCLASS PARENTED LOWER WORKING BLACK HISP WHITE if CONTROL==0, nolog

Table 3.2, Model 2

logit TOWARD3 i.SOCLOC i.ALTERCLASS PARENTED LOWER WORKING BLACK HISP WHITE i.SOCLOC##i.ALTERCLASS if CONTROL==0, nolog

Table 3.2, Model 3

logit TOWARD3 i.SOCLOC i.ALTERCLASS PARENTED LOWER WORKING BLACK HISP WHITE i.SOCLOC##i.ALTERCLASS RLIKE RDISLIKE ALTERLIKE if CONTROL==0, nolog

Table 3.2, Model 4

logit TOWARD3 i.SOCLOC i.ALTERCLASS PARENTED LOWER WORKING BLACK HISP WHITE i.SOCLOC##i.ALTERCLASS RLIKE RDISLIKE ALTERLIKE RLIKEXALTERLIKE RDISLIKEXALTERDISLIKE if CONTROL==0, nolog

Figure 3.1

logit TOWARD3 i.SOCLOC i.ALTERCLASS PARENTED LOWER WORKING BLACK HISP WHITE i.SOCLOC##i.ALTERCLASS i.RTASTE ALTERLIKE i.RTASTE##ALTERLIKE if CONTROL==0, nolog

margins RTASTE#ALTERLIKE

Figure created manually in Excel

Table 3.2, Model 5

logit TOWARD3 i.SOCLOC i.ALTERCLASS PARENTED LOWER WORKING BLACK HISP WHITE i.SOCLOC##i.ALTERCLASS RLIKE RDISLIKE ALTERLIKE
Table 3.3, Model 1

logit TOWARDLIKE i.SOCLOC i.ALTERCLASS PARENTED LOWER WORKING BLACK HISP WHITE if CONTROL==0, nolog

Table 3.3, Model 2

logit TOWARDLIKE i.SOCLOC i.ALTERCLASS PARENTED LOWER WORKING BLACK HISP WHITE i.SOCLOC#i.ALTERCLASS if CONTROL==0, nolog

Table 3.3, Model 3

logit TOWARDLIKE i.SOCLOC i.ALTERCLASS PARENTED LOWER WORKING BLACK HISP WHITE i.SOCLOC##i.ALTERCLASS RLIKE RDISLIKE if CONTROL==0, nolog

Table 3.3, Model 4

logit TOWARDLIKE i.SOCLOC i.ALTERCLASS PARENTED LOWER WORKING BLACK HISP WHITE i.SOCLOC##i.ALTERCLASS RLIKE RDISLIKE FEMALE AGEMID SIMBIN3 if CONTROL==0, nolog

Table 3.4, Model 1

logit TOWARDDISLIKE i.SOCLOC i.ALTERCLASS PARENTED LOWER WORKING BLACK HISP WHITE if CONTROL==0, nolog
Table 3.4, Model 2
logit TOWARDDISLIKE i.SOCLOC i.ALTERCLASS PARENTED LOWER WORKING BLACK HISP WHITE i.SOCLOC##i.ALTERCLASS if CONTROL==0, nolog

Table 3.4, Model 3
logit TOWARDDISLIKE i.SOCLOC i.ALTERCLASS PARENTED LOWER WORKING BLACK HISP WHITE i.SOCLOC##i.ALTERCLASS RLIKE RDISLIKE if CONTROL==0, nolog

Table 3.4, Model 4
logit TOWARDDISLIKE i.SOCLOC i.ALTERCLASS PARENTED LOWER WORKING BLACK HISP WHITE i.SOCLOC##i.ALTERCLASS RLIKE RDISLIKE FEMALE AGEMID SIMBIN3 if CONTROL==0, nolog

Table 3.5, Model 1
logit AWAY i.SOCLOC i.ALTERCLASS PARENTED LOWER WORKING BLACK HISP WHITE if CONTROL==0, nolog

Figure 3.2
margins i.SOCLOC#i.ALTERCLASS

Figure created manually in Excel

Table 3.5, Model 2
logit AWAY i.SOCLOC i.ALTERCLASS PARENTED LOWER WORKING BLACK HISP WHITE i.SOCLOC##i.ALTERCLASS if CONTROL==0, nolog
Table 3.5, Model 3

logit AWAY i.SOCLOC i.ALTERCLASS PARENTED LOWER WORKING BLACK HISP WHITE i.SOCLOC##i.ALTERCLASS RLIKE RDISLIKE ALTERLIKE if CONTROL==0, nolog

Table 3.5, Model 4

logit AWAY i.SOCLOC i.ALTERCLASS PARENTED LOWER WORKING BLACK HISP WHITE i.SOCLOC##i.ALTERCLASS RLIKE RDISLIKE ALTERLIKE RLIKEXALTERLIKE RDISLIKEXALTERDISLIKE if CONTROL==0, nolog

Figure 3.3

logit AWAY i.SOCLOC i.ALTERCLASS PARENTED LOWER WORKING BLACK HISP WHITE i.SOCLOC##i.ALTERCLASS i.RTASTE ALTERLIKE i.RTASTE##ALTERLIKE if CONTROL==0, nolog

margins i.RTASTE#ALTERLIKE

Figure created manually in Excel

Table 3.5, Model 5

logit AWAY i.SOCLOC i.ALTERCLASS PARENTED LOWER WORKING BLACK HISP WHITE i.SOCLOC##i.ALTERCLASS RLIKE RDISLIKE ALTERLIKE RLIKEXALTERLIKE RDISLIKEXALTERDISLIKE FEMALE AGEMID SIMBIN3 if CONTROL==0, nolog
Chapter 4

Table 4, Model 1
logit SIMBIN3R CDISCORD i.SOCLOC MUSBRCEN HB POP MATURE URBAN FOLK2 FEMALE AGEMIDCEN PARENTED LOWER WORKING BLACK HISP WHITE if CONTROL==0, nolog

Table 4, Model 2
logit SIMBIN3R CDISCORD BDISCORD TDISCORD i.SOCLOC MUSBRCEN HB POP MATURE URBAN FOLK2 FEMALE AGEMIDCEN PARENTED LOWER WORKING BLACK HISP WHITE if CONTROL==0, nolog

Table 4, Model 3
logit SIMBIN3R TDISCORDANY i.SIMINFR i.SOCLOC MUSBRCEN HB POP MATURE URBAN FOLK2 FEMALE AGEMIDCEN PARENTED LOWER WORKING BLACK HISP WHITE i.ALTERCLASS ALTERLIKE if CONTROL==0, nolog

Table 4, Model 4
logit SIMBIN3R TDISCORDANY i.SIMINFR i.SOCLOC MUSBRCEN HB POP MATURE URBAN FOLK2 FEMALE AGEMIDCEN PARENTED LOWER WORKING BLACK HISP WHITE i.ALTERCLASS ALTERLIKE i.SOCLOC##i.SIMINFR if CONTROL==0, nolog

Figure 4
margins i.SOCLOC#i.SIMINFR

Figure created manually in Excel
Chapter 5

Table 5, Model 1

logit SIMBIN3R TDISCORDANY i.SIMINFR i.SOCLOC MUSBRCEN HB POP
MATURE URBAN FOLK2 FEMALE AGEMIDCEN PARENTED LOWER
WORKING BLACK HISP WHITE i.ALTERCLASS ALTERLIKE
i.SOCLOC##PARENTED if CONTROL==0, nolog

Figure 5.1

margins i.SOCLOC#PARENTED

Figure created manually in Excel

Table 5, Model 2

logit SIMBIN3R TDISCORDANY i.SIMINFR i.SOCLOC MUSBRCEN HB POP
MATURE URBAN FOLK2 FEMALE AGEMIDCEN PARENTED LOWER
WORKING BLACK HISP WHITE i.ALTERCLASS ALTERLIKE
i.SOCLOC##c.MUSBRCEN if CONTROL==0, nolog

Figure 5.2

margins i.SOCLOC, at (c.MUSBR=(-8(2)12))
marginsplot, noci

Table 5, Model 3

logit SIMBIN3R TDISCORDANY i.SIMINFR i.SOCLOC MUSBRCEN HB POP
MATURE URBAN FOLK2 FEMALE AGEMIDCEN PARENTED LOWER
WORKING BLACK HISP WHITE i.ALTERCLASS ALTERLIKE i.SOCLOC#PARENTED#c.MUSBRCEN if CONTROL==0, nolog

**Figure 5.3**

margins i.SOCLOC#PARENTED, at (c.MUSBR=(8(2)12))
marginsplot, by (PARENTED) noci

**Table 5, Model 4**

logit SIMBIN3R TDISCORDANY i.SOCLOC MUSBRCEN HB POP MATURE URBAN FOLK2 FEMALE AGEMIDCEN PARENTED LOWER WORKING BLACK HISP WHITE i.ALTERCLASS ALTERLIKE i.SOCLOC#c.MUSBRCEN if CONTROL==0, nolog

**Table 5, Model 5**

logit SIMBIN3R TDISCORDANY i.SOCLOC MUSBRCEN HB POP MATURE URBAN FOLK2 FEMALE AGEMIDCEN PARENTED LOWER WORKING BLACK HISP WHITE i.ALTERCLASS ALTERLIKE i.SOCLOC##i.ALTERCLASS if CONTROL==0, nolog

**Figure 5.4**

margins i.SOCLOC#i.ALTERCLASS

Figure created manually in Excel
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