Class cultures or micro-class cultures?

An analysis of literary tastes of occupational groups¹

Mikhail Sokolov, European University at Saint Petersburg, 6/1 Gagarinskaya street, 191187 St. Petersburg, Russia, phone. +7(812)386-7640, e-mail: msokolov@eu.spb.ru

Nadezhda Sokolova, European University at Saint Petersburg, 6/1 Gagarinskaya street, 191187 St. Petersburg, Russia, phone. +7(812)386-7640, e-mail: nsokolova@eu.spb.ru

¹ The authors are deeply indebted to Konstantin Linno, the head of Electronic resources division of the Russian National Library who assisted in downloading the database. We are also grateful to Katerina Guba, Tally Katz-Gerro, Alexandra Makeeva, Taru Lindblom, Karina Pavlisa, Semi Purhonen, Maria Safonova, Tatyana Tretyakova and Anzhelika Tsivinskaya for their comments and suggestions and to Kirsty Kay for proofreading the text.

CLASS CULTURES OR MICRO-CLASS CULTURES?

Class cultures or micro-class cultures? An analysis of literary tastes of occupational groups

Abstract

Looking for differences in tastes of macrosocial units, such as classes or status groups, has been sociology of culture's preoccupation for decades. The recent turn to the study of "micro-classes" (Grusky, 2005) in the sociology of stratification, however, questions the reality of such entities, suggesting rather that individual occupations are the real building blocks of social structures and, by implication, a natural site of differences in lifestyles. There have so far been few attempts in the sociology of culture to disaggregate classes into specific occupations in order to study potential contrasts in their artistic tastes, as this requires extensive datasets usually unavailable from surveys. In this paper, we begin to fill this gap using a dataset from the public library system of a major Russian city. Using information on the literary preferences of 15,470 readers who gave their current employment details, we show that indeed there are striking contrasts between occupational groups, with only a minor part of those existing contrasts captured by the class and socioeconomic status scales having the widest currency (ISEI, Treiman, EGP). We discuss several interpretations of this failure of conventional status schema: (a) inapplicability of socioeconomic status schemata to Russia; (b) the existence of strong micro-class cultures; (c) the presence of "economic" and "cultural" dimensions of status, implicating two different ordering of occupations; and (d) difference between occupational and class mobility, and the role of cultural consumption as a strategy of managing discrepancy between class and occupation.

Keywords

cultural consumption, literary taste, Erving Goffman, stigma, occupations, micro-classes, socioeconomic status scales, Russian culture, occupational stigma

CLASS CULTURES OR MICRO-CLASS CULTURES?

1. Introduction

Searching for correlations between positions in social structure and having certain artistic tastes is a long-term preoccupation of sociology of culture. In the more traditional version of such a search, social structure is represented by “classes”, defined primarily through their income, property and/or market chances (Veblen, 2017[1899]; Goffman, 1951; Gans, 1985). According to this view, wider cultural knowledge and familiarity with legitimate cultural forms serves as an instrument of drawing boundaries between the elites and the less privileged groups, which are lacking in wealth, education, and leisure for appropriation of these forms. Classes, defined through their broad socioeconomic characters, are the natural sites of taste development.

This position is prone to three types of criticism. First, adherents of individualization theories such as Beck or Giddens insisted that the pluralization of lifestyles, affluence and increase in reflexivity, all characteristics of late-modern societies, make the very idea of all-encompassing classes sharing uniform behaviour patterns obsolete (see Rasborg, 2017 for review). Following a certain lifestyle is not determined by membership in any kind of societal groupings; nowadays, everyone can be anyone.

Second, the idea that economic-based classes are the entities with distinctive cultures was criticized by those who believe that status, based on prestige attached to a certain lifestyle, is analytically independent from class, and that status groups, rather than classes, are relevant independent variables that can explain cultural participation (DiMaggio and Mohr, 1985; Chan and Goldthorpe, 2004; Chan and Goldthorpe, 2007). Classes may coincide or correlate with status groups, but they need not. Both those who believe economic-based class looms behind cultural consumption and those who believe in the existence of independent status groups appealed to Bourdieu’s classical works (Flemmen, Jarness and Rosenlund, 2018). In Bourdieu’s early writings, class hierarchy is presented as unidimensional and mostly economics based (e.g. Bourdieu, Darbel and Schnapper, 1997[1966]). Moreover, the mechanisms of formation of habitus discussed in “The Distinction” (Bourdieu, 1984) suggests that it is mostly economic security or lack thereof that stands behind the development of “the sense for distinction”, “cultural good-will” and “taste for necessity”. At the same time, in “The Distinction” Bourdieu introduces the notion of different “factions” of the upper classes: those with a predominance of

CLASS CULTURES OR MICRO-CLASS CULTURES?

cultural capital over economic and vice versa, which may be regarded as a concession to the idea of status autonomy (Atkinson, 2011; Lizardo and Skiles, 2012; Flemmen, Jarness and Rosenlund, 2018).

The relative autonomy of status was the subject of a few empirical studies. Thus, in probably the most extensive research on this topic, John Goldthorpe and his various colleagues defined class membership of a given occupational group through the prevailing character of contracts and derived its position on a status scale from the probability of forming strong social ties (friendship) between its members and members of other occupations (Chan and Goldthorpe, 2004; Bukodi, Dex and Goldthorpe, 2007; see also Bihagen and Lambert, 2018 for recent criticism). They also sought to demonstrate that status, rather than class, influences cultural consumption. Another systematic attempt to capture this imagery of bi-dimensional social space in quantitative research was made in studies that attempted to decompose unidimensional scales, ascribing status to certain occupations into separate “cultural status” and “economic status” scales (DeGraaf, Ganzeboom and Kalmijn, 1989; DeGraaf and Kalmijn, 2001; Kraaycamp, 2002). This promising line of research, however, was largely later abandoned, likely because of a methodological complication: no satisfactory approach was proposed to measure “cultural status” comparable with average salary as a measure of an occupation’s economic status. In an early paper (DeGraaf, Ganzeboom and Kalmijn, 1989), the researchers themselves evaluated “cultural status” of different occupations relying on their expert judgment. But while producing intuitively plausible results, this procedure does not seem entirely reliable. In a later work, “cultural status” was evaluated on the basis of the education level of members of an occupation (DeGraaf and Kalmijn, 2001). This measure, however, produced some results that its authors deemed implausible (e.g. many artistic occupations downgraded to the middle of the cultural status scale as a significant share of their practitioners had no college degree).

In contrast to the first two criticisms voiced against the idea of class cultures – the individualisation thesis and autonomous status thesis - the third criticism has yet to be articulated in cultural consumption studies. It follows logically, however, from recent breakthroughs in sociology of stratification. Both sides in the debate on non-economic based cultural status believe that (1) an individual’s cultural consumption as well as a wide variety of other individual beliefs and behaviours, including political or religious, is determined by his or her occupying a certain position in a wider social space and that (2) this space could be

CLASS CULTURES OR MICRO-CLASS CULTURES?

described as having one (class) or, at most, two (class and status) dimensions. An individual's occupation is usually treated in this line of reasoning as a useful identifier of an individual's position in the social space. This identifier is relevant for research purposes as it is easy to obtain and, at the same time, it is presumably strongly correlated with an individual's membership in macro-social groupings. It can thus serve as a proxy for directly non-observable class or status group membership. Thus the existing class/socioeconomic status scales (the International Socioeconomic Index (ISEI), Donald Treiman's international occupational prestige scale and Erickson-Goldthorpe-Portocarero (EGP) class scale) ascribe class membership to subjects on the basis of their occupations.²

The theorizing based on the premise that belonging to macro-social groupings accounts for a wide range of social behaviours was recently called into question by developments in the sociology of stratification. A few studies sought to undermine the very idea of "big classes" as the building blocks of social structure. In a series of papers, Grusky and his co-authors (Weeden and Grusky, 2004; Grusky, 2005; Weeden and Grusky, 2012) sought to demonstrate that occupations are the true loci of social inequality reproduction. Thus, they argued that it is membership in an occupation rather than any kind of wider entity that is likely to be inherited. Doctors' children are likely to become doctors themselves. If they are not becoming doctors, their chances of getting a middle-class job are not markedly different from that of an average child of their generation. Apparent reproduction of class membership is an epiphenomenon of reproduction of occupational membership.

For Grusky, these findings invite a wider return to the Durkheimian idea of professional groupings as the major form of participation in modern societies (Grusky, 2005). According to this position, nowadays occupations are the carriers of distinctive mores, lifestyles and economic advantages. Occupations achieve high homogeneity among their members due to first, selecting their personnel according to certain criteria, second, socializing it in the course of training, and, third, putting it into conditions of communication closure in which they interact with their kind. Occupations may be aggregated into larger groups on the basis of, say, predominant conditions of labour. However, occupations ascribed to such macro-groups are

² An alternative approach to defining class using income as a proxy is also existing, although it is widely criticized as unable to capture the essence of class position in postindustrial societies (but see Grusky and Weeden, 2012).

CLASS CULTURES OR MICRO-CLASS CULTURES?

likely to be extremely heterogeneous in all respects, except those directly involved in building the typology. Thus, no kind of classes identified according to economic criteria are likely to possess distinctive tastes or ideologies. Grusky gives an example of sociologists and economists, who, while nearly indistinguishable in their labour conditions, types of contract, and the like, are strikingly dissimilar in their politics (Grusky 2005: 21). Rather than a few hierarchically ordered classes, the social structure may consist of a plurality of non-ordered “micro-classes”. Following this line of reasoning, we are led to suggest that specific occupations may be the true possessors of distinctive tastes, with class or status tastes just statistical aggregates from the preferences of occupations falling under this or that category of the stratification schema used by the analyst. Our aim in this paper will be thus to find out if conventionally defined classes possess distinctive cultures or if taste patterns are better described as associated with particular occupations.

Studying cultural consumption patterns of particular professions has so far been impeded by the fact that most studies used surveys that covered insufficient samples for characterizing specific occupations. An important exception is a recent article that used an all-European series of surveys on museum-going to make some observations on arts participation by members of particular occupations (Falk and Katz-Gerro, 2016); the work has indeed found striking contrasts. In this study, we use an information database of the St. Petersburg public library system, bordering on what could be defined as Big Data, which allows us to overcome the obstacles posed by sample limitations. We study the readership profiles of particular occupations in a major Russian city and then order them on the basis of their preference for high- or low-brow literature. Next, we analyse relations between this ordering and those of class and status as mapped in existing stratification schemata. Finally, we proceed to theoretical interpretations of these findings.

2. Data and Measures

2.1. The Dataset

We used an electronic dataset that compiles and stores information on fiction books borrowed by all users in the network of St. Petersburg (Russia) municipal libraries for two years, 2014 and 2015, as well as on readers’ selected attributes: year of birth, education completed, general employment status (e.g. student, unemployed, retired) and occupation. An anonymized

CLASS CULTURES OR MICRO-CLASS CULTURES?

version of the database with readers' personal identifiers removed is available for research purposes, courtesy of the administration of the city's library system.

Overall, the dataset compiled information on books from over 25,000 authors borrowed 2,702,425 times by 254,315 readers. Nearly all readers provided details on gender, age and education, but the field on occupation was not mandatory and only some 15,472 individuals gave details of their occupation when filling out their library card application (6%). While many borrowers who did not were either children, students, unemployed, or retired, the number of currently employed adults who gave no details was approximately 80%. However, those who did and those who did not give details on their occupation showed no significant differences in age, gender and education. In all likelihood, filling this field largely depended on the initiative of the particular librarian responsible for issuing the card, rather than on reader choice. Apparently, some librarians requested that all readers give details of their employment while others allowed or even recommended disregarding the occupation field. With some caution, we could thus use the readers about whom we have information as a random sample of library readers as a whole. Moreover, as we argue elsewhere, the literary preferences of St. Petersburg library users is a relatively undistorted picture of fiction readership in Russia (XXX).³

2.2. The Measures

Due to the library card's mandatory fields, card owner information was available to us on gender (coded as a binary variable), year of birth and education (categories are incomplete secondary, secondary, vocational and higher). We then coded their occupations according to the ISCO-88 4-digit codes, with each subsequent digit corresponding to a level of specificity of the description (e.g. 2 – liberal professions, 23 – education professionals, 233 – primary and pre-school teachers, 2331 – primary school teacher). As library visitors could use whatever professional identification they liked, matching them with standard categories often proved a formidable task. We used a procedure described in Bessudnov (2012). At the first stage, we identified all cases that unambiguously fitted with ISCO 4-digit categories, then tried to identify

³ XXXX marks references to publications that one of the authors co-authored, but not included in a text submitted for peer review.

CLASS CULTURES OR MICRO-CLASS CULTURES?

those not coded at the previous stage at the 3-digit level of generality, and so forth. At the second stage, we merged all four-digit codes with frequencies less than 20 in broader three-digit codes together with the cases we could identify at the three-digit, but not four-digit level, and then repeated the same procedure at the three-digit and two-digit levels. At the next stage, we generated new, broad categories for single-digit codes with frequencies less than 20, combining the remains of 3, 4 and 5 into one category, 3 (“other clerical and service”) and 7 and 8 into 7 (“other qualified manual”). Finally, we added new codes for professional groups not present in ISCO-88: 10001 for “self-employed” (*individual’nyj predprinimatel’*), which could stand for any occupation (from Uber taxi-driver to freelance IT specialist), 11001 for “other non-manual” (including such professions as non-specified “managers”, “organisers” or “consultants”) and 12001 (unspecified manual workers (“*rabochij*”). Finally, we added two new categories for research fellows (*nauchnyj sotrudnik*) and research assistants (*laborant*) not specifying their field of study, as ISCO-88 allowed for classifying them only at a one-digit level of generality while we believed that in many senses they were a uniform group. We also created a special category for teachers of foreign languages, who described themselves in a way that did not allow them to be identified as secondary or university teachers or private tutors (“*prepodavateli inostrannogo yazyka*”). We decided not to put them in the “other teachers” category as they very consistently used this formulation, leading us to suspect that they felt themselves to be a distinct group. As we will see below, indeed they were. Overall, we extracted 75 categories. We were able to ascribe ISEI index scores (see below) using R package “SocialPosition” to 72. We also ascribed codes using Treiman's SIOPS scale and EGP scale using Stata package “isko”. As the Stata package requires four-digit codes in ISCO-88 codifier, we arbitrarily added the digit 0 to the three-digit code, assuming that occupations at a three-digit level are already specific enough to correspond to a point at the status scale.

2.3. The Genre Grouping

Even despite our large dataset, the numbers of readers of all but a few of the most popular writers was not big enough to allow us to compare their consumption by members of different occupations. We thus had to obtain a grouping of authors. Tastes most prominently figuring in studies of cultural consumption are tastes for certain artistic genres, such as detective stories or romance. Such conventional genre groupings are often criticised as excessively coarse and unable to capture emic distinctions made by readers themselves (Atkinson, 2011). The size

CLASS CULTURES OR MICRO-CLASS CULTURES?

of our dataset allowed us to overcome the problem of imposing external categorization for authors by using an automatic grouping. We used a Louvain algorithm detecting communities in network structures to obtain grouping of “natural genres” (originally introduced in Blondel et al., 2008, see Vlegels and Lievens, 2017, for a pioneering application to cultural consumption data). In this paper, we used a genre classification obtained using 2015 dataset (fully reported in XXXX). We chose a cluster solution that identified the seven largest clusters comprising 97.85% of all authors. These clusters were used in the further analysis.

Table 1 presents the names of the clusters, the representative authors belonging to each of them and cluster sizes. The table also provides statistics on their readers’ education and various indicators of the authors’ legitimacy. Cluster 1 consists of books for children (e.g. Tove Janson, Astrid Lindgren and Alexander Milne) and some Russian classics included in the school programme, such as Leo Tolstoy. Our explanation for this similarly odd placement is that while we excluded school age children from our sample, some parents borrowed books for their children, including those required by the school curriculum. Cluster 2 includes modern Russian prose, cluster 3 – Russian action, detective, sci-fi and fantasy, cluster 4 – translated detectives (such as Agatha Christi and James Chase), cluster 5 – translated romance and detective, patronized by women (Nora Roberts, Danielle Steel, Barbara Cartland), cluster 6 – Russian books of a similar romance/detective genre (known in Russia as “ironic detective”), cluster 7 – a diverse group of authors we put under the heading of “international classics”, including Dostoevsky and Remarque alongside Stephen King and Terry Pratchett (all Russian writers in this cluster enjoyed wide international renown, such as Nabokov). The diversity of this list, most popular among younger readers, may serve as an illustration of the spread of omnivorousness in the younger generations of Russians (Peterson, 2005; Zavisca, 2005). Nevertheless, books by authors considered “high-brow” numerically prevail.

CLASS CULTURES OR MICRO-CLASS CULTURES?

Table 1. Seven clusters, their principal representatives, per cent of authors belonging to each, and average values of selected variable for communities

Community name	Most popular representatives	Per cent authors	Per cent HE	School curriculum	Nobel prizes	Russian literary prizes
1. Literature for children - Russian classics	Tolstoy, Pushkin, Chekhov, Gogol, Nosov	17.9%	75.2%	27 30.3%	1 5.9%	2 1.8%
2. Contemporary Russian prose	Rubina, Akunin, Tokareva, Ulitskaya, Prilepin	17.5%	74.1%	8 9.0%	1 5.9%	58 52.3%
3. Russian fantasy / science fiction	Abdullaev, Bushkov, Leonov, Lukjanenko, Kolychev	10.6%	67.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	12 10.8%
4. Translated detectives	Nesbe, Kristi, James, Gerritsen, Granzhe	10.1%	72.8%	2 2.2%	0 0.0%	10 9%
5. Translated romance/ detectives	Roberts, Steel, Brown, Sheldon, Pilcher	9.6%	71.3%	3 3.4%	0 0.0%	2 1.8%
6. Russian romance/ detectives	Marinina, Dontsova, Vil'mont, Ustonova, Litvinova	10.4%	67.6%	3 3.4%	0 0.0%	9 8.1%
7. International classics	Dostoevsky, Remarque, King, Bradbury, Schmidt	23.9%	75.1%	46 51.7%	15 88.2%	18 16.2%
All network		100%	73.2%	89 100%	17 100%	111 100%

The table's next columns present some evidence on the legitimacy or brow-level of authors belonging to each group. There are two conceptual approaches to measurement of legitimacy. One approach suggests using share of readers with university diplomas as an estimate of an author's legitimacy (Bryson, 1996; Warde and Gayo-Cal, 2007: 150; Warde and Gayo-Cal, 2009: 123; Warde 2011). The second approach associates legitimacy with the

CLASS CULTURES OR MICRO-CLASS CULTURES?

institutional recognition an author receives, including literary prizes and inclusion into a school curriculum (DiMaggio and Muktar, 2004). We employed both approaches. We calculated for each cluster (1) the average share of individuals with university diplomas among readers of each of the authors belonging to this cluster; (2) the number of authors approved by the Russian State Education Standard (*Gosstandart*) for study in secondary school; (3) the number of Nobel prize winners in literature; and (4) the number of winners of 46 Russian literary prizes.⁴ The results are quite consistent and show an easily interpretable picture. While readers with higher education diplomas prevail in audiences of all clusters, clusters 1, 2 and 7 have a significantly higher share of university educated readers than clusters 3, 5 and 6. Authors winning Russian literary prizes concentrate among the authors belonging to cluster 2, and authors winning Nobel prizes in literature are nearly exclusively found in cluster 7. Finally, most *Gosstandart* authors were found in cluster 1. Overall, clusters 3, 5 and 6 are plausible candidates for low-brow status and clusters 1, 2 and 7 – for high-brow status. Translated detectives (cluster 4) fall in between.

3. Results

As a first step, we used multidimensional scaling to spatially represent the relations between tastes of our groups. Figure 1 depicts the solution based on affinities between our

⁴ The authors thank Ksenia Ovadenko for providing the list of prize-winners.

CLASS CULTURES OR MICRO-CLASS CULTURES?

occupational groups and preferences for authors belonging to clusters 2-7.⁵

Figure 1.⁶ A multi-dimensional scaling of tastes by 75 occupational groups, PROXCAL

Figure 1 offers us an easily interpretable picture: on the right, one sees mostly creative professionals, like writers, journalists, actors or designers while on the left, we find manual workers and clerical occupations. The second dimension opposes predominantly male occupations (manual workers, IT specialists) to predominantly female occupations (accountant,

⁵ Using all seven clusters produced several outliers, particularly pre-school teachers and a rudimentary category of “other educators”, including all those who identified themselves as “pedagogues” or “educators” (*prepodavатели*) as well as teachers at music schools, school librarians and teachers from schools for children with Special Educational Needs (SEN). What makes these categories special is a very high percent of cluster 1 (books for children) literature, which they probably borrow to complement what is lacking at their institutions and thus they are using the municipal libraries for work-related, rather than personal, purposes. If we exclude cluster 1, the anomalies disappear.

⁶ PROXCAL, distances calculated from counts using Chi-square measures, simple normalized stress for 2-dimensional solution 0.0732.

CLASS CULTURES OR MICRO-CLASS CULTURES?

nurse, school teacher, economist⁷). What seems anomalous, however, is that occupations on the right, falling under Pierre Bourdieu's category of "high cultural, low economic capital" creative professions, are mixed with occupations usually regarded as far removed from the cultural elites: market analysts, office managers and waiters (which incidentally is the group with the highest percent of readers of cluster 7 [international classics] books). Moreover, some of the occupations with members usually regarded as typical "professionals", such as doctors, are found far on the left together with some unqualified manual occupations, such as cleaners.

Studying demographic profiles of a particular occupation helps to explain some of these anomalies. Thus, the waiters' highest scores for cluster 7 might be explained by the fact that waiters were on average 21.6 years old and were mostly students working part-time. In contrast to what can be observed in many European cases (Falk and Katz-Gerro, 2016), younger people in Russia are the most eager to consume what is considered "high culture" (XXXX). This result probably explains why high-brow cluster 7 is overrepresented in the cultural consumption of occupations in which younger people are concentrated.

However, while age and generational effects may explain some differences between occupations, they do not explain them all. To sort out demographic effects, we calculated a logistic regression with occupation, age and gender as independent variables and the fact of borrowing books belonging to a given cluster as the dependent one. We also included education to isolate the effects of being employed in a particular occupation from those of belonging to a more general educated group. Finally, we also added the total number of genres as an independent variable to account for the fact that some categories of individuals could have been more omnivorous than others. The results seem quite straightforward (Table 2, models 1–7, corresponding to clusters 1–7).

Table 2. Logistic regression coefficients for seven clusters and general preference for high-brow literature

⁷ Most library users identifying themselves as "economists" are probably administrative economists or planning engineers at public enterprises rather than academic economists, as the former group is much more numerous in Russia.

CLASS CULTURES OR MICRO-CLASS CULTURES?

	Model 1, Books for children	Model 2, contemporary	Model 3, Russian fantasy/mystery	Model 4, international mystery	Model 5, international	Model 6, Russian romance	Model 7, international classics	Model 8, high-brow vs low-brow
Gender (female)	1.213** *	.860*	.370** *	.892	1.735* **	1.810* **	.990	1.048
Age	.985***	1.017* *	1.002	1.003	1.000	1.032* **	.971** *	1.000
Education (vocational)	1.129	.872	.898	.988	1.148	1.167	.834*	.932
Education (higher)	1.188*	1.074	.674** *	1.074	1.071	.702**	1.274* *	.980
Occupation								
other professional	1.017	.467	.438	.982	1.292	1.371	2.060	2.067*
other clerical and service	1.032	.802	.831	1.588*	1.199	.574**	1.557* *	1.718
other skilled manual	.841	.986	.961	1.788*	1.111	.836	1.088	1.000
unskilled manual	1.047	1.172	.841	1.019	1.061	.536*	1.803*	1.540
senior manager	1.562**	.863	.503**	1.101	1.047	.681	1.547*	2.153
building worker	.898	.790	1.257	1.958*	1.204	.744	.867	.788
mechanic	1.020	.802	.951	1.344	1.348	.761	1.135	.893
military and police	.926	.446*	1.018	1.701	1.246	1.172	1.267	.700
IT professional	1.216	.596	.945	2.071*	.450*	1.140	1.305	1.575*
engineer	1.030	.840	.787	1.586*	1.152	.770	1.261	1.594* **
doctor	1.184	.870	.684*	1.502*	1.281	.745	1.087	1.322*
higher education teacher	1.231	1.162	.477*	1.380	.759	.569*	2.206* *	2.211* **
school teacher	1.605*	.947	.738	.987	.905	.758	1.120	2.122* **

CLASS CULTURES OR MICRO-CLASS CULTURES?

pre-school teacher	3.032**	.585**	.809	.939	.939	.848	.625*	1.792* **
special needs teacher	1.539	.492	.956	.540	.990	1.573	.733	1.658
other educator	3.876** *	.687*	.418** *	1.162	.801	.430** *	.964	3.808* **
humanities professional	1.178	.885	.533	1.751	1.452	.361*	2.523*	1.842*
writer	1.374	.909	.452** *	1.631	.785	.499**	2.010* *	2.185* **
other health associate prof	.875	.560	.974	1.605	1.156	1.115	1.343	1.304
financial associate prof	.877	.817	.727	5.719* **	1.020	.548	1.009	1.547
secretary	.929	.839	.643	1.538	1.261	.468*	2.263* *	2.489* **
postal clerk	.836	.985	.389	1.875	2.569	.735	1.005	.977
bank cashier	1.089	.560	.916	1.822	1.978	.580	.762	.971
security service	.962	.507**	1.195	1.603*	1.048	.873	1.177	.824
seamstress	1.027	.492	1.313	1.928	1.690	.551	.982	1.170
locomotive driver	1.245	.729	.797	.828	1.401	.412	3.010*	3.360*
car driver	1.412	.822	.871	1.383	.822	.723	1.136	.900
cleaner	1.597*	.518*	.765	1.288	1.158	.936	1.297	.980
architect	1.369	1.327	.534	1.483	.987	.491	1.622	1.163
pharmacist	1.921	.320*	1.026	2.146	.848	.660	1.163	1.059
foreign language teacher	1.125	1.019	.390	1.109	1.443	.372*	2.944*	9.075* **
education methods specialist	1.026	.737	.581	1.087	1.323	.620	2.391*	2.089*
accountant	1.331	.874	.811	1.169	1.264	.544	1.317	1.905*
market analyst	1.520	.901	.527	1.183	.808	.743	1.729	3.894* **

CLASS CULTURES OR MICRO-CLASS CULTURES?

lawyer	1.563*	.754	.635*	1.407	.903	.739	1.260	2.439* **
museum curator	1.348	.848	.662	1.367	1.025	1.034	1.011	1.403
librarian	2.281*	.416*	.329**	1.168	1.212	.663	2.852	7.570* **
economist	1.055	.907	.706	1.480	1.051	1.018	1.020	1.836* **
interpreter	.983	1.672*	.374**	1.370	1.097	.448	2.021*	3.058* **
psychologist	1.586	1.245	.607	.790	.740	.609	1.326	3.467* **
social worker	1.164	1.311	.872	1.716	1.214	.406**	.891	1.658*
journalist	1.263	1.756*	.561*	1.955*	.612	.219	2.038* *	2.905* **
artist	1.542	.607	.538	1.524	1.003	.407*	2.506* *	2.468*
actor	3.318**	1.643	.192**	.179	.923	.186*	1.733	7.264* **
researcher	1.153	.891	.618	2.109* *	.693	.384**	2.330* *	2.452* **
research assistant	1.584	1.147	.333**	.986	.821	.546	1.888*	2.779* **
image recording operator	.939	1.017	.642	.874	1.110	.382	2.910*	2.265*
nurse	1.210	.978	.756	1.152	1.564	.604	1.059	1.038
pre-primary education assoc	4.429**	.238*	.710	1.161	1.447	.614	.757	1.245
real estate agent	.835	1.329	.396	1.057	.739	.671	4.064*	2.774*
sales representative	1.435	.554	.957	1.440	1.255	.450	1.391	2.484* *

CLASS CULTURES OR MICRO-CLASS CULTURES?

labour contractor	.977	.973	.346*	2.892* *	1.027	.760	2.078	1.349
other broker	1.108	1.040	.766	.503	1.110	.572	2.528*	3.587* *
office manager	1.185	.935	.682	1.651	1.221	.219*	2.504*	2.289*
designer	1.106	1.477	.737	.892	.617	.425*	2.308	4.651* **
sports and yoga instructor	.868	1.799	.809	.806	1.324	.692	1.086	3.478* *
accounting clerk	1.482**	.715*	.797	1.011	1.200	.732	1.128	1.454* *
stock clerk	1.158	.726	.782	.957	1.584	1.030	1.278	.919
production clerk	1.023	.590	.798	1.775	.844	.639	2.238	1.541
library clerk	1.691**	1.300	.583**	.943	.970	.607	1.368	2.224* **
cashier	1.196	.491*	1.099	1.730	1.883	.727	.841	1.122
guide	1.278	1.457	.445*	1.298	.851	.282	2.265	4.397* **
cook	.934	.466*	.810	1.529	2.206	1.116	.940	1.009
waiter	.933	.636	.453	1.401	.992	1.056	2.366	3.284* **
care worker	1.576	1.247	.290*	1.123	.953	1.364	1.018	.751
hairdresser	.686	1.097	.875	1.102	1.834	1.241	.847	.898
salesperson	1.158	.570**	.712	1.452	1.741	.756	1.125	1.099
painter	.600	1.500	1.824	1.736	1.102	.262	1.386	1.000
baker	.891	.926	.486	.864	1.038	1.730	1.389	.783
building caretaker	1.030	.431	.744	2.539	.757	.597	1.868	1.031
deliverer	1.213	.491	.734	2.431*	.957	.862	1.637	1.410
doorkeeper	.701	.515	.742	1.216	1.492	.969	1.779	.605
self-employed	1.538*	.759	.510**	1.297	1.244	.712	1.281	2.053* **

CLASS CULTURES OR MICRO-CLASS CULTURES?

non-specified non-manual	1.159	.901	.648**	1.623* *	1.063	.548	1.531	2.063* **
Sum of genres	1.493** *	2.687* **	2.436* **	2.919* **	2.732* **	2.441* **	2.713* **	.982
-2Log Likelihood	18937.6	14401.2	12447.8	11059.6	11096.9	11731.5	14259.7	18142.3
Cox PseudoR²	.122	.349	.322	.366	.345	.344	.275	.042

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

Not surprisingly, the total number of genres a library user has ever borrowed is the most powerful predictor of borrowing books belonging to any particular genre. Even controlling for this factor, and others held constant, women have higher odds of borrowing children's books/school classics (cluster 1) or various romance (clusters 5 and 6) and significantly lower odds of taking home contemporary Russian prose (cluster 2), fantasy/science fiction or action/detectives (cluster 3). Confirming our suggestion that reading for purposes of self-cultivation is more salient among younger people, senior readers are less likely to borrow international classics, but more likely to borrow books by Darya Dontsova, along with other writers of the Russian-language "ironic detective" genre, whose books are widely referred to in Russia as prototypical examples of low-brow taste. On the other hand, there is a marked decline in the popularity of contemporary Russian (cluster 2) prose in younger generations. Education increases the probability of borrowing books from cluster 1 (Russian classics) and cluster 7 (international classics) but decreases the likelihood of reading Russian fantasy/science fiction and Russian romance.

Even after accounting for all these effects, we find out that different occupations strongly favour different clusters. In general, the evidence corroborates findings obtained with multidimensional scaling. Most creative professions (actors, journalists, humanities specialists (historians, philologists), higher education teachers) are among the most eager consumers of high-brow cluster 7, but also clusters 1 and 2. They eschew low-brow clusters 3 (Russian fantasy / mystery) and 6 (Russian romance / detectives). They are joined in this pattern, however, by a few occupations, such as administrative secretaries, office managers, city guides, and real estate agents, which are usually not regarded as occupations associated with possessing larger volumes of cultural capital.

CLASS CULTURES OR MICRO-CLASS CULTURES?

Based on these insights, we calculated for each individual a share of high-brow authors (clusters 1, 2 and 7) among all authors s/he borrowed. Then we calculated a binary variable assigning value 1 to all who borrowed more than half of the high-brow books, and 0 to those for whom the value was 0.5 or less. The last (eighth) model in Table 2 regresses this variable on the same set of independent variables. In this regression, all factors, except occupation, prove insignificant. The variance explained by the model thus goes down. However, contrasts between occupations persist. We used an odd's ratios obtained in this regression as values at a scale of "brow level" for each respective group, treating it thus as a measure of "cultural status" (DeGraaf and Kalmijn, 2001).

Having obtained the "brow scale" for occupations, we can proceed to address the main subject of this paper: the relations between the "brow level" of occupations and their localization within conventional socioeconomic status divisions. To explore this relation, we turned to class and status scales with the greatest currency: the International Socioeconomic Index (ISEI), Donald Treiman's international occupational prestige scale and the Erickson-Goldthorpe-Portocarero (EGP) class scale. While each represents the major competing approaches to understanding and measuring status (Ganzeboom et al., 1992; Weeden and Grusky, 2012) they all share the general tactics of deriving the positions of individuals from their occupations. EGP ascribes occupations to categorical classes using the prevailing terms of contract. ISEI is a continuous index, constructed from measures of education and income, which presumably captures the single major dimension of socio-economic inequality (Ganzeboom et al., 1992). And, Treiman's scale is based on prestige evaluations of occupations. Of the major approaches to measuring status, we could not obtain only a relational status scale similar to the one used by Chan and Goldthorpe to measure status as distinct from class (Chan and Goldthorpe, 2004). Research in this direction was carried out in Russia by Alexey Bessudnov (2012), but Bessudnov was able to obtain status scores for only 34 professional groups because of the limited size of samples. He demonstrated, however, that status defined according to Goldthorpe is strongly (at 0.9 level) correlated with ISEI and Treiman's prestige measures. Groups situated at the poles of status scales are unlikely to establish any kinds of long-lasting social bonds.

CLASS CULTURES OR MICRO-CLASS CULTURES?

Does the class or socioeconomic status of occupations define their cultural consumption patterns? Table 3 presents Spearman's correlations between these measures and our "brow level" scale for 75 occupations.

Table 3. Spearman's Rho correlations between an occupation's scores at the "brow-scale" and its position at major status scales

	Brow Scale	ISEI	TREIMAN	EGP
Brow Scale	1	,469**	,450**	-,485**
N	75	72	64	65
ISEI	,469**	1	,922**	-,932**
N	72	72	64	64
TREIMAN	,450**	,922**	1	-,921**
N	64	64	64	64
EGP	-,485**	-,932**	-,921**	1
N	65	64	64	65

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

While correlations between our brow scale and measures of status are moderately strong, they are much less so than between established scales of status themselves, never reaching 0.5 level. This in of itself demonstrates that cultural consumption is not a strong correlate of socioeconomic status or class membership, conventionally measured. To accumulate further evidence, we calculated a logistic regression with preference for high- or low-brow literature as a dependent variable (Table 4).

Table 4. Logistic regression of preference for high-brow literature on demographic variables and major status scales

	Model 1 (ISEI)	Model 2 (Treiman)	Model 3 (EGP)
Gender(male)	1,282***	1,186**	1,123

CLASS CULTURES OR MICRO-CLASS CULTURES?

Age	1,004	0,999	1
Education (vocational)	0,946	0,878	0,858
Education (higher)	1,347*	1,102	1,01
Sum of genres	0,946***	0,939***	0,945
ISEI	1,009***		
Treiman		1,012***	
EGP lower controllers			0,986
EGP routine non-manual			0,655***
EGP self- employed			0,924
EGP skilled manual			0,486***
EGP unskilled manual			0,461***
N	11855	9940	10094
-2 Log Likelihood	18638,54	12081,18	12218,12
Cox PseudoR²	0,010	0,016	0,021
-2 Log Likelihood for Occupations	14219,01	11621,75	11909,21
Cox PseudoR² for Occupations	0,050	0,051	0,050

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

Overall, we do find significant connections between measures of status on the one hand, and tendency to have high-brow tastes, on the other, but they are rather weak; thus, the

CLASS CULTURES OR MICRO-CLASS CULTURES?

model suggests that the occupations receiving the highest grades at the ISEI (doctors and lawyers - 85) scale have odds of becoming readers of high-brow literature just 84% greater than those who have the lowest score (cleaners - 16). Treiman's scale gives a slightly better result (96%), but even here the odd's ratio for highest- and lowest- scoring occupation remains under two. Note that differences are times greater for occupations in our Table 1. Thus, the odds of reading high-brow, rather than low-brow, literature are 15 times greater for foreign language teachers than for doorkeepers. The EGP scale shows some evidence of difference between classes i and ii (managers and liberal professionals) and routine non-manual and manual occupations, although not between i and iv (self-employed) and no contrast is great. The last two lines in the table give model parameters for regressions in which class and status scales were replaced with a categorical variable consisting of specific occupations (calculated for the same sample of cases). We find everywhere a significant improvement in the model parameters.

The next Figure 3 visualizes the relations between socioeconomic status of occupations measured by ISEI and their position at the "brow scale" (odd's ratios were logged).

CLASS CULTURES OR MICRO-CLASS CULTURES?

Figure 2. Position of 75 occupations on axes of “brow level” and the International socio-economic status (ISEI) scale

We observe a shape similar to one described in DeGraaf, Ganzeboom and Kalmijn (1989): while low-status occupations have nearly invariably low cultural resources, those in the middle or on the top of the status scale vary greatly in their preferences. Some of the highest-status occupations (doctors, pharmacists, architects) do not differ much from the lowest-status ones (cleaners) and fall far beyond middle-status occupations such as city guides. While overall the correlation between socioeconomic status and cultural consumption exists, privileged groups are extremely heterogeneous, and it hardly makes any sense to speak of tastes as marking their boundaries.

Discussion

This study’s most important empirical finding is that occupations differ dramatically in the cultural consumption patterns of their members, and these differences are rather poorly captured by their usual grouping into categorical classes or ascription to a position on socioeconomic status scales. At the same time, our findings do not corroborate the vision of a

CLASS CULTURES OR MICRO-CLASS CULTURES?

fully individualized society in which one's lifestyle is completely a matter of choice. Indeed, occupational categories do differ in their cultural consumption choices. However, the ordering of occupations based on their literary tastes does not fit conventional class or status hierarchies.

How can the pattern we observe be accounted for? In the rest of this paper we will discuss four possible explanations: (1) inapplicability of international status scale to Russia; (2) existence of strong micro-class cultures; (3) parallel co-existence of "economic" and "cultural" statuses; and (4) difference between occupational and class mobility and the role of cultural consumption as a means of managing occupational stigma. We will discuss the fourth possible explanation to a much greater extent as we believe that it offers the best insight into the formation of occupational tastes.

The first explanation suggests that the highest-status occupational groups in Russia are not the same as in other countries; it might be that international status scales just ascribe wrong scores to occupations in Russia. A high correlation between ordering of occupations based on their socioeconomic status and their position at "brow scale" thus exists, but we do not see it because we use the wrong socioeconomic status ordering. While this explanation is not implausible, there is little evidence to support it. Studies directly aimed at evaluating the validity of international occupational prestige and status scales for studying Russia have reported a reasonable degree of accuracy (see survey in Bessudnov, 2012). While Russia's social structure may be peculiar, this peculiarity does not seem to touch too much on occupational status. And, indeed, no description of Russian stratification we are aware of proposes a status scheme ascribing highest-status positions to foreign language teachers and librarians.

The second explanation is the one which Grusky's theorizing on micro-classes suggested: rather than an element of class taste, literary preferences are characteristic of micro-class cultures. According to criteria Grusky puts forward (2005; Weedan and Grusky, 2012), the Russian society is probably a fertile ground for development of micro-classes. The Russian education system since Soviet times is strongly segmented with specialized institutions preparing students for different occupations (e.g. specific medical, pedagogic or economic universities). Occupational dynasties with children inheriting the trade of their parents were glorified in Soviet propaganda and are still widely looked at with approval. Finally, the importance of personal connections in individual careers meant that individuals often choose to follow in the footsteps of their parents

CLASS CULTURES OR MICRO-CLASS CULTURES?

using their professional networks to, first, enter a university passing highly corrupt admissions and, second, find a job after graduation. However, while the vision of society as an assemblage of non-ordered micro-classes can explain such anomalies as doctors' low-brow preferences, it runs into difficulties in dealing with the fact that some of the most peculiar taste patterns are demonstrated by groups which, according to Grusky's criteria, are the least likely to develop strong micro-class cultures. Thus, waiters or city guides are transitory occupations without stable personnel, are not relying on extensive training and their practitioners work in spatial isolation from each other. It is not at all clear how they could have managed to inculcate high-brow tastes in their personnel.

The third explanation points to the existence of autonomous "cultural status" not captured by the prevailing scales. This signals the turn to the neo-Bourdieuian idea that cultural capital is likely to be used for drawing boundaries primarily between factions of the upper classes (cf. Holt, 1997; Lizardo and Skiles, 2012). But while the general idea of cultural capital demarcating intra-class boundaries fits well with our data, the specific character of the "factions" is far from what "The Distinction" and its modern interpreters suggest. Some occupations one can expect to find among most active cultural consumers, such as school teachers (with the notable exception of foreign language teachers) and architects, in fact do not differ much from manual workers in the tastes they manifest while waiters, market analysts, sport and yoga trainers or real estate agents demonstrate tastes much closer to those of actors or writers, even with age and education controlled.

The fourth possible explanation introduces the difference between class and occupational mobility, and calls into question the whole practice of sorting individuals into micro-classes on the basis of their occupational membership alone. According to this explanation, while classes are undoubtedly correlated with occupations, the correlation is far from perfect. Under many circumstances, individuals may find themselves in occupations incongruous with other attributes, locating them in the stratification system (patterns of social ties, property, learning, lifestyle, self-identification). While occupational mobility probably often precedes an individual's class mobility, a discrepancy may persist. The argument here is that seeming anomalies in literary tastes of certain occupational groups can be largely explained by the positions of these occupations in the logistics of social mobility flows (Coulangeon, 2015).

CLASS CULTURES OR MICRO-CLASS CULTURES?

A discussion of what happens when a discrepancy between one's occupational and class membership emerges can be found in Erving Goffman's classical treatment of stigma (Goffman, 1963). Stigma is widely used to refer to any kind of undesirable social attribute (McPhelan and Link, 2001), although Goffman insisted that he uses the word in a more specific sense – as a reference to an attribute that is unexpected in a member of a category to which an individual belongs and makes this individual in some sense worse than s/he would be if s/he possessed the expected or “normal” attribute. In the society Goffman was writing about, being a black or female member of a middle-class occupation like doctor would be a stigma (Hughes, 1958). Thus, stigma points to relations between a category and an attribute, rather than to properties of an attribute as such (thus, in the same society, being female would be considered a “normal” attribute for a nurse), although some attributes are usually considered stigmatizing for nearly any category of persons (e.g. being a heroin addict). An interesting corollary of this reasoning, which Goffman mentions in passing (p.3), is that such an “abnormal” attribute need not be degrading. Indeed, a kind of attribute opposite to stigma must exist: they are unexpected but make individuals better in the eyes of the audience than normal members of the respective category. Goffman did not give a name to such attributes. One can call them, however unimaginatively, *distinctions*.⁸

Now we can think of class as a category and of occupation as an attribute and of cultural consumption as an additional attribute used by individuals to manage the esteem based on the former two. Occupations may be stigmas as well as distinctions.⁹ If an occupation is a distinction for an individual, the individual will do his/her best to provide evidence that s/he is a member of the occupation in good standing. If an occupation is a stigma, s/he will attempt to provide evidence that could amend esteem based on it. There are at least three ways in which occupation-based evaluations could be modified. First, additional evidence may specify or even redefine the motives that lead individuals to a certain occupation. Second, it may redefine

⁸ For a sociologist, being a chess grandmaster or making a living as a jazz musician would be a distinction, as this is something unexpected in an ordinary academic, and also in a way raises the individual above others. Consumption of high culture is in many senses a prototypical distinction: at least in Russia, being an expert in highly legitimate art is something that is no way universal, but widely valued, and could serve as a badge of honour for a member of nearly any category (XXXX).

⁹ On “occupational stigma” see Ashforth and Kreiner, 1999; Ashforth and Kreiner, 2014; Meisenbach, 2010.

CLASS CULTURES OR MICRO-CLASS CULTURES?

individuals' relationships with their present occupation, say, stressing that it is likely to be only transitory. Third, individuals may manage impressions of the occupation itself.

On the one hand, a wider list of attributes of an individual allows imputing motives behind picking an occupation. Was failing at another occupation the reason for choosing a particular job, or was it chosen because it reflected an individual's inner calling? In the latter case, an occupational choice may render admiration and envy, even if an occupation is not generally considered particularly desirable. The job of a lighthouse keeper may be not high-status in of itself, however, an Einstein-type voluntarily choosing to live a life of undisturbed meditation is likely to be earnestly admired (and envied) by armies of academics struggling with deadlines, indifferent students and university bureaucrats. On the other hand, an occupation may be changed, and some positions are well known to be transitory. Thus, other attributes of an individual provide grounds for inferring what an individual's chances of shifting to a new job are and what this next job will be. Thus, evidence of having broader intellectual horizons and wider interests, particularly among younger individuals, may be interpreted as a sign that an individual's present undesirable employment is just a temporary stage before stepping toward a much more desirable one. Finally, some occupations are not particularly familiar to most people who may just wonder to what category they belong, what qualities it requires to join and what the remuneration is likely to be. Relatively small and newer occupations are particularly likely to be ones without any stable public image. Their members may count on being the only representatives of their occupation that their acquaintances have ever met, and thus hope that the impression of them could alter the impression of their occupation, rather than vice versa. Our hypothesis about the differences between "brow levels" of occupational groups is that they emerge from attempts by their members to redefine their relation to a given occupation or even modify the perception of the occupation itself in all these ways.

Looking now back at the list of the occupations most eagerly involved in consumption of high culture, we may speculate about the reasons making their tastes more or less high-brow. We find in our list, first, occupations immediately involved in production and reproduction of literary texts as such (actors, writers, journalists), which are usually described as "creative" and generally perceived as desirable. For them, arguably, cultural capital, particularly those related to literary tastes and skills, is bordering on human capital involved in fulfilment of professional tasks (cf. DeGraaf et al., 2000), and evidence of consuming high culture may be treated as a sign

CLASS CULTURES OR MICRO-CLASS CULTURES?

of professional fitness. In addition, dedication to high culture on their part leaves little doubt that their choice of occupation expresses their deepest inner leanings.

Second, we find among the most eager consumers of culture occupations, which are in different ways instrumental in translating cultural values, regarded as economically insecure and not particularly desirable. Indeed, some of the occupations receiving higher scores at our brow scale are those known as serving as either side-jobs (city guides) or last resorts (librarians) for struggling intellectuals in Russia. The case of librarians is instructive here. For the low-paid position of librarian, reading a lot provides evidence that they could have chosen a life surrounded by books voluntarily, despite the financial hardships, rather than as a last resort against unemployment.

Third, we find a few occupations not directly associated with the production or distribution of cultural values but likely to be transitory or temporary occupations for aspirant members of economic and cultural elites. Thus, waiters are usually recruited from students and an office manager or a secretary is likely to be the first job a recent graduate can find. Not prestigious in of themselves, and not regarded as a life-long vocation, such occupations favour the appropriation of cultural goods that may become an important part of one's identity and serve as a sign that an individual does not really fit his/her present position and is likely to move to a more desirable one. Another occupation gravitating toward this group is foreign language teachers. Most people who described themselves this way while filling a library card were probably working at public secondary schools. However, in contrast to other school teachers, they could relatively easily leave their employment and work as language teachers at higher education institutions, private tutors or as interpreters. Their preference for a generic term covering most of these occupations (*prepodavатели*), rather than a more specific one pointing specifically to secondary school teachers (*uchitel'ia*), is telling. Their literary preferences may also be interpreted as evidence of the same striving to distance themselves from the less desirable category of school teachers.

Fourth, we find here some newer occupations absent in the Soviet planned economy, which thus are mostly comprised of younger personnel and many of which are still rather unfamiliar to most Russians (real-estate agents, market analysts). One can therefore wonder whether a PR manager is closer to a writer and is a form of creative occupation, or she is

CLASS CULTURES OR MICRO-CLASS CULTURES?

occupying an essentially clerical job. Here one may hope to redefine the character of occupation in the eyes of one's immediate audience by demonstrating higher cultural leanings.¹⁰

The interpretation presenting differences in tastes of occupational categories as an outcome of their members' managing occupational stigma (or fostering occupational distinction) recognizes, counter to Grusky, that entities broader than individual occupations still exist. At the same time, relevant social macro-categories seem more specific than broad "classes" or even "class factions". As far as readership is concerned, occupations, which invariably inculcate high-brow preferences in their practitioners, are those requiring working with texts as a part of their job assignments. This interpretation brings important amendments to our understanding of "factions" in the upper class. While occupations are probably divided into groups on the basis of cultural resources required to practice them, these resources may be more specific than the notion of generalized cultural capital lead us to believe. Thus, it seems that members of occupations considered "creative", but not directly working with texts such as architects feel less pressure to comply with the canons of high-brow taste. There might be, therefore, many more than one faction in the culturally rich elite, as an older work on *situses* suggested (More and Suchner, 1976).

The status of cultural consumption as a resource for managing occupational stigma explains difficulties in correlating cultural consumption with other stratification divisions. Ironically, established professional occupations in which individuals are likely to spend the whole of their career, and regarded as important and intellectually taxing but not directly related to any form of artistic production, probably discourage their members from investing too heavily in cultural pursuits (doctors, engineers, scientists). At the same time, in addition to creative occupations immediately involved in textual production, a significant number of members from other occupations for various and probably conflicting reasons choose to attempt to comply to the ideal of a cultured person. If our considerations of the role of occupational stigma are correct, many of them are doing so precisely because this is *not* expected from those in their trade. For some, thus, cultural consumption serves as an expression of their living up to what is expected from members of their occupation, for others it

¹⁰ The recently emerging and transitory occupations are also characterized by younger personnel, which, for the reasons previously mentioned, probably create a corporate culture that favors cultural investments.

CLASS CULTURES OR MICRO-CLASS CULTURES?

creates a role distance (Goffman, 1961; Pyysiäinen and Ryyänen, 2018) between themselves and their current place in the division of labour. Somewhat paradoxically, one cannot expect an ideal correlation between cultural consumption and other dimensions of social hierarchy, including those based on training and professional expertise (education, intellectual labour), precisely because cultural consumption may serve as a means of re-defining the position of an individual within these dimensions.

References

1. Ashforth, B. E., & Kreiner, G. E. (1999). "How can you do it?": Dirty work and the challenge of constructing a positive identity. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(3), 413-434.
2. Ashforth, Blake E., and Glen E. Kreiner. (2014) Dirty work and dirtier work: Differences in countering physical, social, and moral stigma. *Management and Organization Review* 10(1): 81-108.
3. Atkinson, W. (2011). The context and genesis of musical tastes: Omnivorousness debunked, Bourdieu buttressed. *Poetics*, 39(3), 169–86. doi: 10.1016/j.poetic.2011.03.002.
4. Bessudnov A (2012). A Relational Occupational Scale for Russia. In: B.Blackburn, R.Connelly, V.Gayle and P.Lambert (eds) *Social Stratification: Trends and Processes*. Farnham: Ashgate, pp. 53-68.
5. Bihagen, E., & Lambert, P. (2018). Can class and status really be disentangled?. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 58, 1-10.
6. Bourdieu P (1984). *Distinction: The Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. London: Routledge/Kegan Paul.
7. Bourdieu, P., Darbel, A., & Schnapper, D. (1997 [1966]). *The love of art: European art museums and their public*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

CLASS CULTURES OR MICRO-CLASS CULTURES?

8. Bukodi E, Dex S, Goldthorpe JH (2011) The Conceptualisation and Measurement of Occupational Hierarchies: a Review, a Proposal and some Illustrative Analyses, *Quality & Quantity* 45(3): 623-39.
9. Bukodi E (2007) Social Stratification and Cultural Consumption in Hungary: Book Readership, *Poetics* 35(2-3): 112-31
10. Bryson B (1996). Anything but Heavy Metal: Symbolic Exclusion and Musical Dislikes, *American Sociological Review*, 61(5): 884-99.
11. Chan TW and Goldthorpe JH (2004) Is there a Status Order in Contemporary British Society? Evidence from the Occupational Structure of Friendship, *European Sociological Review*, 20(5): 383-401.
12. Chan TW and Goldthorpe JH (2007) Social Stratification and Cultural Consumption: Music in England. *European Sociological Review* 23(1): 1-19. doi: 10.1093/esr/jc1016.
13. Coulangeon, P. (2015). Social mobility and musical tastes: A reappraisal of the social meaning of taste eclecticism. *Poetics*, 51, 54-68.
14. de Graaf, P. M., Ganzeboom, H. B. G., & Kalmijn, M. (1989). Cultural and economic dimensions of occupational status. In W. Jansen, J. Dronkers, & K. Verrips (Eds.), *Similar or different?: Continuities in Dutch research on social stratification and social mobility* (pp. 53-74). (SISWO publication; No. 338). Amsterdam: SISWO.
15. De Graaf, P. M., & Kalmijn, M. (2001). Trends in the intergenerational transmission of cultural and economic status. *Acta Sociologica*, 44(1), 51-66.
16. DiMaggio P and Mohr J (1985) Cultural Capital, Educational Attainment, and Marital Selection, *American Journal of Sociology* 90(6): 1231-61. doi: 10.1086/228209.
17. DiMaggio P and Mukhtar T (2004) Arts Participation as Cultural Capital in the United States, 1982–2002: Signs of Decline?, *Poetics* 32(2): 169–94.

CLASS CULTURES OR MICRO-CLASS CULTURES?

18. Dubin B & Zorkaya, N. (2005) Knigi v segodniazhnej Rossii: vypusk, rasprostranenie, chtenie. [Books in present-day Russia: Publishing, distribution, reading]. *Vestnik obshchestvennogo mnenija. Dannye. Analiz. Diskussii*, [Russian Public Opinion Herald] (5), 39-57.
19. Falk M and Katz-Gerro T (2016) Cultural Participation in Europe: Can we Identify Common Determinants?, *Journal of Cultural Economics* 40(2): 127-62.
20. Flemmen, M., Jarness, V., & Rosenlund, L. (2018). Social space and cultural class divisions: the forms of capital and contemporary lifestyle differentiation. *The British journal of sociology*, 69(1), 124-153.
21. Gans H J (1985). American Popular Culture and High Culture in a Changing Class Structure, *Prospects* 10: 17-37.
22. Ganzeboom H, deGraaf P, and Treiman D (1992) Standard International Socio-Economic Index of Occupational Status, *Social Science Research* 21: 1-56.
23. Goffman, E. (1951). Symbols of class status. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 2(4), 294-304.
24. Goffman, E. (1961) Role distance. In *Encounters: Two Studies in the Sociology of Interaction*. Bobbs-Merrill, pp. 85-168
25. Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. Simon and Schuster.
26. Grusky D (2005). Foundations of a Neo-Durkheimian Class Analysis. *Approaches to Class, Analysis*: 51–81. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511488900.004>
27. Holt DB (1997). Distinction in America? Recovering Bourdieu's Theory of Tastes from its Critics, *Poetics* 25(2–3): 93-120.
28. Hughes, E. C. (1958). *Men and their work*. Free Press.

CLASS CULTURES OR MICRO-CLASS CULTURES?

29. Kraaykamp, G. L. M. (2002). Cumulative advantages and inequality in lifestyle: A Dutch description of distinction in taste.
30. Lizardo O (2006) How Cultural Tastes Shape Personal Networks, *American Sociological Review* 71(5): 778-807.
31. Lizardo, O., & Skiles, S. (2012). Reconceptualizing and theorizing “omnivorousness”: genetic and relational mechanisms. *Sociological Theory*, 30(4), 263–82. doi: 10.1177/0735275112466999.
32. Lizardo O (2016). Why “Cultural Matters” Matter: Culture Talk as the Mobilization of Cultural Capital in Interaction, *Poetics* 36(2): 33-50.
33. Meisenbach, R. J. (2010). Stigma management communication: A theory and agenda for applied research on how individuals manage moments of stigmatized identity. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 38(3), 268-292.
34. More, D. M., & Suchner, R. W. (1976). Occupational situs, prestige, and stereotypes. *Sociology of Work and Occupations*, 3(2), 169-186.
35. Peterson, R. (2005). Problems in comparative research: The example of omnivorousness. *Poetics*, 33(5-6), 257–282.
36. Pyysiäinen, J., & Rynänen, M. (2018). Downplaying class with style: Middle class anxiety and the aesthetic performance of role distance. *Poetics*. Available on-line at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2018.10.001>
37. Rasborg K (2017) From Class Society to the Individualized Society? A Critical Reassessment of Individualization and Class, *Irish Journal of Sociology*
38. Vlegels J and Lievens J (2017) Music Classification, Genres, and Taste Patterns: A Ground-Up Network Analysis on the Clustering of Artist Preferences, *Poetics* 60: 76-89.
39. Veblen T. (2017) [1899] *The theory of the leisure class*. Routledge

CLASS CULTURES OR MICRO-CLASS CULTURES?

40. Warde A, Wright D, and Gayo-Cal M (2007) Understanding Cultural Omnivorousness: Or, the Myth of the Cultural Omnivore, *Cultural Sociology* 1(2): 143–64.
doi:10.1177/1749975507078185.
41. Warde A and Gayo-Cal M (2009) The Anatomy of Cultural Omnivorousness: The Case of the United Kingdom, *Poetics* 37(2): 119–45. doi: 10.1016/j.poetic.2008.12.001.
42. Weber M (1978). *Economy and Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
43. Weeden KA and Grusky DB (2004) Are There Any Big Classes At All?, *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 22(4): 3–56.
44. Weeden KA and Grusky DB (2012). The Three Worlds of Inequality, *American Journal of Sociology* 117(6): 1723–85.
45. Zavisca J (2005) The Status of Cultural Omnivorism: A Case Study of Reading in Russia, *Social Forces* 84(2): 1233–55.