



ELSEVIER

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Poetics

journal homepage: [www.elsevier.com/locate/poetic](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/poetic)



## Family (and) culture: The effect of cultural capital within the family on the cultural participation of adolescents



Mart Willekens\*, John Lievens

Department of Sociology, Ghent University, Onderbergen 4, 3000 Ghent, Belgium

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Available online 14 January 2014

#### Keywords:

Family  
Adolescents  
Cultural capital  
Multilevel analysis

### ABSTRACT

Bourdieu's theory of social reproduction states that cultural capital is passed down from generation to generation through the habitus formed within the family of origin. This cultural capital presents itself in three different states: as embodied (dispositions and practices), institutionalized (educational qualifications), and objectified (cultural goods). In this scheme, the presence of all three forms of cultural capital in the family can be assumed to have an impact on the cultural participation patterns of adolescents. This article focuses on the cultural participation patterns of adolescents, in the forms of art and heritage participation and attending pop or rock concerts. Using data from the "Cultural Participation Survey 2003–2004", a multilevel model is constructed—with the presence of the three forms of cultural capital in the family as family-level effects and the educational position, age, and gender of the adolescent as individual-level effects. We find support for Bourdieu's reproduction model for art and heritage participation, but the educational level and gender of the adolescents are also found to be important. We also find significant effects of familial cultural capital on attending pop and rock concerts, which indicates that cultural reproduction mechanisms also, although to a lesser extent, structure participation in these activities.

© 2013 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: [Mart.Willekens@UGent.be](mailto:Mart.Willekens@UGent.be) (M. Willekens), [John.Lievens@UGent.be](mailto:John.Lievens@UGent.be) (J. Lievens).

## 1. Introduction

Cultural participation patterns have become a central subject in the study of social stratification, and the notion of cultural capital, in particular, has taken a prominent place in this field. In most research, cultural capital is operationalized as participation in or knowledge of high-status culture (Aschaffenburg and Maas, 1997; DiMaggio, 1982; Wildhagen, 2009). The concept was developed by Pierre Bourdieu. In his theory of social reproduction, the primary manifestation of cultural capital in early adolescence involves an interest in highbrow cultural activities (Bourdieu, 1984, 1986). These activities are regarded as “legitimate” forms of culture, and in order to appreciate them, people need a culturally oriented habitus, which constitutes an “embodied” form of cultural capital. This type of cultural capital is developed in the family of origin and can be deployed in different social settings in later life (the educational system, labor market, social networks, etc.). In order to explain the development of cultural capital, Bourdieu emphasized the role of different forms of cultural capital initially present in the family and, in a second step, the accumulation of cultural capital in the educational system (Bourdieu, 1984, 1986).

Most research has demonstrated that family background and educational level are the two most important factors for explaining adolescents' participation in highbrow cultural activities (Mohr and DiMaggio, 1995; Nagel, 2010; Nagel and Ganzeboom, 2002). In this article, we focus on the first step of this process, namely the effect of different types of cultural capital in the household on the cultural participation of adolescents. Here, we use a detailed set of familial cultural capital variables, based on the distinction between embodied (cultural tastes of the parents), institutionalized (educational level of the parents), and objectified (cultural goods) that Bourdieu described (Bourdieu, 1986). We differentiate between the embodied and institutionalized cultural capital of both the father and mother to account for gender dynamics in the cultural reproduction process, which is an underdeveloped theme in Bourdieu's original model (Reay, 2000, 2004; Silva, 2005). We also differentiate between cultural goods (as indicators of objectified cultural capital) and multimedia, which could also function as more contemporary status-marking products (McCracken, 1990). We analyze how both types of goods relate to the cultural participation of adolescents.

The cultural reproduction model has been applied to analyze adolescent participation in highbrow cultural activities (Mohr and DiMaggio, 1995; Nagel, 2010; Nagel and Ganzeboom, 2002; van Eijck, 1997), but attending pop and rock concerts has received far less attention. However, it is also possible to apply the cultural capital framework to these activities, for the esthetic disposition that is part of the culturally oriented habitus is being applied more and more in the realm of popular culture as well (Hibbett, 2010; Lizardo and Skiles, 2008). Therefore, participation in or knowledge of popular culture can also function as cultural capital—especially for adolescents, because pop and rock music is usually seen as a specific expression of youth culture (Christenson and Roberts, 1998; Laughey, 2006; Trondman, 1990). Most research that has applied the cultural capital framework to participation in popular culture has studied this form of participation as part of an omnivorous taste pattern. This line of research states that combining popular and highbrow culture is becoming the most important distinction mechanism for younger, higher-educated groups (Peterson and Kern, 1996; Vander Stichele and Laermans, 2006). However, this research has focused on small groups of respondents who combine both types of culture. Gripsrud et al. (2011) has shown, that among students, there is a general shift toward mainstream popular culture, while their interest in “highbrow” culture is declining. There is also some evidence that attending pop and rock concerts is positively correlated with educational level, especially in younger cohorts (Bennett et al., 2009; Chan, 2010). This could suggest that pop and rock culture is becoming a more important form of cultural capital for students in higher education. Other studies that have compared these effects with the effects on art and heritage participation show that the effect of family background is along the same lines, but somewhat less so for pop and rock participation (Vlegels and Lievens, 2011; Voorpostel and van der Lippe, 2001). In this article, the Bourdieusian model is applied both to highbrow cultural participation among adolescents and to their attendance at pop and rock concerts. In doing so, we try to unravel and compare the specific influences of different types of cultural capital in the household on both types of cultural participation, while taking into account the individual characteristics of the adolescents.

In order to address our research questions, a unique household dataset is used, containing information that was gathered independently for all the members of each household. This allows us to build a multilevel model, where the individual characteristics of the adolescent (educational level, age, and gender) are used to analyze the differences between adolescents, and the cultural capital in the household is used to analyze the differences between households. Furthermore, a detailed set of cultural capital variables is used to analyze cultural participation pattern—which enables us to provide a refined test of how the different types of cultural capital relate to the participation of adolescents in both highbrow and pop and rock activities.

## 2. Theoretical background and hypotheses

### 2.1. Family background

According to Bourdieu, adolescent's cultural participation is mostly determined by their family background because it requires a culturally oriented habitus formed through early contact with cultural capital in the family (Bourdieu, 1984, 1986). Bourdieu distinguished three forms of cultural capital: embodied, institutionalized, and objectified cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1986). These refer to dispositions of the mind and body toward the cultivation and culture of the parents for the embodied state, the educational credentials of the parents for the institutionalized state, and cultural goods for the objectified state (books, pictures, musical instruments, etc.). The social class of the family is determined by the composition of economic capital and different forms of cultural capital in the family, and each form of cultural capital will have a unique influence on the development of embodied cultural capital by children in the household. This primary form of cultural capital is a necessary condition for children to succeed in the educational system, where embodied cultural capital is legitimized as institutionalized cultural capital, which in turn, will determine the social position of the children in later life. This leads to a cycle of cultural and social reproduction and a structural homology between social class positions and cultural status in society.

In line with Bourdieu, we expect that the presence of each form of cultural capital in the household will have a unique effect on cultural participation by the adolescents. Embodied and institutionalized cultural capital relate to characteristics of the parents and are discussed first. Here, we argue that it is necessary to distinguish between the cultural capital of the mother and the father. Next, we discuss the presence of cultural and multimedia goods in the household as indicators of objectified cultural capital.

#### 2.1.1. Embodied and institutionalize cultural capital of the parents

According to Bourdieu (1973, 1986), embodied cultural capital is developed through cultural socialization in the family, and parents can only provide this socialization if they possess the appropriate embodied cultural capital themselves. This suggests that the culturally active lifestyle of parents will be an important determinant of cultural participation by adolescents. Indeed, many studies have found a strong link between parental and adolescent participation in highbrow cultural activities (Kraaykamp and van Eijck, 2010; Mohr and DiMaggio, 1995; Nagel, 2010; van Eijck, 1997). However, some studies have also found intergenerational transmission of popular music tastes (Siongers, 2007; ter Bogt et al., 2011), which suggests that participation patterns for pop and rock music are also transmitted within the family. We therefore expect to find a large effect of participation in highbrow and pop and rock activities by the parents on the same types of cultural participation by the adolescents.

The educational level (institutionalized cultural capital) of the parents is a second type of familial cultural capital. In Bourdieu's (1973, 1984, 1986) framework, this form of cultural capital is the result of an accumulation of embodied cultural capital. Cultural dispositions are further developed in the educational system, and their influence will then extend from the cultural sphere to the broader social sphere. This will lead to a more stimulating environment for adolescents, which can encourage them to participate in different types of cultural activities. Therefore, we expect that the educational level of the parents has a unique effect on the cultural participation of adolescents in both highbrow and pop and rock activities.

**Cultural reproduction hypothesis (1):** Higher levels of embodied (cultural participation) and institutionalized (educational level) cultural capital of the parents will have a positive effect on the cultural participation of adolescents in the household.

We make a clear distinction between the cultural capital of the mother and the father because a number of studies have indicated that cultural participation by the mother has the largest impact on the cultural participation of their children. (van Eijck, 1997; van Wel et al., 2006; Voorpostel and van der Lippe, 2001). Bourdieu already hinted at this process when he noted that the maintenance of cultural capital (or “cultural housekeeping”) within the family is mainly the task of the mother (Bourdieu, 2001; Lovell, 2000). Nevertheless, he saw the cultural capital of the family as being determined by the social class of the father. Mothers only have a symbolic function: they are responsible for the management of the public image and symbolic capital of the family (Bourdieu, 2001). From this point of view, we can expect the cultural participation patterns of the mother to be more important because she has the responsibility for transmitting cultural capital within the family (Bourdieu, 2001), and the educational level of the father will have a stronger effect on the cultural participation of adolescents because of the intertwining relationship between educational level and social class (Bourdieu, 1984).

Critics have noted that it is questionable whether this view of the family still holds today, as there have been many transformations in the education system, the gender division of labor, and family living arrangements (Lovell, 2000; Silva, 2005). The parents of the adolescents in our study were mostly in the educational system between 1980 and 1995. During this period, the educational expansion that had started in the 1960s began to reach a saturation point, and the gender gap for enrollment in higher education became increasingly small in Flanders (Verbergt et al., 2009). This indicates that women are now more able to use their institutionalized cultural capital as an individual resource within family life (Silva, 2005). For example, Van Berkel and De Graaf have shown that, for cohorts born after 1935, the educational level of women became more important than the educational level of their husbands in explaining the cultural behavior of both partners (Van Berkel and De Graaf, 1995). Furthermore, Upright (2004) has shown that early art socialization and the educational level of the wife have an important additional effect on the cultural participation of the husband, while the opposite relationship (from husband to wife) is less pronounced. van Eijck (1997) has shown that the educational level of the mother is more closely related to a latent “family factor” than the educational level of the father, and this family factor has a large effect on the highbrow cultural participation of children in the family. These results suggest that the educational level of the mother is more important for explaining the cultural participation patterns of adolescents. Therefore, we use separate indicators of both the embodied and institutionalized cultural capital of the mother and the father to obtain a more refined insight into the intergenerational reproduction of cultural capital. Here, we expect that both the embodied and institutionalized cultural capital of the mother will be more important in the intergenerational transmission of cultural capital than those of the father.

**Gendered cultural capital hypothesis:** The embodied and institutionalized cultural capital of the mother will have a larger impact on adolescents' cultural participation than the embodied and institutionalized cultural capital of the father.

### 2.1.2. *Objectified cultural capital in the household*

The third form of familial cultural capital that Bourdieu described is the presence of cultural goods in the household. Parents are not the only source of cultural socialization, the mere presence of cultural goods can have a “generalized arrow effect” as well (Bourdieu, 1986), which means that these products can operate directly on the habitus of the child. This type of domestic cultural capital has received the least attention to date in research (Kraaykamp and van Eijck, 2010). Furthermore, when Bourdieu referred to objectified cultural capital, it was exclusively defined as highbrow cultural goods, such as paintings, books, or a piano (Bourdieu, 1986). However, since the 1960s, many different, and more popular cultural products and multimedia, have found their way into family homes, and it is not always clear whether these should be considered as forms of objectified cultural capital. Livingstone (2002) has described today's youth as a multi-mediated generation because they grow up in houses

where cultural multimedia products are omnipresent. This results in a bedroom culture among youngsters, where more and more leisure time is spent at home, at the expense of outdoor activities. This trend, in turn, could lead to a decline in cultural participation outside the home. [Gripsrud et al. \(2011\)](#) has also noted a general trend for the increased privatization of cultural consumption by students in more recent generations. On an aggregated level, his results have showed an increase in the hours spent on a computer and watching television, and a decline in almost every form of culture that is identified with traditional legitimate taste. In a similar vein, [Peterson and Sherkat \(1995\)](#) have showed that video, radio, or recorded consumption of particular art forms (classical music, opera, and ballet) are rising in younger cohorts, while their physical attendance of cultural activities is declining over time. These results suggest that multimedia in the household comprise a substitute for cultural participation. These studies have focused on participation in highbrow activities, but the same arguments can be applied to attending pop and rock concerts as well. Multimedia at home could replace all types of outside cultural activities because they do not require any effort and are more flexible to use. Knulst has found that people who participate in culture outside the home also invest less in multimedia products such as television ([Knulst, 1995](#)). Other studies using correspondence analysis have showed that the activity of watching a large amount of television is the furthest removed from public participation in cultural activities ([Bennett et al., 2009](#); [Roose and Waege, 2002](#)). However, other studies have found that private cultural consumption (listening to music, reading books, etc.) is correlated with public cultural participation (theater and museum visits), so we could expect that these cultural goods are compatible with a culturally oriented lifestyle that requires embodied cultural capital ([Roose and Waege, 2002](#)). This relationship has also been found with other screen multimedia. [Ganzeboom \(1989\)](#) has suggested that the rise of television viewing can introduce culture to a large group of people, which will lead to cultural democratization. This trend has also been observed for Internet use, where it enhances cultural participation in younger cohorts ([Van Steen et al., 2012](#)). It will be easier to obtain information about cultural activities, so the thresholds for participating in these activities will be lower. Again, these studies have mostly focused on highbrow cultural participation, but the same arguments can also be applied to attending pop and rock concerts.

Bourdieu did not pay much attention to emerging forms of multimedia in the 1960s (music recordings, radio, television, and other forms of multimedia) and their relationship to cultural capital. He did state that luxury material goods are not part of objectified cultural capital, as they do not require embodied cultural capital as a precondition for appreciating them ([Bourdieu, 1984](#)). Instead, such goods belong to the economic realm and will be more relevant for the distinction of the economically dominant class (as opposed to the culturally dominant class). Other authors have found that, in recent cohorts, material and cultural consumption go hand in hand ([Savage et al., 1992](#)). [van Eijck and van Oosterhout \(2005\)](#) have showed that the antagonism between cultural participation and material consumption is disappearing for the group that participates in highbrow culture, which supports a compatibility hypothesis. However, he also found a second trend: a large proportion of the higher-educated population is losing interest in highbrow culture and shows higher levels of material consumption instead, which supports a substitution hypothesis. For participation in pop and rock activities, this antagonism between material consumption and cultural participation might be less relevant because the growing popularity of pop and rock music is usually associated with the rise of mass media and mass consumption ([Lizardo and Skiles, 2008](#)). However, if pop and rock participation is defined as part of the cultural capital repertoire of adolescents, then we can expect that the same conflict between cultural capital and material consumption also applies to pop and rock concerts. Accordingly, we examine these new forms of capital and their relationship with the cultural consumption of adolescents for both highbrow and pop and rock activities. Here, we distinguish three types of material goods: cultural goods (paintings, CDs, and books) screen multimedia (television and computer) and other multimedia (GPS, mobile phones, etc.). We expect a positive relationship between the cultural participation of adolescents and cultural goods (objectified cultural capital) in the household. Screen multimedia can also be considered as more popular cultural goods, but their relationship with cultural participation by adolescents is not clear. Other multimedia products are more luxury goods that are usually not described as traditional cultural capital. However, they also carry a strong status connotation, which makes their relationship with cultural participation ambiguous. Since results in the existing literature for screen and other multimedia are mixed, we

formulate two contrasting hypotheses about the effect of these types of products on cultural participation:

**Cultural reproduction hypothesis (2):** Objectified cultural capital in the household will have a positive effect on the cultural participation of adolescents in the household.

**Compatibility hypothesis (a):** Screen and other multimedia products in the household will have a positive effect on the cultural participation of adolescents in the household.

**Substitution hypotheses (b):** Screen and other multimedia products in the household will have a negative effect on the cultural participation of adolescents in the household.

## 2.2. Individual-level characteristics of adolescents

In order to test the effects of cultural capital in the family on the cultural participation of adolescents in the household, we need to control for some characteristics of the adolescents themselves. Gender and educational level are our main control variables in this respect.

In Bourdieu's original theoretical framework, the school only intermediates in the intergenerational transmission of cultural capital because familial cultural capital determines the habitus of the student and the habitus determines the chances of educational success. Bourdieu acknowledged that it is also possible to accumulate cultural capital throughout the educational process, but he emphasized the role of the domestic sphere as being the most relevant (Bourdieu, 1984). However, most studies have found a strong effect of educational level on highbrow cultural participation, even after controlling for family background (DiMaggio and Useem, 1978; Ganzeboom, 1982; Nagel, 2010). These findings contest the cultural reproduction theory, and some authors have suggested that other processes are at play. Ganzeboom (1982) has stated that participation in highbrow cultural activities and success in the educational system can both be explained by the information-processing capacities of individuals. These capacities offer a distinct explanation for the link between educational level and cultural participation, apart from status-seeking motives. DiMaggio has stressed that the educational level not only reproduces cultural capital acquired in the family, but it also produces cultural capital, even for students who were not acquainted with cultural forms during early socialization (DiMaggio, 1982). This means that cultural knowledge is no longer a prerequisite for educational success. It has become part of the curriculum in higher education, which makes the school itself an important institute for cultural socialization (Aschaffenburg and Maas, 1997; Nagel and Ganzeboom, 2002). In line with these arguments, we would expect the effect of education to be stronger for participation in highbrow activities and less pronounced for pop and rock activities because the latter require less information processing and are also not established forms of culture that belong to the official school curriculum. However, some complex forms of contemporary pop and rock music do require strong information-processing abilities, and it is possible that participation in pop and rock activities is stimulated informally within the education system (Duff, 2003). Hence, we expect that even within the same family, adolescents with higher levels of education will show higher levels of cultural participation in both highbrow and pop and rock culture.

**Educational socialization hypothesis:** The educational level of the adolescent will have a positive effect on their cultural participation patterns.

Gender is the second individual-level factor that has to be taken into account. Women tend to participate more in highbrow culture than men do (Bihagen and Katz-Gerro, 2000; Katz-Gerro, 2002; Roose and Waage, 2002), and this gap is greater in more recent cohorts (DiMaggio and Mukhtar, 2004). These differences are explained by the different socialization patterns of boys and girls (Mohr and DiMaggio, 1995), by the differential effects of education and occupational careers (de Graaf and Kalmijn, 2001; Lizardo, 2006), and by differences in the domestic division of labor (Collins, 1992). All

these explanations suggest that cultural capital is a more important status marker for women, because they benefit more from this type of capital in their professional and family life. Furthermore, [Tepper \(2000\)](#) has argued that families put more emphasis on the development of participation in highbrow culture for girls because this realm of leisure activities provides a safer, separate sphere with more female attributes ([Christin, 2010](#); [Tepper, 2000](#)). This “separate sphere” argument relates more strongly to highbrow cultural participation, but the other arguments for the gender gap in cultural participation can also be applied to participation in pop and rock activities. Therefore, we expect that adolescent girls will participate more in both types of cultural activities than adolescent boys will.

**Gendered socialization hypothesis:** Girls will have higher rates of cultural participation than boys.

### 3. Data and variables

To test our hypotheses we use data from the survey “Cultural Participation in Flanders 2003–2004” ([Lievens et al., 2006](#)). This is a household dataset, which contains information on the cultural participation patterns of all household members above the age of 14, and it contains details on cultural and material goods present in these homes. In a first step, 2849 randomly selected Flemish respondents between 14 and 85 were surveyed using computer assisted face-to-face interviewing (with a response rate of 61%). Subsequently, a drop-off questionnaire was left for the other family members in the respondent’s household and a separate short questionnaire for the head of the household. The drop-off questionnaire contains a selection of questions that were also given to the primary respondent. This procedure provides us with information on the cultural participation patterns and background characteristics of all family members in the household. The primary respondent also had to indicate a head of the household (this could be the respondent or any other family member), and this person received an extra questionnaire with specific questions about the household in general. This provides us with information on the presence of material and cultural goods in the household. This information is used to construct the household and individual variables necessary for our analyses.

Full household information was gathered for 83% of the primary respondents (2378 households). We use a subset of this data consisting of families with adolescents (between 14 and 25 years old) in the household ( $N=1211$ ). Adolescents with information missing for one of the individual-level variables (gender, age, and educational level) and households with no information at the household level are excluded from the analysis.<sup>1</sup> This results in a final dataset of 705 families with information on 1150 adolescents. There are a minimum of one and a maximum of six adolescents per household, the median is two adolescents per household, and the mean is 1.50 with a standard deviation of 0.75.

#### 3.1. Dependent variables

We construct two dependent variables to distinguish between the two types of cultural participation of adolescents addressed here. The first measures participation in arts and heritage. The second measures participation in pop and rock concerts or festivals. We use a dummy variable for participation in four types of art and heritage activities combined: visits to art museums or exhibitions; attending a classical concert, a play or a dance performance; and participating in a heritage activity. Fifty-eight percent of the respondents participated in one or more activities in the six months prior to the survey, and 42% did not. Adolescents who only participated in cultural activities at school are considered as non-participants. A second dummy variable is constructed for attending pop and rock concerts or festivals. In total, 48% of the adolescents visited one or more concerts or festivals in the six months prior to the survey and 52% did not.

<sup>1</sup> The categorical household variables have a separate missing value category in order to retain households with some information available. These categories are always very small (maximum  $N=42$ ), and there is never a significant difference with the other categories (results not reported in tables).

### 3.2. Independent variables

There is a hierarchical structure in our dataset, and in order to differentiate between individual-level effects and household-level effects, we construct separate variables for both levels.

#### 3.2.1. Individual-level variables

We include the gender, age, and educational level of the adolescents as individual-level variables. We use age categories that correspond to the general ages for transitions in the educational system (14–15, 16–18, 19–21, and 22–25). Six categories are constructed to measure educational level. The first two categories are students in secondary school—distinguishing between general education (1), which prepares for higher education, and vocational and technical education (2), which prepares for advanced technical training or an occupation in the labor market (without higher education). The third and the fourth categories are students in higher education, taking social/cultural studies (4), or economic/technical studies (5). The last two categories are adolescents who had already graduated. Here, we distinguish between respondents who graduated without obtaining a higher education qualification (5) and respondents who graduated with a degree in higher education (6).

#### 3.2.2. Household-level variables

In order to make a clear differentiation between cultural and economic capital in the family, we include a control variable for subjective satisfaction with family income, indicated on a seven point scale (ranging from not satisfied, to very satisfied) by the head of the household.

The embodied (cultural participation) and institutionalized (educational level) cultural capital of both parents is included separately in the analyses. We differentiate between parents with lower-secondary education, higher-secondary education, and higher education. Participation in arts and heritage, and participation in pop and rock concerts and festivals is measured using two categories—no participation, or participation in one or more activities in the six months before the survey.

A wide variety of indicators is available for objectified cultural capital in the household. The cultural items are the presence of paintings (or reproductions), musical instruments, books (novels, children's books, comic books, cooking books, books about art and culture, hobby books or books about history, society, health, etc.) and CDs (pop, rock or dance music, world or folk music, jazz and blues music, classical music, popular Flemish music). We use percentile scores of the number of each type of book or CD to construct comparable ordinal groups (small, medium, and large number present). We also construct indicators for screen multimedia in the household. These include the presence and type of television and computer in the household and the presence of a games console. Other forms of multimedia (hi-fi system, video camera, GPS, digital camera, advanced mobile phone, tablet or pocket PC, digital DVD recorder) are included as a numerical variable, which distinguishes between families with none or one of these products, two products, and three or more products.

## 4. Results

In order to model the individual-level and family-level effects, a logit multilevel model is estimated (using the Markov chain Monte Carlo method) for art and heritage participation and a second one for pop and rock participation. We build a random intercept model, which allows us to make statements about the variation at the family-level, after controlling for individual-level variation (Rasbash et al., 2009). First, all the individual-level variables are added in a fixed effect model, which corresponds to a general linear regression model for all adolescents. The model is then extended to a random intercept model, which allows the intercepts of our model to vary across families.<sup>iii</sup> In this way, it is possible to assess how much variation is situated at the family-level, after controlling for the individual-level variables.<sup>iiii</sup> Table 1 shows that there still is a large and significant amount of unexplained variance at

<sup>iii</sup> Because of the small numbers of adolescents per household, it is not possible to fit a random slope model. Therefore, it is not possible to test whether the individual-level effects vary between families.

<sup>iiii</sup> It is not possible to calculate the variance-partitioning coefficient for a logit multilevel model. Therefore, we cannot calculate what proportion of the total residual variance is due to differences between families.



**Table 1**

Residual variance at level 2 and Wald statistics for the models in the stepwise procedure.

		Art and heritage participation		Pop and rock participation	
		$\sigma^2 (u_0)$	Wald ( $\sigma^2 (u_0)$ )	$\sigma^2 (u_0)$	Wald ( $\sigma^2 (u_0)$ )
Model 1	Random intercept model (with individual-level effects)	0.479	7.78**	0.41	7.23**
Model 2	Model 1+ income and educational level of the parents	0.498	7.84**	0.396	6.46*
Model 3	Model 2+ art and heritage participation of the parents	0.441	5.99*	0.392	6.26*
Model 4	Model 3+ pop and rock participation of the parents	0.436	5.78*	0.368	5.45*
Model 5	Model 4+ cultural goods in the household	0.376	4.26*	0.301	3.83*
Model 6	Model 5+ multimedia in the household	0.351	3.81	0.286	3.43

\*  $p < .05$ .\*\*  $p < .01$ .\*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

the household level for art and heritage participation (0.48) and for pop and rock participation (0.41) after controlling for the individual-level variance. This means that, even after controlling for differences in composition between households (on the included indicators), there remains substantial variation between families that can be accounted for by including family-level characteristics. In the final step, the cultural capital variables are added to the model to explain the variance at the household level. First, the educational level of the parents is added, then cultural participation of the parents, and finally, cultural goods and multimedia products in the household.

Adding the educational level of the parents and satisfaction with income causes a very small decrease in unexplained between-family variance for pop and rock participation and almost no difference for art and heritage participation (see Table 1). For the latter, participation of the parents produces a larger drop in unexplained variance at the family-level. This is also the case for the effect of pop and rock participation of the parents on pop and rock participation of the adolescents. It is notable that cultural goods and multimedia in the household also cause a large drop in unexplained variance for both art and heritage participation and pop and rock participation. For both activities, no significant proportion of unexplained variance remains at the household level when all cultural capital variables are included.

Table 2 presents the logit coefficients (exp  $B$ ) for the full model for art and heritage participation and pop and rock participation. First, we examine the results for art and heritage participation. Next, we discuss the results for pop and rock concerts, and then we highlight the differences and similarities between the two models.

#### 4.1. Art and heritage participation

At the individual-level, both the gender and educational level of adolescents prove to be very important for explaining art and heritage participation (see Table 2). Age shows no effect. The odds for art and heritage participation are significantly greater (2.38 times) for girls than for boys. The effects of educational level are also in line with our expectations: the odds of participating in art and heritage are greater for higher education levels. Students enrolled in general education (which prepares for higher education) are the reference group. They have the highest odds of participation. The odds are lower for students with a degree in higher education (2.86 times lower [ $=1/0.35$ ]) and students enrolled in higher education (3.23 times lower for students in social or cultural studies, and 3.57 times lower for students in economic or technical studies). These differences are all in the same range. However, when we look at students in vocational and technical education, the difference between students in general education is even greater (the odds of participating are 4.35 times lower). The largest difference occurs

**Table 2**

Odds ratios for individual and household-level effects on art and heritage participation and pop and rock participation.

		N	Art and heritage Exp (B)	Pop and rock Exp (B)	
Gender	Male (ref)	616			
	Female	534	2.38 <sup>***</sup>	1.22	
Age	14–15	234	0.92	0.34 <sup>**</sup>	
	16–18 (ref)	364			
	19–21	319	0.84	1.27	
	22–25	233	0.81	1.11	
Educational level	Secondary education	Vocational	339	0.23 <sup>***</sup>	0.63
		Technical (ref)	217		
	Higher education	Social/cultural	160	0.31 <sup>†</sup>	0.67
		Economic/technical	120	0.28 <sup>†</sup>	0.99
	Graduated	No higher education	205	0.10	0.47
		Higher education	109	0.35 <sup>***</sup>	0.66
Income		1150	1.03	0.96	
Educational level (father)	Lower secondary	339			
	Higher secondary	318	0.70	1.80	
	Higher education	390	0.90	1.01	
Educational level (mother)	Lower secondary (ref)	310			
	Higher secondary	396	1.43	0.98	
	Higher education	365	1.93 <sup>†</sup>	1.91 <sup>†</sup>	
Art and heritage participation (father)	No (ref)	454			
	Yes	610	1.02	1.13	
Art and heritage participation (mother)	No (ref)	430			
	Yes	645	2.54 <sup>***</sup>	1.33	
Pop and rock participation (father)	No (ref)	775			
	Yes	299	1.22	1.27	
Pop and rock participation (mother)	No (ref)	737			
	Yes	342	1.56	1.86 <sup>**</sup>	
Instruments	No (ref)	493			
	Yes	601	1.57 <sup>†</sup>	1.84 <sup>**</sup>	
Books (novels)	0 (ref)	199			
	1–20	394	1.88	1.00	
	21+	490	1.41	1.00	
CDs (folk)	0 (ref)	384			
	1–10	301	1.57	0.83	
	11+	392	1.65	1.48	
CDs (classical music)	0 (ref)	362			
	1–10	388	1.45	1.00	
	11+	327	2.05 <sup>†</sup>	1.00	
Multimedia products	0 or 1 (ref)	220			
	2	496	0.42 <sup>**</sup>	0.56 <sup>†</sup>	
	3 or more	378	0.39 <sup>**</sup>	0.61 <sup>†</sup>	

†  $p < .05$ .\*\*  $p < .01$ .\*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

between students in general education and adolescents who graduated without a degree in higher education (the odds are 10 times lower). Therefore, the odds of participation are low for students in secondary education (which does not prepare for higher education) and extremely low for adolescents who graduated without a degree in higher education.

Satisfaction with income is added as a family-level effect in order to control for economic differences between families (see Table 2). We do not find any significant effect for this variable. Next,

we look at the cultural capital variables to explain differences between families. Art and heritage participation of the mother is the most important variable in this respect: the odds of participation in art and heritage for an adolescent are 2.54 times greater if the mother participates in these activities. This effect is not present for art and heritage participation of the father. The same pattern is found for the educational level of the parents. The odds of participating in art and heritage when the mother has a degree in higher education are 1.93 times higher than for mothers with lower-secondary education, while there are no differences for the educational level of the father. Thus, our findings concerning parental cultural capital and the art and heritage participation of adolescents provide strong support for the gendered socializing hypothesis: the cultural participation and educational level of the mother both have net effects on the cultural participation of adolescents, whereas there are no net effects for the cultural participation and educational level of the father.

We also find significant effects for cultural goods in the household. In order to decide which products to include in the final model, we include each indicator of material goods in the model with the individual-level variables and the parental cultural capital variables separately. Only the indicators that produce significant effects ( $p < .05$ ) are included in the final model (see [Table 2](#)). We find a significant difference between households with no classical music CDs and households with more than ten. The odds of participation are 2.05 times greater for the latter. The presence of a musical instrument in the household also has a unique effect on art and heritage participation by adolescents (the odds are 1.57 times higher). We also find positive effects for the number of books present in the household and the number of folk and world music CDs; however, these effects are no longer significant when we control for the other forms of objectified cultural capital and multimedia. Thus, the presence of cultural goods in the household has a positive effect on art and heritage participation of adolescents, which supports the compatibility hypothesis. On the other hand, we do not find any significant effects for screen multimedia (television, computer, or games console), and we find a negative effect for the number of other multimedia products present in the household. The odds of participating in art and heritage are 2.38 times lower when there are two products present and 2.56 times lower when there are more than two products present, compared with households having no or only one product. Summarizing, for other multimedia products the substitution hypothesis is supported.

#### 4.2. *Pop and rock participation*

When we compare the individual-level effects of gender, age, and educational level for art and heritage participation and pop and rock participation, we find some notable differences. There are no significant effects of educational level and gender (see [Table 2](#)). Age is the only variable with a significant effect on pop and rock participation by adolescents, whereas this is the only non-significant individual-level variable for art and heritage participation. The odds of participating before the age of 16 are low compared with adolescents between 16 and 18 (2.94 times lower). The latter do not differ significantly from older adolescents.

The effects of parental cultural capital at the household level are similar to those found for art and heritage participation. First, pop and rock participation and the educational level of the mother have significant effects on the pop and rock participation of adolescents, while for the father, these factors have no significant effects (see [Table 2](#)). The odds are 1.86 times greater when the mother attended pop and rock concerts or festivals in the six months before the survey, and 1.91 times greater when the mother has a degree in higher education, compared with mothers having lower-secondary education. Art and heritage participation of the parents does not prove to be significant in explaining pop and rock participation by adolescents. Thus, the gendered socializing hypothesis is also supported for pop and rock participation.

The effects of cultural goods and multimedia in the household are similar to those observed for art and heritage participation, but there are some specific differences (see [Table 2](#)). Books and classical music CDs do not show a significant effect on pop and rock participation when they are included separately, so they are excluded from the final model. The number of folk and world music CDs do have a significant positive effect when included separately, but this effect disappears in the full model. Only the presence of a musical instrument in the household has a significant positive effect in the full

model. The odds of participation are 1.84 times higher when there is a musical instrument present. Again, we find no effects for the presence of screen multimedia; we find negative effects for the number of other multimedia products in the household, but these effects are not as strong as for art and heritage participation. The odds of participation are 1.79 times lower when there are two products present and 1.64 times lower when there are more than two products present, compared with households having none or only one product.

## 5. Discussion and conclusion

In this article, we use Bourdieu's domestic cultural reproduction model to explain the cultural participation patterns of adolescents. We show that a multilevel design is a very useful technique to study the effects of cultural capital at the household level. It allows us to explore the unique family-level effects of different forms of cultural capital in the household on the cultural consumption patterns of adolescents, after taking into account the individual-level characteristics of these adolescents. We focus on participation in art and heritage and attendance at pop and rock concerts. Studying both types of activities in the same framework is not common in cultural reproduction research. For some, the Bourdieusian model seems appropriate for explaining art and heritage participation, but not pop and rock participation. The latter participation is usually seen as an expression of a counterculture against parents, school, and other forms of authority (Brown and Hendee, 1989; Collins, 2004; Lull, 1987). Therefore, it is expected that participating in these types of activities is more a matter of individual (or peer group) choice and less determined by traditional, institutional factors (Beck, 1992, 1997; Siongers, 2007). However, a number of authors have contested this view, and they have argued that cultural reproduction mechanisms might also apply for participation in popular culture (Lizardo, 2008; Lizardo and Skiles, 2008; Siongers, 2007; ter Bogt et al., 2011).

By applying the cultural capital framework to both types of activities, we show that familial cultural reproduction mechanisms also operate for popular culture, indicating that popular and elite culture are related spheres that can be studied within the same theoretical framework. We note a similar cultural transmission pattern for art and heritage participation and for pop and rock participation, but there are also some clear differences.

First, as for the individual characteristics of the adolescents, we find strong effects of gender and educational level for art and heritage participation, whereas these effects are not present for pop and rock participation. Thus, the educational socialization hypothesis is confirmed for art and heritage participation, but not for pop and rock participation. This provides support for the information-processing model (Ganzeboom, 1982), as pop and rock concerts are generally seen as less complex cultural activities that require less information-processing capacities (Voorpostel and van der Lippe, 2001). In addition, pop and rock participation is not a traditional and institutionalized form of status culture, so these activities receive less attention in higher education than traditional highbrow participation (DiMaggio, 1982). The same is true for the gendered socialization hypothesis: girls participate more in art and heritage than boys do, but there is no gender difference for pop and rock participation. A possible explanation for the specific gender effect on art and heritage can be found in the separate sphere argument (Christin, 2010; DiMaggio, 2004; Tepper, 2000). This states that families see participation in highbrow cultural activities as appropriate activities for girls because it promotes female behavior and traits. Tepper has viewed the following types of traits as respectively male and female: aggressive vs. passive, rebellious vs. rule following, and group oriented vs. individualistic (Tepper, 2000). The female attributes are linked to highbrow cultural activities, and this could explain why they are more popular among girls. However, it does not seem straightforward to link these traits to participation in pop and rock concerts or festivals. Some male characteristics (group oriented, rebellious, aggressive) could just as easily be applied to some types of pop and rock concerts or festivals as well. This could explain why we do not find a gender gap for these activities.

Second, when we look at the effects of cultural capital at the household level, we see that the cultural capital of the father and the mother have to be distinguished. Both the cultural participation patterns and the educational level of the mother have positive net effects on the cultural participation patterns of adolescents, whereas there are no net effects of the father's cultural capital. Previous

research already has established this finding for art participation (van Wel et al., 2006; Voorpostel and van der Lippe, 2001), but it is notable that the same pattern arises for pop and rock participation. The stronger effect of the mother can be expected for art and heritage activities because women, in general, have a higher rate of participation in these activities and accordingly have a higher probability of transmitting these patterns. However, this gender difference is not present for pop and rock participation. Nevertheless, we note that pop and rock participation of the mother has a unique influence on pop and rock participation of the adolescents and, again, this is not the case for the father. This suggests that cultural transmission of participation in a broad range of activities in the family is mainly passed on by the mother.

If we agree to define pop and rock participation as a form of cultural capital in addition to art and heritage participation, the results fit the reproduction model of Bourdieu, who called wives “the managers of the symbolic capital in the family” (Bourdieu, 2001). The mother is regarded as the culture specialist in the family (Collins, 1988; DiMaggio, 2004). She invests her cultural and emotional capital in the education and upbringing of children in the household (Bourdieu, 2001; Reay, 2004). However, the effects of the educational level of the mother do not fit the original reproduction model. Bourdieu suggested that the status of the family is primarily determined by the social status of the father (Bourdieu, 1973, 1984, 2001). Therefore, we would expect the educational level of the father to be more important than that of the mother, since educational level has become the primary determinant of social status position (de Graaf and Kalmijn, 2001). However, our results indicate that the social status of the mother is more important in the process of intergenerational transmission of cultural capital. The educational level of the mother has unique and positive effects on both art and heritage participation and pop and rock participation, and this is not the case for the father, which confirms the gendered socializing hypothesis. These results imply that it is better to analyze cultural capital as an individual resource that can take different (gendered) forms instead of as a family resource determined by the social status of the father (Silva, 2005).

Third, we include a number of cultural products present in the household that could function as objectified cultural capital, alongside indicators for screen multimedia and other multimedia. By adding the presence of these goods, we evaluate whether we can observe the “generalized arrow effect” of cultural goods in the household that Bourdieu described: the mere presence of these goods in the childhood environment has an educative effect that helps children to develop their embodied cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1986). A disadvantage of our approach is that it does not allow us to assess how the actual use of these products is related to the cultural participation patterns of adolescents. For example, we do not find any effect for a television and computer in the household, but other research has found a negative relationship between the hours of television viewing or computer use and cultural participation (Livingstone, 2002). We also cannot distinguish between the parents' goods and those acquired by the adolescents themselves. In the latter case, these products could be regarded as an indicator of embodied cultural capital of the adolescents, which would also explain their cultural participation patterns. As Bourdieu (1984, 1986) noted, there is a clear relationship between objectified cultural capital and embodied cultural capital, as the appropriate consumption of objectified cultural capital always requires embodied cultural capital. Thus, objectified cultural capital helps to develop the cultural capital of adolescents, but they will only start consuming these products properly once their embodied cultural capital is developed. Therefore, it is not possible to observe the direction of causality in this process. Accordingly, we limit ourselves to reporting which products in the household are compatible with the cultural participation of adolescents and which are not. Our results show a clear compatibility relationship for cultural goods in the household, but a negative relationship with other, more luxurious multimedia products.

The presence of a musical instrument in the household is positively related to both art and heritage participation and pop and rock participation. The effect is stronger for pop and rock participation, which could either indicate compatibility between playing an instrument and visiting pop and rock concerts if the instrument belongs to the adolescent, or it could indicate the generalized arrow effect that Bourdieu (1986) described, if it belongs to another member of the household. The presence of folk and world music CDs is also positively related to participation in both cultural activities, but the effect is not significant for pop and rock participation in the full model. The presence of these CDs could be regarded as a newer form of objectified cultural capital that indicates a cosmopolitan interest in more

exotic forms of culture. Other research has shown that this type of cosmopolitan lifestyle and taste in music is becoming more apparent in higher status groups (Coulangeon and Lemel, 2007; Holt, 1998; Peterson and Kern, 1996; Prieur and Savage, 2011), which can explain their positive relationship with cultural participation. The presence of books and classical music CDs can be seen as more highbrow forms of objectified cultural capital in the household, and this could also explain why they only have a positive effect on art and heritage participation and not pop and rock participation.

One of the most notable findings in our study is the strong negative relationship between the amount of multimedia present in the household and participation in both art and heritage and pop and rock activities. Two distinct processes might account for this. It could be that there still is an opposition between an economic and a culturally dominant class, each with their own status symbols (Bourdieu, 1984). This would contradict the postmodern argument that the opposition between cultural and material consumption is fading (Holt, 1998). An alternative explanation could be that multimedia products are replacing traditional cultural capital in the new highly educated middle class (van Eijck and van Oosterhout, 2005). More research is needed to examine which processes are at play here, but in general we can conclude that the compatibility hypothesis is confirmed for cultural goods and the substitution hypothesis for multimedia goods.

By focusing on traditional highbrow culture (art and heritage) and popular culture (pop and rock concerts), we are able to compare how both types of participation are structured by cultural capital in the family. Our results show that cultural reproduction mechanisms operate for both, indicating that highbrow and popular cultures are related spheres that can be studied within the same theoretical framework. We note a similar cultural transmission pattern for art and heritage participation and pop and rock participation, and this transmission clearly contradicts the hypothesis that participation in pop and rock activities is an expression of an individual lifestyle with no relationship to familial background (van Eijck and Bargeman, 2004). The largest difference between pop and rock participation and art and heritage participation is found at the individual-level: In contrast with art and heritage participation, we do not find gender or educational-level effects for pop and rock participation. It is possible there are other individual-level factors that are important to understand participation in these activities. Most studies on pop and rock participation find that these activities have a stronger link with other factors, such as friendships networks, budget, and time constraints (Siongers, 2007; van Wel, 1993; Voorpostel and van der Lippe, 2001). However, it is outside the scope of this article to study how these specific factors relate to pop and rock participation.

In general, our multilevel research design provides a strong basis to test the net effects of different types of cultural capital in the family on different types of cultural participation by adolescents. It allows us to use specific cultural capital variables in the family to explain differences between households, while taking the individual-level characteristics of the adolescents into account. Furthermore, by focusing on adolescents in their family setting, we are able to present a detailed picture of the contemporary processes of intergenerational transmission of cultural capital. These results can be helpful tools for further empirical work that tries to disentangle the specific dynamics of cultural reproduction.

## References

- Aschaffenburg, K., Maas, I., 1997. Cultural and educational careers: the dynamics of social reproduction. *American Sociological Review* 62 (4) 573–587.
- Beck, U., 1992. *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. Sage, London.
- Beck, U., 1997. Democratization of the family. *Childhood* 4 (2) 151–168.
- Bennett, T., Savage, M., Silva, E.B., Warde, A., Gayo-Cal, M., Wright, D., 2009. *Culture, Class, Distinction*. Routledge, London.
- Bihagen, E., Katz-Gerro, T., 2000. Culture consumption in Sweden: the stability of gender differences. *Poetics* 27 (5–6) 327–349.
- Bourdieu, P., 1973. Cultural reproduction and social reproduction. In: Brown, R. (Ed.), *Knowledge, Education and Cultural Change: Papers in the Sociology of Education*. Tavistock, London, pp. 71–112.
- Bourdieu, P., 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Bourdieu, P., 1986. The forms of capital. In: Richardson, J.J. (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. Greenwood Press, New York, pp. 241–258.
- Bourdieu, P., 2001. *Masculine Domination*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.
- Brown, E.F., Hendee, W.R., 1989. Adolescents and their music: insights into the health of adolescents. *Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA)* 262 (12) 1659–1663.
- Chan, T.W., 2010. *Social Status and Cultural Consumption*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

- Christenson, P.G., Roberts, D.F., 1998. *It's Not Only Rock & Roll: Popular Music in the Lives of Adolescents*. Hampton Press, New York.
- Christin, A., 2010. *Gender and Highbrow Cultural Participation in the United States*. Working Paper Series # 42. Center for Arts and Cultural Policy Studies, Princeton University.
- Collins, R., 1988. Women and men in the class structure. *Journal of Family Issues* 9 (1) 27–50.
- Collins, R., 1992. Women and the production of status cultures. In: Lamont, M., Fournier, M. (Eds.), *Cultivating Differences: Symbolic Boundaries and the Making of Inequality*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, p. 346.
- Collins, R., 2004. *Interaction Ritual Chains*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Coulangeon, P., Lemel, P., 2007. Is “distinction” really outdated? Questioning the meaning of the omnivorization of musical taste in contemporary France. *Poetics* 35 (1–2) 93–111.
- de Graaf, P.M., Kalmijn, M., 2001. Trends in the intergenerational transmission of cultural and economic status. *Acta Sociologica* 44 (1) 51–66.
- DiMaggio, P., 1982. Cultural capital and school success: the impact of status culture participation on the grades of US high school students. *American Sociological Review* 47 (2) 12.
- DiMaggio, P., 2004. Gender, networks, and cultural capital—preface. *Poetics* 32 (2) 99–103.
- DiMaggio, P., Mukhtar, T., 2004. Arts participation as cultural capital in the United States, 1982–2002: signs of decline? *Poetics* 32 (2) 169–194.
- DiMaggio, P., Useem, M., 1978. Social class and arts consumption: the origins and consequences of class differences in exposure to the arts in America. *Theory and Society* 5 (2) 141–161.
- Duff, P.A., 2003. Intertextuality and hybrid discourses: the infusion of pop culture in educational discourse. *Linguistics and Education* 14 (3–4) 231–276.
- Ganzeboom, H.B.C., 1989. *Cultuurdeelname in Nederland: Een Empirisch-Theoretisch Onderzoek naar Determinanten van Deelname aan Culturele Activiteiten*. Van Gorcum, Maastricht.
- Ganzeboom, H.B.C., 1982. Explaining differential participation in high-cultural activities: a confrontation of information-processing and status-seeking theories. In: Raub, W. (Ed.), *Theoretical Models and Empirical Analyses: Contributions to the Explanation of Individual Actions and Collective Phenomena*. E.S. Publications, Utrecht, pp. 186–205.
- Gripsrud, J., Hovden, J.F., Moe, H., 2011. Changing relations: class, education and cultural capital. *Poetics* 39 (6) 507–529.
- Hibbett, R., 2010. The new age taboo. *Journal of Popular Music Studies* 22 (3) 283–308.
- Holt, D.B., 1998. Does cultural capital structure American consumption? *Journal of Consumer Research* 25 (1) 1–25.
- Katz-Gerro, T., 2002. Highbrow cultural consumption and class distinction in Italy, Israel, West Germany Sweden, and the United States. *Social Forces* 81 (1) 207–229.
- Knulst, W.P., 1995. *Podia in een Tijdperk van Afstandsbediening: Onderzoek naar Achtergronden van Veranderingen in de Omvang en Samenstelling van het Podiumpubliek sinds de Jaren Vijftig*. Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau, Rijswijk.
- Kraaykamp, G., van Eijck, K., 2010. The intergenerational reproduction of cultural capital: a threefold perspective. *Social Forces* 89 (1) 209–231.
- Laughey, D., 2006. *Music and Youth Culture*. Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.
- Lievens, J., Waage, H., De Meulemeester, H., 2006. *Cultuurkijker – Cultuurparticipatie gewikt en gewogen: Basisgegevens van de survey “Cultuurparticipatie in Vlaanderen 2003–2004”*. De Boeck, Antwerpen.
- Livingstone, S., 2002. *Young People and New Media: Childhood and the Changing Media Environment*. Sage, London.
- Lizardo, O., 2006. The puzzle of women’s “highbrow” culture consumption: integrating gender and work into Bourdieu’s class theory of taste. *Poetics* 34 (1) 1–23.
- Lizardo, O., 2008. The question of culture consumption and stratification revisited. *Sociologica* 2. <http://www.sociologica-mulino.it/journal/issue/index/issue/journal:ISSUE:5> (accessed 18.10.13).
- Lizardo, O., Skiles, S., 2008. Cultural consumption in the fine and popular arts realms. *Sociology Compass* 2, 285–502.
- Lovell, T., 2000. Thinking feminism with and against Bourdieu. *Feminist Theory* 1 (11) 11–32.
- Lull, J., 1987. Listeners’ communicative uses of popular music. In: Lull, J. (Ed.), *Popular Music and Communication*. Sage, Beverly Hills, CA, pp. 140–174.
- McCracken, D.G., 1990. *Culture and Consumption: New Approaches to the Symbolic Character of Consumer Goods and Activities*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington, IN.
- Mohr, J., DiMaggio, P., 1995. The intergenerational transmission of cultural capital. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 4, 169–200.
- Nagel, I., 2010. Cultural participation between the ages of 14 and 24: intergenerational transmission or cultural mobility? *European Sociological Review* 26 (5) 541–556.
- Nagel, I., Ganzeboom, H.B.C., 2002. Participation in legitimate culture: family and school effects from adolescence to adulthood. *The Netherlands Journal of Social Sciences* 38 (2) 102–120.
- Peterson, R.A., Kern, R.M., 1996. Changing highbrow taste: from snob to omnivore. *American Sociological Review* 61 (5) 900–907.
- Peterson, R.A., Sherkat, D.A., 1995. *Age Factors in Arts Participation: 1982–1992*. Research Division Report #34, Part 1. National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, DC.
- Priour, A., Savage, M., 2011. Updating cultural capital theory: a discussion based on studies in Denmark and in Britain. *Poetics* 39 (6) 566–580.
- Rasbash, J., Steele, F., Browne, W.J., Goldstein, H., 2009. *A User’s Guide to MLwiN Version 2.10*. University of Bristol, Bristol, UK.
- Reay, D., 2000. A useful extension of Bourdieu’s conceptual framework? Emotional capital as a way of understanding mothers’ involvement in their children’s education?. *Sociological Review* 48 (4) 568–585.
- Reay, D., 2004. Gendering Bourdieu’s concepts of capitals? Emotional capital, women and social class. *The Sociological Review* 52 (Suppl. S2) 57–74.
- Roose, H., Waage, H., 2002. *Cultuurpubliek—Publieke cultuur? Publieksonderzoek bij Theater- en Museumbezoekers te Gent*. Stad Gent, Dienst Culturele Zaken, Dienst Kunsten, Gent.
- Savage, M., Barlow, J., Dickens, P., Fielding, T., 1992. *Property, Bureaucracy and Culture: Middle Class Formation in Contemporary Britain*. Routledge, New York.

- Silva, E.B., 2005. Gender, home and family in cultural capital theory. *British Journal of Sociology* 56 (1) 83–103.
- Siongers, J., 2007. Qui se ressemble, s'assemble? About the (dis)similarities in cultural tastes between adolescents, parents and peers. In: Paper Presented at the 8th European Sociology Conference, Dublin.
- Tepper, S.J., 2000. Fiction reading in America: explaining the gender gap. *Poetics* 27 (4) 255–275.
- ter Bogt, T.F.M., Delsing, M., van Zalk, M., Christenson, P.G., Meeus, W.H.J., 2011. Intergenerational continuity of taste: parental and adolescent music preferences. *Social Forces* 90 (1) 297–319.
- Trondman, M., 1990. Rock taste—on rock as symbolic capital: a study of young people's music taste and music making. In: Roe, K., Carlsson, U. (Eds.), *Popular Music Research*. Nordicom, Gothenberg, pp. 71–86.
- Upright, C.B., 2004. Social capital and cultural participation: spousal influences on attendance at arts events. *Poetics* 32 (2) 129–143.
- Van Berkel, M., De Graaf, N.D., 1995. Husband's and wife's culture participation and their levels of education: a case of male dominance? *Acta Sociologica* 38 (2) 131–149.
- van Eijck, K., 1997. The impact of family background and educational attainment on cultural consumption: a sibling analysis. *Poetics* 25 (4) 195–224.
- van Eijck, K., Bargeman, B., 2004. The changing impact of social background on lifestyle: "culturalization" instead of individualization? *Poetics* 32 (6) 439–461.
- van Eijck, K., van Oosterhout, R., 2005. Combining material and cultural consumption: fading boundaries or increasing antagonism? *Poetics* 33 (5–6) 283–298.
- Van Steen, A., Vlegels, J., Lievens, J., 2012. On intergenerational differences in highbrow cultural participation: is the Internet an explanatory factor in understanding lower highbrow participation among younger cohorts? In: Van Steen, A. (Ed.), *Hoe Wij over Kunst en Cultuur Denken: Een Sociologisch Onderzoek naar Verschillen in Percepties en Betekenissen van Kunst en Cultuur in Vlaanderen*. Universiteit Gent, Gent, pp. 84–102.
- van Wel, F., 1993. Een cultuurkloof tussen generaties? *Cultuurstijlen onder jongeren en hun persoonlijk netwerk*. Boekmancahier 17, 306–327.
- van Wel, F., Couwenbergh-Soeterboek, N., Couwenbergh, C., ter Bogt, T., Raaijmakers, Q., 2006. Ethnicity, youth cultural participation, and cultural reproduction in the Netherlands. *Poetics* 34 (1) 65–82.
- Vander Stichele, A., Laermans, R., 2006. Cultural participation in Flanders: testing the cultural omnivore thesis with population data. *Poetics* 34 (1) 45–64.
- Verbergt, G., Cantillon, B., Van den Bosch, K., 2009. *Sociale Ongelijkheden in het Vlaamse Onderwijs: Tien Jaar Later*. Centrum voor Sociaal Beleid (CBS), Antwerpen.
- Vlegels, J., Lievens, J., 2011. Louter een kwestie van voorkeur en goesting? Over kunsten- en erfgoedparticipatie, bekeken door een cultuursociologische bril. In: Lievens, J., Waeye, H. (Eds.), *Participatie in Vlaanderen 2: Eerste Analyses van de Participatiesurvey 2009*. Acco, Leuven, pp. 235–272.
- Voorpostel, M., van der Lippe, T., 2001. Jongeren en cultuur: een verklaring voor verschillen in deelname aan elitaire en populaire cultuur. *Mens en Maatschappij* 76 (03) 202–239.
- Wildhagen, T., 2009. Why does cultural capital matter for high school performance? An empirical assessment of teacher-selection and self-selection mechanisms as explanations of the cultural capital effect. *Sociological Quarterly* 50 (1) 173–200.

**Mart Willekens** is a doctoral candidate at the Department of Sociology of Ghent University, Belgium. He specializes in cultural sociology and sociology of the family.

**John Lievens** is associate professor at the Department of Sociology of Ghent University, Belgium. His research focuses on culture and art participation/consumption, social stratification and social science research methods.