

Social and cultural mobility: rising to the middle class and cultural practices in contemporary Finland

Jarmo Kallunki 

Unit of Social Research, Faculty of Social Sciences, 33014 Tampere University, Kalevantie 5, 33100, Tampere, Finland
Corresponding author. Email: jarmo.kallunki@tuni.fi

How does social mobility influence cultural taste and participation? Cultural reproduction theory predicts little change, while cultural mobility theory suggests more substantial makeover. This article explores the influence of upward educational and occupational mobility in reading literature, participation in highbrow activities, television watching, and music and food tastes, focusing on mobility from the secondary-level education and the working class to the higher education and the middle class. By analysing survey data ($N = 2,813$) collected in Finland in 2007 and 2018 with ordinary least squares regression, we show that educational mobility and occupational mobility are mostly differently related to tastes and participation. Both educationally and occupationally upwardly mobile people tend to participate more in highbrow activities, watch less television and dislike meat-heavy food, as is more typical to their social destination than to their social origins. Conversely, the educationally upwardly mobile, again more typical to their destination, tend to read more books, like light-ethnic food and classical music, and dislike popular folk, but occupational mobility is not associated with reading or liking light-ethnic food, and the occupationally mobile retain their original tastes in classical and popular folk music when education is controlled for. We discuss the implications of our results.

Introduction

Cultural stratification is one dimension of social stratification (Weber, 1946). Cultural practices—that is, cultural tastes, participation, competences, and knowledge—and their patterning are intertwined with other dimensions of social stratification, such as those related to gender, age, education, occupational class and status, income, and area of residence, with potential national and temporal variations (e.g. DiMaggio, 1982; Bourdieu, 1984; Bennett *et al.*, 2009; Purhonen *et al.*, 2014). One ongoing debate concerns the intermingling of intergenerational social mobility and cultural practices, with the issue being to what extent cultural practices are both the cause and the effect of social reproduction and/or social mobility (e.g. Bourdieu, 1973, 1984; DiMaggio, 1982; Aschaffenburg and Maas, 1997; Van Eijck, 1999; Daenekindt and Roose, 2014; Jaeger and Breen, 2016; Curl, Lareau and Wu, 2018; Dumais, 2019). This paper focuses on one aspect of this debate: how intergenerational upward social mobility influences cultural practices.

Theoretically, our study situates in the debate between the theories of cultural reproduction and

cultural mobility. Cultural reproduction theory holds that individuals' cultural practices result largely from early socialization (e.g. Bourdieu, 1984; Lareau, 2011; Vaisey and Lizardo, 2016), which we operationalize into a hypothesis that upwardly mobile individuals retain the cultural practices that they adopted in their social origin. An alternative hypothesis, based on the cultural mobility theory, which argues for changing cultural practices during later-life socialization (e.g. Swidler, 1986; Van Eijck, 1999; Lahire, 2011; Daenekindt and Roose, 2014), is that upwardly mobile individuals gravitate towards cultural practices common in their social destination, either in all or some of their practices. We operationalize social mobility through education and occupation to investigate whether educational and occupational mobility has similar associations to cultural practices, a study that, to our knowledge, has never been conducted.

Using data collected from two surveys in Finland (2007 and 2018), we analyze the associations of both mobility measures with ten domains of culture and show that upwardly mobile individuals gravitate towards the cultural practices of their social destination, but only regarding certain practices. Our results

Received: July 2021; revised: September 2022; accepted: September 2022

© The Author(s) 2022. Published by Oxford University Press.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted reuse, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

showcase the importance of including popular cultural practices in analyses of cultural reproduction and mobility. We also find asymmetric mobility effects which suggest a need for more nuanced analyses of class fractions in the future. Our results, secondly, show that educational and occupational mobility diverge in their associations with cultural practices. This suggests that the education system and the occupational world adhere to different cultural hierarchies; this difference should be accounted for in the analyses of cultural reproduction and mobility to better grasp the practices to which the socially mobile newcomers are socialized into (and out of), especially in the class-fractionalized education system and occupational world.

Theoretical background

Cultural reproduction

Cultural reproduction can be defined as the intergenerational transmission of (socially stratified) cultural practices from one generation to the next. Cultural reproduction theory holds that an individual's cultural practices are largely a result of early socialization in their childhood family, and differences in practices are reinforced by the school system (Bourdieu, 1973, 1984; Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977; for a review, see Jaeger and Breen, 2016) and labour markets (Rivera, 2012; Koppman, 2016). Supporting reproduction theory, early experiences and socialization have lasting influences on skill formation, attitudes, and beliefs (Heckman, 2006; Lareau, 2011; Vaisey and Lizardo, 2016; Kiley and Vaisey, 2020).

In her review, Sullivan (2011: p. 198) noted that 'there is no lifestyle domain in which researchers have not found evidence of intergenerational transmission', albeit the evidence is stronger in some domains than in others. Research on cultural reproduction has focused on so-called 'highbrow' practices, such as reading literature or liking and attending operas, classical music concerts, museums, and galleries, and has shown that the intergenerational transmission of highbrow practices is well established (Sullivan, 2011; Jaeger and Breen, 2016). More recent studies have shown, for example, that musical preferences (ter Bogt *et al.*, 2011), television watching habits (Notten, Kraaykamp and Konig, 2012), and general orientation to popular culture (Kallunki, 2022) can also be intergenerationally transmitted.

Given that cultural practices are stratified by social class (operationalized as education and occupation; Bourdieu, 1984; Bennett *et al.*, 2009; Lareau, 2011; Purhonen *et al.*, 2014), and cultural reproduction posits that individuals' cultural practices are largely formed during early socialization, the result would be that regardless of their life trajectories, individuals

retain cultural practices that are common in their social class of origin. This reasoning motivates our first hypothesis (H1a).

Social mobility and cultural mobility

A competing perspective is offered by the cultural mobility theory, which posits that valued cultural resources are neither possessed nor controlled solely by the upper classes; individuals from other classes can use such resources too (DiMaggio, 1982; Erickson, 1996; Emmison, 2003). Accordingly, children from less privileged families can use cultural resources as leverage for upward social mobility (DiMaggio, 1982; DiMaggio and Mohr, 1985; Aschaffenburg and Maas, 1997). Another approach is to view cultural mobility as a consequence of or an adaptation to social mobility (e.g. Van Eijck, 1999; Friedman, 2012; Daenekindt and Roose, 2014; Curl, Lareau and Wu, 2018). An underlying idea is that individuals encounter and engage in various diverse socialization contexts in their lives, and their childhood home is but one context. Cultural socialization in the education system is not necessarily concordant with cultural socialization at home (Lahire, 2011; Lareau, 2011), and cultural socialization in the workplace can differ further (Erickson, 1996). Accumulating experience from multiple contexts changes and pluralizes an individual's cultural 'tool kit' (Swidler, 1986), possibly leading to incoherent or 'dissonant' cultural practices (Lahire, 2011; Daenekindt and Roose, 2014). Social mobility encompasses an assemblage of such contexts (Lahire, 2011: pp. 36–41). In sum, the significance of social origins diminishes as individuals progress in their lives, and social destination surpasses social origin in its influence over one's cultural practices.

While cultural mobility has been less researched than cultural reproduction (Streib, 2017), a body of research studying the effects of social mobility on cultural practices has emerged in recent decades. Studies often focus on one or two cultural domains (for an exception, see Daenekindt and Roose, 2013b) and use either educational or occupational mobility measure. At least domains of highbrow culture, music, food, film, and comedy have been studied. Van Eijck (1999) explored how educational mobility influences the consumption of highbrow culture (reading serious literature, visiting museums, attending plays etc.) and popular culture (watching television etc.). He found that educationally mobile people consume highbrow culture in a pattern somewhere in between their social origin and destination, but mobility does not influence their consumption of popular culture. Similarly, when studying the link between educational mobility and highbrow practices, Dumais (2019) found that the practices of upwardly mobile first-generation college graduates were more

similar to the practices of immobile second-generation college graduates than to the practices of immobile high school graduates.

In the domain of music, [Daenekindt and Roose \(2014\)](#) found that educationally mobile people tend to adopt music listening patterns characteristic of their social destination, which causes dissonance in their tastes (cf. [Chan and Turner, 2017](#)). Similarly, [Coulangeon \(2015\)](#) showed that occupationally mobile people tend to adopt the musical tastes characteristic of their social destinations. In the domain of food consumption, [Domanski and Karpinski \(2018\)](#) found that occupationally upwardly mobile conforms to upper-class habits in their food consumption, but downwardly mobile people tend to maintain the habits of their upper-class origins. Qualitative studies by [Curl, Lareau and Wu \(2018\)](#) and [Beagan, Power and Chapman \(2015\)](#) support this view. Regarding other cultural domains, [Daenekindt and Roose \(2013a\)](#) showed that educational mobility influences the evaluation of films such that upwardly mobile people adhere to the upper-class forms of evaluation, but downwardly mobile people tend to retain their upper-class forms. When analysing comedy tastes, [Friedman \(2012\)](#) observed that upwardly mobile people add highbrow comedy to their taste palette, yet they often retain their tastes for 'lowbrow' comedy.

A theoretical underpinning uniting the mobility research cited above is the status theory ([Ganzeboom, 1982; Van Eijck, 2011; Nagel and Ganzeboom, 2015](#)). According to the status theory, cultural socialization includes learning of the social norms and habits of cultural consumption particular to the group one belongs to or is becoming a member of. New individuals to a group gradually adopt the group's typical tastes and participation patterns, and newcomers particularly learn to appreciate the practices the group values and shun the practices the group considers questionable. ([Nagel and Ganzeboom, 2015](#).) Two debates within the status theory are of special interest for cultural mobility research: First, how 'deep' can cultural socialization be when it occurs alongside social mobility? [Daenekindt and Roose \(2013b\)](#) found that for the socially mobile individuals cultural practices performed in public spaces are more strongly tied to social mobility than privately practiced cultural practices, suggesting that the mobile overstress their conformity to destination class in public to better fit in (also [Roose and Vander Stichele, 2010; Friedman, 2012](#)). In other words, social mobility might not change the deeper-level long-lasting dispositions or stable preferences, but the change may be limited to the level of public performances. Therefore, we might find that social mobility is associated with publicly performed practices, such as going to the opera and to the theatre, but mobility has no

influence, for example, in reading, watching television at home, or in musical preferences.

A second debate within the status theory concerns the symmetry/asymmetry of mobility effects. The question is whether social mobility has a similar effect regardless of the respondents' origin and destination (symmetric effect), or does the effect depend on either origins or destinations (asymmetric effect)? For an example of an asymmetric effect, the above-cited literature debates about the so-called maximization hypothesis, according to which the socially mobile adopt cultural practices associated with the highest social status they have occupied, whether origin or destination ([Ganzeboom, 1982; Van Eijck, 1999; Daenekindt and Roose, 2013b](#)). In other words, upwardly mobile people would adopt cultural practices typical to their destination, while downwardly mobile people retain practices typical to their origin. The above-cited literature is split on the issue, with some results supporting the maximization hypothesis ([Daenekindt and Roose, 2013a; Beagan, Power and Chapman 2015; Domanski and Karpinski, 2018; Dumais, 2019](#)) and some rejecting it ([Van Eijck, 1999; Daenekindt and Roose, 2013b; Coulangeon, 2015; Chan and Turner, 2017](#)). Cultural mobility theory, including the questions about the 'level of depth' and the symmetric/asymmetric effects inform our second and third hypotheses (H1b, H1c).

Studies analysing the effects of social mobility on cultural practices typically operationalize social mobility either as educational mobility (e.g. [Van Eijck, 1999; Daenekindt and Roose, 2014; Chan and Turner, 2017; Dumais, 2019](#)) or occupational mobility (e.g. [Coulangeon, 2015; Domanski and Karpinski, 2018](#)), but not both. Nevertheless, educational and occupational mobilities have potentially different associations to cultural practices: as [Erickson \(1996: p. 224\)](#) argues, 'there is no single cultural hierarchy that correlates with all forms of inequality'. The education system, according to both reproduction theorists ([Bourdieu, 1973; 1984](#)) and mobility theorists ([DiMaggio, 1982; DiMaggio and Mohr, 1985](#)), values high-status culture and both encourages and rewards pupils' participation in it. On the other hand, the education system might hypothetically shun television watching, and be indifferent about pupils' musical tastes. In this case, under the status theory, we would expect that the educationally upwardly mobile adopt more highbrow activities and reduce the amount of watching television compared to those immobile individuals who stay at the lower educational level. But this need not be the case for occupational mobility. As [Erickson \(1996\)](#) observed, highbrow culture can be seen as a waste of time in the business world, and breadth of taste and knowledge of sports may instead be valued (see also [Rivera, 2012; Koppman, 2016](#)). If this was the case, we

would expect that the occupationally upwardly mobile would at least not increase their participation in high-brow activities compared to the immobile stayers. Thus, the education system and the occupational field may have (at least partly) different cultural hierarchies, and it seems fruitful to study both educational and occupational mobility and whether their effect cohere or not (H2a, H2b).

The Finnish context

The context for our analysis is Finland. Per international comparisons, social mobility in Finland is high, whether mobility is measured in terms of education (Hertz *et al.*, 2007; Pfeffer, 2008) or occupation (Härkönen, 2010), even though recent studies suggest that mobility has started to decline (Erola, 2009; Härkönen and Sirniö, 2020). By contrast, cultural stratification in contemporary Finland follows patterns similar to other Western countries: education and occupation, along with gender and age, structure Finns' cultural tastes and participation (e.g. Kahma, 2011; Purhonen *et al.*, 2014), and signs of reproduction are observed (Kallunki and Purhonen, 2017). Empirical analyses of Finnish cultural stratification since the 1960s show that participation in highbrow culture has continuously been a preoccupation of the highly educated upper classes. Conversely, watching television has, since the 1970s, been more common for working-class and agricultural groups (e.g. Eskola, 1976; Liikkanen, Hanifi and Hannula, 2005; Purhonen *et al.*, 2014). Similarly, tastes in music have been socially stratified (Toiviainen, 1970; Seppänen, 1993). The long history of stable differences between upper-class and lower-class cultural practices suggests that socially mobile people encounter different practices in their origin and destination.

Finland can be described as a middle-class society. Historically, Finland experienced a fast transformation from an agriculture-dominated economy to an industrial and service-based economy in the 1960s and 1970s (e.g. Vartia and Ylä-Anttila, 2005). As one consequence, the share of middle-class occupations increased, first to about a third of all occupations until the end of the 1970s (Alestalo, 1985), and then becoming the most typical occupational class from the beginning of the 2000s onwards (Blom and Melin, 2014). The core of the middle class has consisted of higher-educated professionals working in administration, trade, public, and private services, and later also in information technology (Alestalo, 1985; Erola, 2010; Blom and Melin, 2014). According to Blom and Melin (2014), the traits of middle-class lifestyles and values dominate contemporary Finnish society, with most Finns having identified themselves as middle class for quite some time (also Erola, 2010; Kahma, 2010).

These accounts not only point to the 'middle-classification' of Finnish society in recent decades but also reveal that the middle class has a certain gravitational pull in terms of identification in Finland. Whether this pull applies to cultural practices is not yet known.

Thus, focusing on the transition to the middle class in the Finnish context offers an interesting topic. This focus means that our analysis will cover only upward mobility: catching the downwardly mobile offspring of the small Finnish upper-most social class is not feasible here. Studying the upwardly mobile middle-class-destined Finns leads us to specify our research questions and hypotheses.

The research questions and hypotheses

Our general research questions are as follows: Which cultural practices, if any, are influenced by upward social mobility from the working class to the middle class in contemporary Finland? Do educational and occupational mobility have similar effects? We investigate these questions by positing two sets of hypotheses:

H1a: Upwardly mobile individuals retain the cultural practices they have adopted at their social origin. (Reproduction hypothesis.)

H1b: Upwardly mobile individuals gravitate towards middle-class cultural practices in all their cultural practices. (Uniform mobility hypothesis.)

H1c: Upwardly mobile individuals gravitate towards middle-class practices only in some cultural practices. (Non-uniform mobility hypothesis.)

H2a: Educational mobility and occupational mobility are similarly associated with the cultural practices. (Concordance hypothesis.)

H2b: Educational mobility and occupational mobility are differently associated with at least some cultural practices. (Divergence hypothesis.)

Data and variables

Data

Our data came from two similar, nationally representative Finnish surveys collected by Statistics Finland in 2007 and 2018 (excluding the Åland Islands). The first survey, titled 'Culture and Leisure in Finland, 2007', targeted a random sample of 3,000 Finns aged 18–74, with a response rate of 46.3 per cent ($N = 1,388$), while the latter, 'Culture and Leisure in Finland, 2018', contacted a random sample of 3,500 Finns (same age range) and had a response rate of 40.7 per cent

($N = 1,425$). The surveys included a range of cultural domains in which the respondents were asked about their tastes and participation. Among those domains were reading literature, participating in highbrow activities, television watching habits, music tastes, and food tastes. The surveys also requested the education levels and occupations of the respondents, their fathers and their mothers. Regarding variables of interest, there were no major differences between the survey rounds in the variables' distributions or in their one-to-one associations. We thus merged the data ($N = 2,813$) to increase the analytical N (see below).

Variables measuring social mobility

In this paper we study both educational and occupational mobility. Respondent's social destination is measured by their current education level and occupational position. To measure respondent's social origin, we use information about both fathers and mothers. An ongoing methodological debate has suggested several ways of combining information about both parents (e.g. Korupp, Ganzeboom and Van Der Lippe, 2002; Beller, 2009; Thaning and Halssten, 2020). In this paper, we focus on respondents whose social origins are 'class-consistent' (Beller, 2009), that is, both parents have the same class, for two reasons. The first is empirical: constructing the educational mobility measure directs us to this focus (see below), and for the logical consistency of our analysis, we do the same for occupational mobility. Secondly, focusing on class-consistent origins better highlights the differences between 'the cores of the classes' (De Graaf, Nieuwebeerta and Heath, 1995: p. 1007), that is, groups of respondents whose destinations are the same as their origins, which, consequently, should make it easier to detect how the mobile differ from the class cores.

The education levels were measured by a seven-point scale, ranging from less than basic to post-graduate university. Transformations of the structure of the Finnish secondary and tertiary education systems in the 1980s and 1990s (Lehtisalo and Raivola, 1999: pp. 139–154; Lampinen, 2003: pp. 87–106) cause intergenerational comparability problems in our survey-based data, so we leave out the old post-secondary education (*opistoaste* in Finnish). Higher education characterizes the Finnish middle class; therefore, we defined the immobile higher educated (IHE) group as individuals and both of their parents having a university education (technically, ISCED 6–8). By contrast, we defined the immobile low-educated (ILE) group as individuals with a secondary education (ISCED 2–3) whose both parents have either a primary or secondary education (ISCED 1–3): we allowed for the parents to have a primary education to account for the education level increase in Finland (Pekkala Kerr and Rinne,

2012). The educationally mobile (UMED) group then consists of individuals with a university education but whose parents have a primary or secondary education. Leaving out the old post-secondary level led to few parent couples having mixed education levels (<8 per cent), so we focus on class-consistent origins. Thus, the educational mobility measure is a three-class nominal variable (Table 1). Through this construction, our educational mobility measure roughly corresponds to Dumais's (2019) measure.

Occupations were requested as open text fields. The responses were coded according to the European classification of occupations 2010 (Statistics Finland, 2011), ranging from 1 to 9 as follows: group 1 = top managers; group 2 = professionals; group 3 = technicians and associate professionals; group 4 = clerical support workers; group 5 = service and sales workers; group 6 = agricultural occupations; and groups 7–9 = various blue-collar occupations, ranging from industry and transport to elementary and unskilled occupations. We combined groups 2, 3, and 4 to represent the middle class and groups 5, 7, 8, and 9 to represent the working class (following Kahma, 2010 and Purhonen *et al.*, 2014). Group 6 was left untouched: agriculture is historically culturally close to the working class (Alestalo, 1985), but an agricultural childhood, when compared to a working-class childhood, has quite different and lasting effects on an individual's lifestyle (e.g. Kortteinen, 1982).

The occupational mobility measure was constructed as follows: The immobile middle class (IMC) comprised individuals and their parents being middle class, whereas the immobile working class (IWC) comprised individuals and both their parents being working class. The separation of working class and agriculture created two upwardly mobile groups: (i) middle-class individuals with working-class parents (UMWC) and (ii) middle-class individuals with agricultural parents (UMAG). The immobile agriculture group was expectedly small and therefore omitted.¹ Thus, the occupational mobility measure is a four-class nominal variable (Table 1).

Table 1 shows that the mobility measures captured only a portion of the entire dataset. While the analytical N decreased, merging the survey rounds ensured that N remained large enough. Notably, the mobility measures captured different subsets of the entire dataset. In the subset where both mobility measures were defined ($N = 475$), the measures were highly correlated (the gamma coefficient was 0.867).

Variables measuring cultural practices

The cultural practices we used as dependent variables are such that their social stratification in Finland is well known. We used measures for both participation and

Table 1 Educational mobility and occupational mobility measures.

	N	%	Description of the criteria
Educational mobility			
Immobile higher educated (IHE)	146	15.2	Respondent: university educated Parents: university educated
Upwardly mobile (UMED)	337	35.1	Respondent: university educated Parents: primary or secondary level educated
Immobile lower educated (ILE)	476	49.6	Respondent: secondary level educated Parents: primary or secondary level educated
Total	959	100.0	
Excluded from analysis	1,854		Other combinations: 65.9 per cent of the entire dataset.
Occupational mobility			
Immobile middle class (IMC)	294	25.0	Respondent: middle class Parents: middle class
Upwardly mobile from working class (UMWC)	296	25.2	Respondent: middle class Parents: working class
Upwardly mobile from agriculture (UMAG)	186	15.8	Respondent: middle class Parents: agriculture
Immobile working class (IWC)	400	34.0	Respondent: working class Parents: working class
Total	1,176	100.0	
Excluded from analysis	1,637		Other combinations: 58.2 per cent of the entire dataset.

taste. The variables are constructed below (statistics in [Table 2](#)).

Reading literature

The surveys asked how many books the respondent had read during the past year (open number). The original distribution was heavily positively skewed, and we recoded the variable into a six-point scale.

Highbrow activities

The respondents were asked how often they visit the following: (i) operas, (ii) classical music concerts, (iii) theatres, (iv) art galleries, and (v) museums. The options were: (i) every week; (ii) every month; (iii) a few times a year; (iv) less than a few times a year; and (v) never. To control for outliers, the variables were first recoded into three-point scales (0 = never; 1 = less than a few times a year; 2 = a few times a year or more) and then summed (Cronbach's alpha: 0.814).

Television watching

The respondents were asked how many hours per weekday (excluding weekends) they watch television (open number). The responses were rounded to integers, and responses of more than 5.5 h were lumped together.

Music tastes

The respondents were presented with 13 music genres and asked whether they liked them (a standard five-point Likert scale with a sixth option 'I haven't listened' was used). Principal component analysis (Kaiser normalization, Varimax rotation) was performed, resulting in four musical tastes: highbrow music (comprising opera, classical music, modern jazz, blues, and world music), popular folk (Finnish schlagers, folk, country, and religious), rock (rock and heavy metal), and dance (electro-dance, hip hop, and R&B). As this is a known pattern of contemporary Finnish musical tastes, we composed measures for each taste as a mean score of the genres belonging to a component.

Food tastes

The respondents were presented with nine food items and asked whether they liked them (same answering options as with music). The same procedures of principal component analysis and construction of tastes as means were performed. The resulting three well-known contemporary Finnish food tastes included meat-heavy (chateaubriand, Karelian stew, and Wienerschnitzel), light-ethnic (Greek salad, Chinese, and sushi), and fast food (pizza and hamburger).

Altogether, we had ten variables for Finnish cultural practices, three for activities, four for musical tastes, and three for food tastes. Research ([Purhonen,](#)

Table 2 Distributions and descriptive statistics for the cultural practice variables

Reading literature	Subset for educational mobility analysis		Subset for occupational mobility analysis		Entire dataset	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
0 books (within last year)	11.5	94	11.2	111	11.1	258
1–2 books	21.3	174	21.5	213	21.2	492
3–5 books	21.8	178	20.8	206	22.7	526
6–10 books	19.6	160	19.7	195	18.3	426
11–20 books	11.7	96	13.5	134	13.2	306
21 or more books	14.2	116	13.3	132	13.5	314
Total	100.0	818	100.0	991	100.0	2322
	Mean	Std. dev.	Mean	Std. dev.	Mean	Std. dev.
Highbrow activities (annual visiting intensity)	3.86	2.558	4.06	2.556	3.91	2.575
Television watching (hours watched per day)	2.12	1.283	2.29	1.300	2.28	1.334
Liking highbrow music	0.03	0.822	0.08	0.811	0.06	0.806
Liking popular folk	0.20	0.812	0.33	0.798	0.29	0.824
Liking rock	0.55	0.993	0.47	0.990	0.47	1.018
Liking dance	-0.04	0.960	-0.19	0.954	-0.12	0.977
Liking meat-heavy food	1.14	0.822	1.16	0.811	1.16	0.809
Liking light-ethnic food	0.97	0.779	0.99	0.782	0.98	0.783
Liking fast food	1.13	0.724	1.05	0.754	1.05	0.762

Note: All music and food tastes have an interval range [-2, 2], where -2 = dislikes a lot; -1 = dislikes a little; 0 = no like nor dislike; 1 = likes a little; 2 = likes a lot.

Gronow and Rahkonen, 2009; Purhonen *et al.*, 2014; Purhonen and Gronow, 2014; Lindblom and Mustonen, 2015; Purhonen and Heikkilä, 2017) has shown the following: (i) reading more literature is typical for the higher social strata (whereas the lower strata read less); (ii) highbrow activities are typical of the upper strata (others rarely participate); and (iii) watching more television per day is more common to the lower strata. For musical tastes, (iv) highbrow music is liked by the upper but not by the lower strata, whereas (v) popular folk is the opposite. Rock (vi) and dance (vii) are stratified by age but not necessarily by socio-economic factors. Finally, (viii) meat-heavy food is liked more by the lower than the upper strata, whereas (ix) light-ethnic food is the opposite. Fast food (x) is influenced mostly by age and not necessarily by socio-economic factors.

Methods

We used multiple ordinary least squares regression (Cohen *et al.*, 2003; Tabachnick and Fidell, 2014). We controlled for gender, age, and survey round. Because education level explains both occupational mobility and cultural practices, in occupational mobility analysis we controlled for the respondent's education

(dichotomized as: university vs. primary or secondary level). See Appendix for the controls' statistics.

Results

The results of the multiple regression are in Tables 3–5, where we report the unstandardized coefficients with confidence intervals and the standardized beta coefficients. Overall, the tables show that reading literature, participation in highbrow activities and liking highbrow music and light-ethnic food are positively associated with higher education and middle-class occupation, whereas watching television and liking popular folk music and meat-heavy food are negatively associated with higher education and middle-class occupation. Thus, the general picture corresponds to the literature on Finnish cultural consumption. Gender and age also show known associations with cultural practices. We henceforth focus on the mobility measures.

Table 3 shows that reading literature was tied more to the respondent's education level than to their social mobility: for educational mobility, both higher-educated groups (IHE, UMED) tended to read more than the immobile lower-educated (ILE) reference group (no difference between IHE and UMED) but, in the

Table 3 Multiple regression analysis of the associations of respondent's educational and occupational upward mobility with reading literature, participating in highbrow activities, and television watching (with controls): ordinary least squares coefficients

Educational mobility models	Reading literature: six-point scale			Highbrow activities: annual visiting intensity			Television watching: hours watched per weekday		
	B	95% CI	beta	B	95% CI	beta	B	95% CI	beta
<i>Educational mobility (ILE = 0)</i>									
UMED	0.717***	[0.492; 0.942]	0.223	1.601***	[1.288; 1.915]	0.300	-0.454***	[-0.629; -0.279]	-0.170
IHE	0.855***	[0.551; 1.158]	0.199	3.247***	[2.823; 3.672]	0.451	-0.645***	[-0.882; -0.408]	-0.179
<i>Controls</i>									
Age	0.016***	[0.009; 0.023]	0.157	0.056***	[0.047; 0.065]	0.337	0.020***	[0.015; 0.026]	0.245
Gender (man = 0)									
Woman	0.361***	[0.151; 0.571]	0.114	0.747***	[0.461; 1.033]	0.145	0.128	[-0.032; 0.288]	0.050
Survey round (2007 = 0)									
2018	-0.649***	[-0.858; -0.440]	-0.205	-0.405**	[-0.690; -0.121]	-0.079	-0.183*	[-0.342; -0.024]	-0.071
Constant	1.440***	[1.056; 1.824]		0.060	[-0.457; 0.577]		1.492***	[1.204; 1.780]	
Model information			N = 814; R ² (adj.) = 0.113			N = 928; R ² (adj.) = 0.283			N = 924; R ² (adj.) = 0.114
<i>Occupational mobility models</i>									
<i>Reading literature: six-point scale</i>									
	B	95% CI	beta	B	95% CI	beta	B	95% CI	beta
<i>Occupational mobility (IWC = 0)</i>									
UMWC	0.047	[-0.284; 0.379]	0.013	0.654**	[0.203; 1.105]	0.107	-0.098	[-0.346; 0.149]	-0.033
UMAG	0.275	[-0.131; 0.681]	0.056	0.538	[-0.010; 1.086]	0.067	-0.204	[-0.513; 0.104]	-0.050
IMC	0.327	[-0.011; 0.665]	0.096	1.876***	[1.409; 2.343]	0.327	-0.302*	[-0.558; -0.045]	-0.106
<i>Controls</i>									
Education (lower education = 0)									
Higher education	0.667***	[0.379; 0.956]	0.214	1.385***	[0.987; 1.783]	0.269	-0.424***	[-0.643; -0.204]	-0.166
Age	0.013***	[0.006; 0.021]	0.132	0.044***	[0.034; 0.055]	0.267	0.023***	[0.017; 0.029]	0.283
Gender (man = 0)									
Woman	0.427***	[0.206; 0.648]	0.134	0.923***	[0.623; 1.222]	0.176	0.07	[-0.095; 0.235]	0.027
Survey round (2007 = 0)									
2018	-0.491***	[-0.709; -0.274]	-0.156	-0.165	[-0.458; 0.128]	-0.032	-0.048	[-0.211; 0.114]	-0.019
Constant	1.276***	[0.857; 1.695]		0.050	[-0.513; 0.613]		1.454***	[1.142; 1.765]	
Model information			N = 751; R ² (adj.) = 0.116			N = 850; R ² (adj.) = 0.308			N = 845; R ² (adj.) = 0.152

*: $P < 0.05$; **: $P < 0.01$; ***: $P < 0.001$.

Control variables: Age is continuous, all other controls are categorical 0/1-dummies.

Acronyms: IHE = Immobile Higher Educated; UMED = Upwardly Mobile from lower to higher Education; ILE = Immobile Lower Educated; IMC = Immobile Middle Class; UMWC = Upwardly Mobile to middle class originating from Working Class; UMAG = Upwardly Mobile to middle class originating from Agriculture; IWC = Immobile Working Class.

Table 4 Multiple regression analysis of the associations of respondent's educational and occupational upward mobility with musical tastes (with controls); ordinary least squares coefficients

Educational mobility models	Liking highbrow music: interval [-2, 2]		Liking popular folk music: interval [-2, 2]	
	B	95% CI	B	95% CI
<i>Educational mobility (ILE = 0)</i>				
UMED	0.340***	[0.230; 0.449]	0.198	[-0.250; -0.046]
IHE	0.678***	[0.531; 0.825]	0.294	[-0.387; -0.110]
<i>Controls</i>				
Age	0.015***	[0.012; 0.018]	0.277	[0.021; 0.027]
Gender (man = 0)				
Woman	0.205***	[0.105; 0.305]	0.124	[0.145; 0.332]
Survey round (2007 = 0)				
2018	-0.026	[-0.125; 0.074]	-0.016	[-0.262; -0.076]
Constant	-0.963***	[-1.143; -0.783]	-0.826***	[-0.995; -0.658]
Model information		N = 937; R2 (adj.) = 0.149		N = 939; R2 (adj.) = 0.234
Liking rock music: interval [-2, 2]				
	B	95% CI	beta	95% CI
<i>Educational mobility (ILE = 0)</i>				
UMED	-0.030	[-0.162; 0.101]	-0.015	[-0.206; 0.049]
IHE	-0.221*	[-0.399; -0.044]	-0.079	[-0.260; 0.086]
<i>Controls</i>				
Age	-0.025***	[-0.029; -0.021]	-0.392	[-0.025; -0.018]
Gender (man = 0)				
Woman	-0.349***	[-0.469; -0.229]	-0.174	[0.128; 0.361]
Survey round (2007 = 0)				
2018	0.158**	[0.039; 0.278]	0.080	[0.308; 0.539]
Constant	1.850***	[1.635; 2.066]	0.598***	[0.388; 0.807]
Model information		N = 934; R2 (adj.) = 0.159		N = 918; R2 (adj.) = 0.164
Liking dance music: interval [-2, 2]				
	B	95% CI	beta	95% CI
<i>Occupational mobility (IWC = 0)</i>				
UMWC	0.067	[-0.089; 0.223]	0.035	[-0.178; 0.103]
UMAG	0.068	[-0.123; 0.258]	0.027	[0.006; 0.348]
IMC	0.341***	[0.179; 0.503]	0.188	[-0.296; -0.006]
Liking popular folk music: interval [-2, 2]				
	B	95% CI	beta	95% CI
<i>Occupational mobility (IWC = 0)</i>				
UMWC	0.067	[-0.089; 0.223]	0.035	[-0.178; 0.103]
UMAG	0.068	[-0.123; 0.258]	0.027	[0.006; 0.348]
IMC	0.341***	[0.179; 0.503]	0.188	[-0.296; -0.006]

Table 4. Continued

Educational mobility models	Liking highbrow music: interval [-2, 2]		Liking popular folk music: interval [-2, 2]	
	B	95% CI	B	95% CI
<i>Controls</i>				
Education (lower education = 0)				
Higher education	0.345***	[0.207; 0.482]	0.212	[-0.245; 0.004]
Age	0.014***	[0.010; 0.018]	0.267	[0.021; 0.028]
Gender (man = 0)				
Woman	0.204***	[0.100; 0.308]	0.123	[0.063; 0.249]
Survey round (2007 = 0)				
2018	-0.121*	[-0.223; -0.019]	-0.074	[-0.249; -0.066]
Constant	-0.924***	[-1.118; -0.729]	-0.798***	[-0.973; -0.623]
Model information		N = 856; R2 (adj.) = 0.163		N = 866; R2 (adj.) = 0.290
Liking rock music: interval [-2, 2]				
	B	95% CI	beta	95% CI
<i>Occupational mobility (IWC = 0)</i>				
UMWC	0.064	[-0.129; 0.257]	0.028	[-0.300; 0.080]
UMAG	-0.069	[-0.305; 0.167]	-0.022	[-0.284; 0.182]
IMC	-0.050	[-0.249; 0.150]	-0.023	[-0.238; 0.155]
<i>Controls</i>				
Education (lower education = 0)				
Higher education	-0.071	[-0.241; 0.099]	-0.036	[-0.209; 0.127]
Age	-0.022***	[-0.026; -0.017]	-0.339	[-0.024; -0.015]
Gender (man = 0)				
Woman	-0.366***	[-0.494; -0.238]	-0.182	[0.042; 0.295]
Survey round (2007 = 0)				
2018	0.164*	[0.038; 0.289]	0.083	[0.247; 0.496]
Constant	1.707***	[1.468; 1.946]	0.547***	[0.308; 0.785]
Model information		N = 853; R2 (adj.) = 0.140		N = 842; R2 (adj.) = 0.125

*: $P < 0.05$; **: $P < 0.01$; ***: $P < 0.001$.

Control variables: Age is continuous, all other controls are categorical 0/1-dummies.

Acronyms: IHE = Immobile Higher Educated; UMED = Upwardly Mobile from lower to higher Education; ILE = Immobile Lower Educated; IMC = Immobile Middle Class; UMWC = Upwardly Mobile to middle class originating from Working Class; UMAG = Upwardly Mobile to middle class originating from Agriculture; IWC = Immobile Working Class.

Table 5 Multiple regression analysis of the associations of respondent's educational and occupational upward mobility with food tastes (with controls): ordinary least squares coefficients

Educational mobility models	Liking meat-heavy food: interval [-2, 2]		Liking light-ethnic food: interval [-2, 2]		Liking fast food: interval [-2, 2]		
	B	95% CI	beta	95% CI	B	95% CI	
<i>Educational mobility (ILE = 0)</i>							
UMED	-0.174**	[-0.285; -0.062]	-0.102	[0.084; 0.303]	0.119	[-0.171; 0.017]	
IHE	-0.305***	[-0.457; -0.153]	-0.132	[0.267; 0.564]	0.190	[-0.214; 0.040]	
<i>Controls</i>							
Age	0.008***	[0.004; 0.011]	0.146	[-0.005; 0.001]	-0.042	[-0.023; -0.017]	
Gender (man = 0)							
Woman	-0.365***	[-0.468; -0.263]	-0.222	[0.142; 0.343]	0.154	[-0.221; -0.049]	
Survey round (2007 = 0)							
2018	-0.171***	[-0.273; -0.070]	-0.105	[-0.028; 0.172]	0.046	[0.167; 0.338]	
Constant	1.185***	[1.001; 1.369]	0.761***	[0.578; 0.943]	2.016***	[1.861; 2.172]	
Model information		N = 918; R2 (adj.) = 0.115		N = 910; R2 (adj.) = 0.069		N = 922; R2 (adj.) = 0.187	
<i>Occupational mobility models</i>							
		Liking meat-heavy food: interval [-2, 2]				Liking fast food: interval [-2, 2]	
		B	95% CI	beta	95% CI	B	95% CI
<i>Occupational mobility (IWC = 0)</i>							
UMWC	-0.053	[-0.213; 0.107]	-0.028	[-0.046; 0.282]	0.063	[-0.248; 0.041]	-0.057
UMAG	-0.034	[-0.228; 0.161]	-0.013	[-0.213; 0.188]	-0.005	[-0.314; 0.036]	-0.058
IMC	-0.259**	[-0.425; -0.093]	-0.142	[-0.005; 0.335]	0.093	[-0.314; -0.014]	-0.095
<i>Controls</i>							
		Liking meat-heavy food: interval [-2, 2]				Liking fast food: interval [-2, 2]	
		B	95% CI	beta	95% CI	B	95% CI
<i>Education (lower education = 0)</i>							
Higher education	-0.121	[-0.262; 0.020]	-0.074	[0.010; 0.299]	0.097	[-0.241; 0.015]	-0.073
Age	0.009***	[0.005; 0.013]	0.174	[-0.004; 0.004]	-0.002	[-0.025; -0.017]	-0.424
<i>Gender (man = 0)</i>							
Woman	-0.393***	[-0.499; -0.287]	-0.237	[0.177; 0.395]	0.177	[-0.229; -0.037]	-0.085
Survey round (2007 = 0)							
2018	-0.206***	[-0.310; -0.102]	-0.127	[-0.035; 0.178]	0.045	[0.243; 0.430]	0.219
Constant	1.203***	[1.004; 1.403]	0.636***	[0.430; 0.841]	2.124***	[1.944; 2.304]	
Model information		N = 840; R2 (adj.) = 0.146		N = 833; R2 (adj.) = 0.059		N = 846; R2 (adj.) = 0.215	

*: $P < 0.05$; **: $P < 0.01$; ***: $P < 0.001$.

Control variables: Age is continuous, all other controls are categorical 0/1-dummies.

Acronyms: IHE = Immobile Higher Educated; UMED = Upwardly Mobile from lower to higher Education; ILE = Immobile Lower Educated; IMC = Immobile Middle Class; UMWC = Upwardly Mobile to middle class originating from Working Class; UMAG = Upwardly Mobile to middle class originating from Agriculture; IWC = Immobile Working Class.

occupational mobility model, occupational mobility was not associated with reading when controlling for the respondent's education. Regarding our first hypotheses, we observed only the educational mobility model and concluded that the educationally upwardly mobile (UMED) group gravitated towards the immobile higher-educated (IHE) group. This evidence against the reproduction hypothesis (H1a) and aligns with the mobility hypotheses (H1b, H1c). Because mobility measures have different associations with reading, results suggest rejecting the concordance hypothesis (H2a) and accepting the divergence hypothesis (H2b).

Participation in highbrow activities differentiates the mobility groups clearly: for educational mobility, the immobile higher-educated (IHE) group was the most likely to participate, the immobile lower-educated (ILE) group was the least likely, and the upwardly mobile (UMED) group was in between (all differences significant). Similarly, occupationally the immobile middle-class (IMC) group was the most likely to participate, followed by the group of upwardly mobile originating from working class (UMWC). The other mobile group originating from agriculture (UMAG) did not differ from either the immobile working class (IWC)—the most passive group—or the upwardly mobile originating from the working class (UMWC). In terms of the confidence intervals, the agriculture-originated upwardly mobile (UMAG) group was somewhere between the upwardly mobile originating from working class (UMWC) and the immobile working class (IWC). Thus, occupational mobility might have a stronger influence on the working-class originated upwardly mobile (UMWC) group than on the agriculture-originated upwardly mobile (UMAG) group. These results evidence against the reproduction hypothesis (H1a) and align with the mobility hypotheses (H1b, H1c). Moreover, both educational and occupational mobility seemed to have a similar pattern of associations, aligning with the concordance hypothesis (H2a). Overall, upper-class origin—in both mobility measures—seemed to be the most powerful factor predicting participation in highbrow activities.

As for television, higher education decreased the amount of watching: both the immobile higher-educated (IHE) and educationally upwardly mobile (UMED) groups differed from the immobile lower-educated (ILE) but not from each other. The strong association of higher education was also seen in the model for occupational mobility. Observing occupational mobility, the immobile middle class (IMC) differed from the immobile working class (IWC), while both upwardly mobile groups (UMWC and UMAG) were in between and indistinguishable from either immobile group. Thus, the reproduction hypothesis (H1a) is rejected, and the mobility hypotheses (H1b,

H1c) survive. Furthermore, for both educational and occupational mobility, the upwardly mobile groups gravitated towards the immobile upper groups, in line with the concordance hypothesis (H2a).

Table 4 shows the results for music tastes. Liking highbrow music was clearly associated with educational and occupational factors. For educational mobility, the upwardly mobile (UMED) group gravitated towards the immobile higher-educated (IHE) group and away from the immobile lower-educated (ILE) group (all differences significant), just as with participation in highbrow activities. Regarding occupational mobility, the immobile middle-class (IMC) group differed from the other groups, and the mobile groups did not gravitate towards the immobile middle class (IMC) (small overlap of the confidence intervals). For highbrow activities, occupational mobility had a stronger association in the case of the upwardly mobile originating from working class (UMWC) group compared to the agriculture-originated upwardly mobile (UMAG) group, but there was no difference between the groups regarding liking highbrow music. Overall, higher education seemed to be the most potent predictor. Regarding our hypotheses, educational mobility and occupational mobility have different association patterns (reject H2a, retain H2b), and educational mobility lent support to the mobility hypotheses (H1b, H1c) but not to the reproduction hypothesis (H1a), while occupational mobility, conversely, rejects the mobility hypotheses and supports the reproduction hypothesis.

Liking popular folk music follows an inverse pattern compared to liking highbrow music: for educational mobility, the immobile lower-educated (ILE) group liked popular folk the most and the immobile higher-educated (IHE) group the least, while the upwardly mobile (UMED) group were close and indistinguishable from the immobile higher-educated (IHE) group. Occupational mobility was also associated with liking popular folk: the immobile middle-class (IMC) group liked popular folk less than the other groups, and the agriculture-originated upwardly mobile (UMAG) group liked it the most. What is exceptional is that while the working-class originated upwardly mobile (UMWC) group gravitated slightly towards the immobile middle-class (IMC) group, the agriculture-originated upwardly mobile (UMAG) group diverged away from the immobile middle class (IMC). The reason is that we lacked a group of immobile agricultural occupations in our mobility measure (see above): popular folk was liked far more by agricultural people than people in other occupations, and the mean for the agriculture-originated upwardly mobile (UMAG) group (0.69) was approximately the same as the mean for people in agricultural occupations in the entire dataset

(0.70) or the mean for the immobile agricultural group (0.83). Knowing this, Table 4 shows that the agriculture-originated upwardly mobile (UMAG) group did not gravitate towards the immobile middle-class (IMC) group but retained their popular folk preference. In sum, the occupationally mobile groups did not gravitate towards the immobile middle-class (IMC) group in liking popular folk, aligning with the reproduction hypothesis (H1a). In contrast, the educationally upwardly mobile (UMED) group gravitated towards the immobile higher-educated (IHE) group, in line with mobility hypotheses (H1b, H1c). Overall, this suggests rejection of the concordance hypothesis (H2a) in favour of the divergence hypothesis (H2b). Liking rock or dance were not associated with either educational or occupational mobility (nor education or occupation), showcasing that not all tastes are stratified according to class or mobility.²

Table 5 shows the results for food tastes. For the meat-heavy food, the immobile higher-educated (IHE) group liked it significantly less than the immobile lower-educated (ILE) group, and the upwardly mobile (UMED) group was located in between, being indistinguishable from the immobile higher-educated (IHE) group. The same pattern was observed for occupational mobility, although the difference between the immobile middle class (IMC) and the mobile groups (UMWC, UMAG) seemed more pronounced, and the mobile groups did not significantly differ from the immobile working class (IWC). This aligns with the mobility hypotheses (H1b, H1c) and the concordance hypothesis (H2a). Liking light-ethnic food was associated with educational but not occupational mobility. The immobile higher-educated (IHE) group liked light-ethnic food the most and significantly more than the immobile lower-educated (ILE) group, while the upwardly mobile (UMED) group was again in between and indistinguishable from the immobile higher-educated (IHE) group. Thus, educational mobility suggests cultural mobility (H1b, H1c), and the difference between the association patterns of mobility measures aligns with divergence hypothesis (H2b). Lastly, liking fast food was not associated with educational mobility, but its association with occupational mobility suggested cultural mobility (H1b, H1c), with the mobile groups gravitating towards the immobile middle-class (IMC) group in disliking fast food. The difference in the associations between the mobility measures aligned with the divergence hypothesis (H2b).

We summarize our results in Table 6. Overall, the reproduction hypothesis only survived in musical preferences and only in terms of occupational mobility. The mobility hypotheses prevailed in most practices, and educational mobility seemed to be a key factor in cultural mobility. While analysing individual cultural

Table 9 Summary: hypotheses in the light of the results

	Participation			Musical tastes (liking)			Food tastes (liking)			
	Reading literature	Highbrow activities	Television watching	Highbrow music	Popular folk	Rock	Dance	Meat-heavy food	Light-ethnic food	Fast food
Cultural reproduction hypothesis (H1a)				O	O	-	-			
Cultural mobility hypothesis (H1b or H1c)	E	E, O	E, O	E	E	-	-	E, O	E	O
Concordance hypothesis (H2a)		X	X			-	-	X		
Divergence hypothesis (H2b)	X			X	X	-	-		X	X

Abbreviations: E = educational mobility supports hypothesis; O = occupational mobility supports hypothesis; X = hypothesis supported; - = no effect.

practices provided little information about whether upward mobility had a uniform impact on all cultural practices (H1b) or not (H1c), [Table 6](#) offers an overview. Support for the reproduction hypothesis in musical preferences (and no associations with rock or dance) allowed us to conclude that mobility is associated with some practices but not all in a uniform way. Thus, we rejected the uniformity hypothesis (H1b) and retained the hypothesis (H1c) that upward mobility influences practices in a non-uniform way.

Finally, [Table 6](#) shows that the concordance hypothesis (H2a) was rejected in all but three cases: participating in highbrow activities, watching television, and liking a meat-heavy diet. Conversely, the divergence hypothesis (H2b) largely prevailed, underscoring that educational mobility and occupational mobility are differently associated with cultural practices.

Discussion and conclusions

We set out to study the effects of social mobility on cultural practices and focused on upward mobility from the working class to the middle class in Finland. We operationalized social mobility through both educational and occupational mobility and studied their associations with reading literature, participating in highbrow activities, watching television, and musical and food tastes. We found that social mobility is associated with cultural mobility in some cultural practices but not in all, that is, association is not uniform across practices. Moreover, educational mobility and occupational mobility typically have different associations with cultural practices.

In general, our results mainly concur with the cultural mobility theory and the status theory as far as the upwardly mobile groups are concerned: for both educational and occupational mobility, the upwardly mobile groups were closer to the practices typical to their destination in the domains of highbrow participation, watching television, and disliking meat-heavy food. Moreover, in terms of educational mobility the upwardly mobile group was closer to the immobile higher educated group in the domains of reading literature, liking highbrow music, disliking popular folk music, and liking light-ethnic food. While it is hardly news that the upwardly mobile adopt the valued practices of the higher-status destination group, our results concerning television, popular folk and meat-heavy food suggest that the newcomers to higher-class destination also shun practices considered questionable among the destination group (see also [Van Eijck, 1999](#); [Curl, Lareau and Wu, 2018](#)). If we follow [Bourdieu's \(1984: 56\)](#) thought that 'tastes are perhaps first and foremost distastes, disgust provoked by (...) the tastes of others', then our results support the inclusion of

popular, 'illegitimate' and 'banal' cultural domains in the future analyses of cultural reproduction and mobility: without knowledge of culture that gets abandoned our understanding of cultural hierarchies and cultural socialization remains incomplete.

Our results also shed some light to the question of the 'depth' of cultural socialization of the socially mobile: that is, does it influence the deep-level dispositions and stable preferences, or are the effects limited to the level of public performances? From the highbrow activities we see that mobility is associated with public practices; but mobility is equally associated with television watching, and educational mobility, moreover, is associated with reading literature and two musical tastes. That is, mobility is associated with private practices and preferences too. While we cannot ascertain whether mobility effects are stronger for public practices than for private practices ([Daenekindt and Roose, 2013b](#)), it certainly seems that cultural socialization that occurs in concert with social mobility is not limited to public performances only.

Another debate within the status theory that our results feed is the question of symmetry of mobility effects. The occupational mobility analysis shows that the upwardly mobile group originating from agriculture participated less in highbrow activities and liked popular folk music more than the upwardly mobile group originating from working class. This showcases asymmetric mobility effects. Contemporary cultural mobility research has often studied global mobility effects (e.g. [Daenekindt and Roose, 2014](#); [Coulangeon, 2015](#); [Chan and Turner, 2017](#)), but our findings suggest that more nuanced analyses could be the next step in this line of research. Cultural practices vary not only according to class but also according to class fractions (e.g. [Bourdieu, 1984](#); [Van Eijck and Mommaas, 2004](#); [Purhonen et al., 2014](#)), and origins and destinations may alter the mobility effects in ways that the global-level analysis leaves hidden. For example, conceivably highbrow culture is more valued in culture-laden occupations such as teaching and creative industries ([Koppman, 2016](#)) compared to, for example, information technology and security business administration ([Erickson, 1996](#)). Thus, one might expect stronger concordance in the effects of educational and occupational mobility when studying the culture-laden occupations. On the other hand, the education system is not monolithic either, but the fields of study may operate as diverse destinations. In this spirit, one shortcoming of our study is that we could not distinguish between fractions of origins or destinations, either professional fractions or fields of study within education. Such a study remains to be conducted.

Following the idea that the education system and the occupational field may adhere to different

cultural hierarchies, we operationalized social mobility through both educational and occupational mobility. Unsurprisingly, they have different associations with cultural practices. Rather, the concordance in highbrow activities, television watching, and liking meat-heavy food might be surprising. One interpretation could be that participating in highbrow activities, watching less television, and liking less meat-heavy food are widely recognized core features of the (Finnish) middle-class lifestyle so that socialization to them occurs both within the education system and after graduation in middle-class employment. The divergence in other practices (reading literature, highbrow music, light-ethnic food) would then suggest that these practices have a status value worth acquiring within the education system (and for the educated) but not in employment (in line with Erickson, 1996). If so, then the general strategy of devising two measures for social mobility simultaneously could help to identify those cultural practices that enjoy the most recognized and valued status in a society.

The limitations of our study follow from our focus in the transition to the middle class and our use of cross-sectional survey data. Regarding the latter, cross-sectional data do not allow causal inference. Because the link between social mobility and cultural practices can clearly operate in both directions—mobility may influence practices, and practices can foster mobility—with cross-sectional data we could only ascertain associations that, according to Daenekindt and Roose (2013b) is typical for this tradition. However, we know no study using robust long-term panel data in this area. Another limitation follows from our focus in the middle class and cores of the classes. First, due to this focus, we are unable to say anything about the other movements in the mobility table: an interesting topic would be, for example, mobility from agriculture to working class (Kortteinen, 1982), but this is left for upcoming analyses. Similarly, we left individuals with mixed-class origins for upcoming analyses. Second, like Dumais (2019), we could not analyze downward mobility; but downward mobility was uncommon in our data anyway. To capture downwardly mobile individuals, we would likely need surveys that oversample or specifically target the lower classes and their cultural practices, which is another niche that lacks studies. Despite these limitations, we believe that this study offers accumulating knowledge to the literature.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank the members of the Tampere Group for Sociology of Culture, the editors of the *European Sociological Review* and the anonymous reviewers for their valuable feedback to the previous versions of this article.

Funding

This work was supported by the Academy of Finland [grant number 309181].

Data availability statement

Part of the data (the 2007 dataset) underlying this article are available in the Finnish Social Science Data Archives at https://services.fsd.tuni.fi/catalogue/FSD2953?study_language=en, and can be accessed with an identification number FSD2953 (visited: 13.10.2022). The rest of the data (2018) will be available from the Archives after an embargo in 2023 (identification number not available yet).

Notes

1. The differences between the immobile agricultural group (IAG; $N = 59$) and the IWC were that IAG liked popular folk substantially more and rock less than the IWC, but their other cultural practices were similar.
2. Association of educational mobility with liking rock is spurious (confounded by age).

References

- Alestalo, M. (1985). Yhteiskuntaluokat ja sosiaaliset kerrostumat toisen maailmansodan jälkeen. In Valkonen, T. et al. (Eds.), *Suomalaiset*. Helsinki: WSOY, pp. 101–200.
- Aschaffenburg, K. and Maas, I. (1997). Cultural and educational careers: the dynamics of social reproduction. *American Sociological Review*, **62**, 573–587.
- Beagan, B. L., Power, E. M. and Chapman, G. E. (2015). “Eating isn’t just swallowing food”: food practices in the context of social class trajectory. *Canadian Food Studies*, **2**, 75–98.
- Beller, E. (2009). Bringing intergenerational social mobility research into the twenty-first century: why mothers matter. *American Sociological Review*, **74**, 507–528.
- Bennett, T. et al. (2009). *Culture, Class, Distinction*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Blom, R. and Melin, H. (2014). Keskiluokkaistuuko Suomi? In Lempiäinen, K. and Silvasti, T. (Eds.), *Eriarvoisuuden rakenteet*. Tampere: Vastapaino, pp. 20–51.
- Bourdieu, P. (1973). Cultural reproduction and social reproduction. In Brown, R. (Ed.), *Knowledge, Education and Cultural Change*. London: Tavistock, pp. 71–112.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. and Passeron, J.-C. (1977). *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London: Sage.
- Chan, T. W. and Turner, H. (2017). Where do cultural omnivores come from? The implications of educational mobility for cultural consumption. *European Sociological Review*, **33**, 576–589.
- Cohen, J. et al. (2003). *Applied Multiple Regression/Correlation Analysis for the Behavioural Sciences*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Coulangeon, P. (2015). Social mobility and musical tastes: a reappraisal of the social meaning of taste eclecticism. *Poetics*, 51, 54–68.
- Curl, H., Lareau, A. and Wu, T. (2018). Cultural conflict: the implications of changing dispositions among the upwardly mobile. *Sociological Forum*, 33, 877–899.
- Daenekindt, S. and Roose, H. (2013a). A mise-en-scene of the shattered habitus: the effect of social mobility on aesthetic dispositions towards films. *European Sociological Review*, 29, 48–59.
- Daenekindt, S. and Roose, H. (2013b). Cultural chameleons: social mobility and cultural practices in the private and the public sphere. *Acta Sociologica*, 56, 309–324.
- Daenekindt, S. and Roose, H. (2014). Social mobility and cultural dissonance. *Poetics*, 42, 82–97.
- De Graaf, N. D., Nieuwebeerta, P. and Heath, A. (1995). Class mobility and political preferences: individual and contextual effects. *American Journal of Sociology*, 100, 997–1027.
- DiMaggio, P. (1982). Cultural capital and school success: the impact of status culture participation on the grades of U.S. high school students. *American Sociological Review*, 47, 189–201.
- DiMaggio, P. and Mohr, J. (1985). Cultural capital, educational attainment, and marital selection. *American Journal of Sociology*, 90, 1231–1261.
- Domanski, H. and Karpinski, Z. (2018). Intergenerational mobility and omnivorism in eating. *Appetite*, 121, 83–92.
- Dumais, S. A. (2019). The cultural practices of first-generation college graduates: the role of childhood cultural exposure. *Poetics*, 77, 101378.
- Emmison, M. (2003). Social class and cultural mobility: reconfiguring the cultural omnivore thesis. *Journal of Sociology*, 39, 211–230.
- Erickson, B. H. (1996). Culture, class, and connections. *American Journal of Sociology*, 102, 217–251.
- Erola, J. (2009). Social mobility and education of Finnish cohorts born 1936–75: succeeding while failing in equality of opportunity? *Acta Sociologica*, 52, 307–327.
- Erola, J. (2010). Luokkarakenne ja luokkiin samastuminen Suomessa. In Erola, J. (Ed.), *Luokaton Suomi*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus, pp. 27–44.
- Eskola, K. (1976). *The Cultural Activities of the Finns*. Helsinki: Valtion taidehallinnon julkaisuja no. 7.
- Friedman, S. (2012). Cultural omnivores or culturally homeless? Exploring the shifting cultural identities of the upwardly mobile. *Poetics*, 40, 467–489.
- Ganzeboom, H. B. G. (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*. Utrecht: E.S.-Publications, pp. 186–205.
- Heckman, J. J. (2006). Skill formation and the economics of investing in disadvantaged children. *Science*, 312, 1900–1902.
- Hertz, T. et al. (2007). The inheritance of educational inequality: international comparisons and fifty-year trends. *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy*, 7, 1–48.
- Härkönen, J. (2010). Sosiaalinen periytyvyys ja sosiaalinen liikkuvuus. In Erola, J. (Ed.), *Luokaton Suomi*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus, pp. 51–66.
- Härkönen, J. and Sirniö, O. (2020). Educational transitions and educational inequality: a multiple pathways sequential logit model analysis of Finnish birth cohorts 1960–1985. *European Sociological Review*, 36, 700–719.
- Jaeger, M. M. and Breen, R. (2016). A dynamic model of cultural reproduction. *American Journal of Sociology*, 121, 1179–1115.
- Kahma, N. (2010). Keskiluokan valossa: suomalaisten luokkasamastuminen empiirisessä tarkastelussa. *Sosiologia*, 47, 81–96.
- Kahma, N. (2011). *Yhteiskuntaluokka ja maku*. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto.
- Kallunki, J. (2022). Cultural reproduction in Finland: symmetric intergenerational transmission of cultural orientations. *Acta Sociologica*, 294–315. doi: [10.1177/000169932111070980](https://doi.org/10.1177/000169932111070980)
- Kallunki, J. and Purhonen, S. (2017). Intergenerational transmission of cultural capital in Finland. *Research on Finnish Society*, 10, 101–111.
- Kiley, K. and Vaisey, S. (2020). Measuring stability and change in personal culture using panel data. *American Sociological Review*, 85, 477–506.
- Koppman, S. (2016). Different like me: why cultural omnivores get creative jobs. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 61, 291–331.
- Kortteinen, M. (1982). *Lähiö*. Helsinki: Otava.
- Korupp, S. E., Ganzeboom, H. B. G. and Van Der Lippe, T. (2002). Do mothers matter? A comparison of models of the influence of mothers' and fathers' educational and occupational status on children's educational attainment. *Quality and Quantity*, 36, 17–42.
- Lahire, B. (2011). *The Plural Actor*. Cambridge, UK: Polity press.
- Lampinen, O. (2003). *Suomen koulutusjärjestelmän kehitys*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
- Lareau, A. (2011). *Unequal Childhoods*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lehtisalo, L. and Raivola, R. (1999). *Koulutus ja koulutuspolitiikka 2000-luvulle*. Porvoo: WSOY.
- Liikkanen, M., Hanifi, R. and Hannula, U. (2005). *Yksilöllisiä valintoja, kulttuurien pysyvyyttä*. Helsinki: Tilastokeskus.
- Lindblom, T. and Mustonen, P. (2015). Culinary taste and the legitimate cuisines. *British Food Journal*, 117, 651–663.
- Nagel, I. and Ganzeboom, H.B.G. (2015). Art and socialisation. In: *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2nd edn. Oxford: Elsevier, pp. 7–14.
- Notten, N., Kraaykamp, G. and Konig, R. P. (2012). Family media matters: unraveling the intergenerational transmission of reading and television tastes. *Sociological Perspectives*, 55, 683–706.
- Pekkala Kerr, S. and Rinne, R. (2012). Koulutus ja väestön taloudellinen ja sosiaalinen liikkuvuus 1900-luvulla. In Kettunen, P. and Simola, H. (Eds.), *Tiedon ja osaamisen Suomi*. Helsinki: SKS, pp. 321–344.
- Pfeffer, F. T. (2008). Persistent inequality in educational attainment and its institutional context. *European Sociological Review*, 24, 543–565.
- Purhonen, S. et al. (2014). *Suomalainen maku*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
- Purhonen, S. and Gronow, J. (2014). Polarizing appetites? *Food, Culture & Society*, 17, 27–47.
- Purhonen, S. and Heikkilä, R. (2017). Food, music and politics: the interweaving of culinary taste patterns, 'highbrow' musical taste and conservative attitudes in Finland. *Social Science Information*, 56, 74–97.

- Purhonen, S., Gronow, J. and Rahkonen, K. (2009). Social differentiation of musical and literary taste patterns in Finland. *Research on Finnish Society*, 2, 39–49.
- Rivera, L. A. (2012). Hiring as cultural matching: the case of elite professional service firms. *American Sociological Review*, 77, 999–1022.
- Roose, H. and Vander Stichele, A. (2010). Living room vs. concert hall: patterns of music consumption in Flanders. *Social Forces*, 89, 185–207.
- Seppänen, S. (1993). Musiikin kuuntelu ja musiikkivalinnat. In Liikkanen, M. and Pääkkönen, H. (Eds.), *Arjen kulttuuria*. Helsinki: Tilastokeskus, pp. 85–97.
- Statistics Finland. (2011). Classification of Occupations 2010. Handbooks No. 14. Available at: <https://www.stat.fi/en/luokitukset/ammatti/> (Visited: 17.5.2021.)
- Streib, J. (2017). The unbalanced theoretical toolkit: problems and partial solutions to studying culture and reproduction but not culture and mobility. *American Journal of Cultural Sociology*, 5, 127–153.
- Sullivan, A. (2011). The intergenerational transmission of lifestyles. *Kölner zeitschrift für soziologie und sozialpsychologie*, 51, 196–222.
- Swidler, A. (1986). Culture in action: symbols and strategies. *American Sociological Review*, 51, 273–286.
- Tabachnick, B.G. and Fidell, L. S. (2014). *Using Multivariate Statistics*. Harlow: Pearson.
- Ter Bogt, T. F. M. et al. (2011). Intergenerational continuity of taste: parental and adolescent music preferences. *Social Forces*, 90, 297–319.
- Thaning, M. and Hällsten, M. (2020). The end of dominance? Evaluating measures of socio-economic background in stratification research. *European Sociological Review*, 36, 533–547.
- Toiviainen, S. (1970). *Yhteiskunnalliset ja kulttuuriset ristiriidat*. Tampere: Tampereen yliopisto.
- Vaisey, S. and Lizardo, O. (2016). Cultural fragmentation or acquired dispositions? A new approach to accounting for patterns of cultural change. *Socius*, 2, 1–15.
- Van Eijck, K. (1999). Socialization, education, and lifestyle: how social mobility increases the cultural heterogeneity of status groups. *Poetics*, 26, 309–328.
- Van Eijck, K. (2011). Vertical lifestyle differentiation: resources, boundaries, and the changing manifestations of social inequality. *Kölner zeitschrift für soziologie und sozialpsychologie*, 51, 247–268.
- Van Eijck, K. and Mommaas, H. (2004). Leisure, lifestyle and the new middle class. *Leisure Sciences*, 26, 373–392.
- Vartia, P. and Ylä-Anttila, P. (2005). *Kansantalous 2028*. Helsinki: Taloustieto oy.
- Weber, M. (1946). Class, status, party. In Gerth, H. and Mills, C.W. (Eds.), *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 180–195.

Author biography

Jarmo Kallunki is a doctoral researcher currently working in Tampere University (Finland) and preparing his doctoral dissertation under the supervision of prof. Semi Purhonen. His dissertation addresses cultural reproduction, cultural mobility and intergenerational transmission of cultural practices in Finland.

Appendix

Table A1 Distributions and descriptive statistics for control variables

	Subset for educational mobility analysis		Subset for occupational mobility analysis		Entire data	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Gender						
Male	44.5	425	39.2	459	42.7	1,198
Female	55.5	530	60.8	713	57.3	1,610
Age (mean, std. dev.)	44.89	15.404	49.23	15.205	48.08	16.024
Survey round						
2007	47.5	456	49.4	581	49.3	1,388
2018	52.5	503	50.6	595	50.7	1,425
Respondent's education level						
Higher education	50.4	483	49.8	442	44.1	961
Lower education	49.6	476	50.2	446	55.9	1,217