THE PATHS OF INHERITANCE:
A CLOSER LOOK AT CULTURAL CAPITAL'S REPRODUCTION WITHIN FAMILIES

Karam Hwang

A thesis submitted to the faculty at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in the Sociology Department in the School of Arts and Sciences.

Chapel Hill
2016

Approved by:

Lisa D. Pearce

Karolyn Tyson

Andrew J. Perrin

ABSTRACT

Karam Hwang: The Paths of Inheritance:
A Closer Look at Cultural Capital's Reproduction within Families
(Under the direction of Lisa D. Pearce)

Cultural capital's roles in social exclusion, mobility, and reproduction have become central topics in sociological research. However, studies of the social reproduction of cultural capital have tended to examine only a few dimensions of cultural capital at once, typically among younger children, and using limited measures of class. This study incorporates four previously theorized measures of cultural capital (highbrow consumption, omnivorous consumption, technical capacity, and social competence) and three indicators of socioeconomic status to assess patterns of cultural capital development among recent cohorts of American adolescents. Using nationally-representative time-diary data, it also tests variations in time use as a mechanism for the unequal development of cultural capital. Results suggest that patterns of adolescents' cultural capital acquisition differ from those previously observed among younger children, and that parents' occupations and educational attainment are independently consequential for various measures of cultural capital. Class and time use show clear but complex associations.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank my advisor Lisa Pearce most of all for her repeated readings and sharing of insights. I also thank Karolyn Tyson, Andy Perrin, and Arne Kalleberg for commenting upon drafts of this paper, and I thank Jessica Pearlman, Ricardo Martinez-Schuldt, Brian Levy, and Batool Zaidi for reviewing this paper in various forms and suggesting methodological improvements. The paper further benefited from my attending the University of Maryland Population Center's Perspectives on Time Use Conference.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ATUS	The American Time Use Survey

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

In the decades since Bourdieu and Passeron (1964/1979, 1968/1977) introduced their theory of cultural capital, researchers around the world have used it to describe inequality processes within their societies of interest. One major line of study has examined cultural capital in terms of taste. Debates in this tradition have centered on what consumption patterns distinguish different classes, and whether or not familiarity with upper class tastes can facilitate status attainment (e.g. Alderson, Junisbai, & Heacock, 2007; DiMaggio & Mohr, 1985; Gripsrud, Hovden, & Moe, 2011). Other researchers have turned away from consumption altogether, examining cultural capital as embodied skills that serve to reproduce class over generations. These latter studies demonstrate how families of greater means are able to help their children acquire habits of social interaction that are likely to lead to educational and occupational success (e.g. Calarco, 2011; Lareau, 2015).

Despite the wealth of past research on cultural capital, numerous unresolved issues remain in the study of its reproduction within families, core to Bourdieu's original theories of cultural capital (Jaeger & Breen, 2016).[1] First, few studies compare patterns of class reproduction across the forms of cultural capital discussed above. Second, scholars have not fully interrogated which aspects of family background contribute most to the development of cultural capital: do parental education, income, and occupation each contribute equally, or are some advantages more influential than others? Third, much research on the class reproduction of cultural capital tends to

[1] Jaeger and Breen (2016) propose a dynamic model to study the reproduction of cultural capital to redirect research; this paper focuses on other gaps.

focus on young children, though it is likely that youth may develop cultural capital at older ages as well.

Through analysis of the nationally-representative American Time Use Survey (ATUS), this paper offers new insight into how standing theories of cultural capital acquisition play out in the contemporary American context. It incorporates four previously researched measures of cultural capital and three separate indicators of socioeconomic status to examine the activities of high school-enrolled adolescents from 2003 to 2014. Few stratification studies have featured analyses of time-diary data, though researchers have often observed that class-based differences in time-use are likely mechanisms for how social status persists across generations. The results offer an updated and empirically based perspective on much theorized cultural capital-building activity, and point to new research directions for studying the reproduction of family advantage.

CHAPTER 2: BACKGROUND

2.1 Bourdieu's Cultural Capital Theory

In Weber's classic formulation, class and status are distinct yet frequently overlapping bases of social hierarchies (1925/1945). While class rests upon ownership of economic resources that lead to the experience of similar "life chances," status is founded upon social honor or prestige demonstrated through particular "styles of life." Bourdieu's theory of cultural capital builds upon Weber's argument by delineating the resources that demonstrate high status groups' prestigious "styles of life" (1986). *Embodied* cultural capital consists of socially valued aptitudes, preferences, dispositions, and behaviors that individuals gain through both passive assimilation and active cultivation. O*bjectified* cultural capital includes the goods, artistic works, performances, and even technical equipment valued within a society, successfully mobilized for exchange when individuals can symbolically possess them through "correct" appreciation or use. The mastery of objectified and embodied forms is typically necessary to acquisition the last and most durable form, *institutionalized* cultural capital—credentials such as degrees and honorifics that in turn can be converted in economic and social power. Bourdieu argued that no less than land, titles, and wealth, cultural capital is a resource that is inherited within families even as it is unequally distributed across them (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1968/1977).

The effectiveness of any real world disposition or knowledge as cultural capital is context-dependent, however, coincident with the particular system of symbolic hierarchies in a given society at a historical moment (Bourdieu, 1991; Holt, 1997). In empirical studies, Bourdieu and other scholars have highlighted how different forms of cultural capital manifest in inequality

processes across societies (e.g. Pereira, 2011; Prieur & Savage, 2011; Roose, van Eijck, and Lievens, 2012). The following operationalizations of cultural capital have generated tremendous amounts of research: *objectified* cultural capital as 1) "highbrow" and 2) "omnivorous" forms of consumption, and *embodied* cultural capital in the forms of 3) "technical capacity"; and 4) "social competence." Scores of studies have demonstrated the powerful influence of these operationalizations on stratification-related outcomes such as social mobility, educational attainment, the formation of social networks, and social exclusion.

2.2 Past Research: Objectified Cultural Capital

An early established body of research has operationalized cultural capital as the symbolic ownership of its objectified forms, with a focus on classes' distinct patterns of consumption and leisure, and the social consequences of taste. Many scholars have followed DiMaggio and his collaborators' early examples in relying upon existing survey data and operationalizing cultural capital as highbrow or beaux-arts participation[2]. These early studies found that familiarity with prestigious culture like literature, classical music, and fine arts are associated with such positive outcomes as better grades, higher educational attainment, and socially advantageous marriages (DiMaggio, 1982; DiMaggio & Mohr, 1985). Later studies have tested and confirmed the greater likelihood of highbrow consumption by the upper class in diverse industrialized societies (e.g. Katz-Gerro 2002; Kane 2003), and further examined the scholastic rewards of highbrow consumption (Aschaffenburg & Mass, 1997; Dumais & Ward, 2010; Jaeger, 2009; Jaeger, 2011).

Other researchers have challenged the emphasis on highbrow consumption, arguing that omnivorousness more accurately characterizes the tastes of the contemporary upper class. As omnivorousness signals open-mindedness and full membership in a globalized world, new elites

[2] See Lamont (2012), Lizardo (2012), and Sallaz and Zavisca (2007) for histories of the diffusion of Bourdieu's theories

are likely to embrace a wide spectrum of genres, while the lower classes prefer the parochial familiar (DiMaggio & Mukhtar, 2004; Erickson, 1996; Peterson & Kern, 1996; Sullivan & Katz-Gerro, 2007). However, despite the democratic spirit that omnivorous tastes attempt to signal, they work like highbrow taste to mark class distinction. Educational and economic advantages are still necessary to access the unusual travel, culinary, and aesthetic experiences that round out the omnivore's enjoyment of more widely available pastimes (Johnston & Baumann, 2007), and omnivorousness is delimited in predictable ways (e.g. Atkinson, 2011; Bryson, 1996; Tampubolon, 2011).

Lizardo and Skiles (2012) suggest a reconciliation of the two operationalizations. They contend that both highbrow and omnivorous consumption mark class in contemporary societies, with omnivorous consumption merely the broader application of an aesthetic disposition that scholars mistakenly assume applies only to highbrow consumption. They argue that early exposure to highbrow culture is in fact highly predictive of later omnivorousness, forming the core around which omnivorousness accretes. Furthermore, familiarity with both highbrow culture and omnivorous consumption is highly socially advantageous. Lizardo (2006a; 2011) finds that omnivorous and highbrow tastes predict weak and strong ties, respectively, within social networks. In her observational study of elite professional firms' hiring practices, Rivera (2012) finds that the most successful candidates are able to reference a broad (i.e. omnivorous) range of cultural signals to communicate with evaluators, as well as demonstrate deep familiarity with stereotypically upper-class pursuits.

In summary, existing studies on objectified cultural capital have studied the social consequences of taste and consumption, and debated whether it is more accurate to describe elite tastes as highbrow, omnivorous, or both. The extent to which family background predicts

familiarity with objectified cultural capital acquisition, however, is more often assumed than addressed. Studies that do disclose the correlation between parents' and children's consumption of objectified cultural capital only look at highbrow consumption (Dumais, 2002; Roscigno & Ainsworth-Darnell, 1999). To date, there has not been any research on the effects of social origins on cultural capital acquisition that incorporate both highbrow and omnivorous forms of objectified cultural capital.

2.3 Past Research: Embodied Cultural Capital

In their review of cultural capital in educational research, Lareau and Weininger (2003) criticize what they see as sociologists' excessive focus on objectified cultural capital. They propose that researchers instead attend to the embodied dimensions of "technical capacity" and "social competence" that Bourdieu insists also "indissolubly" constitute cultural capital (Bourdieu 1996). These embodied dimensions signify individual intellect and character in schools and workplaces, but are, like objectified cultural capital, the products of class-specific socialization rather than the expressions of innate worth.

In *Unequal Childhoods* (2003), Lareau illustrates how American middle and upper class parents reproduce embodied cultural capital in their young children. Educated and financially comfortable parents concertedly cultivate their children's "technical capacity" through linguistic training and the prioritization of institutional requirements such as homework. These practices grant their children significant advantages, since skilled language use and fulfillment of such demands are critical for academic success. Middle class parents cultivate their children's "social competence" by involving their elementary aged children in more organized activities than do working class or poor parents. Lareau argues that while these activities often leave children irritable and exhausted, they lead to greater success at school and work. For instance, the high-

pressure, publicly scrutinized nature of organized sports helps prepare participants for performance-based assessments, while extracurricular and volunteer commitments train them on how to interact and collaborate with others toward productive goals. Middle class children's activities thus create life patterns that mimic their parents' and accustom them to their future professional responsibilities.

Subsequent studies have examined, with varying points of emphasis, these dimensions of embodied cultural capital and their connections to family background and future attainment. For the most part, research on technical capacity has confirmed Lareau's arguments for the strong associations between family socioeconomic background, children's linguistic and academic orientations, and academic success. For instance, Bodovski and Farkas (2008) and Calarco (2014) find that higher SES parents' attention to books and language at home benefits elementary school students' test scores and grades. In addition, Roberts and Foehr's (2004) national media survey of youth indicates that children aged 8-18 whose parents have at least a college degree report more average weekly minutes reading print media than other children. However, these findings may be more robust for samples featuring younger children. Using a different nationally representative dataset and restricting her sample to older adolescents, Dumais (2008) finds no significant relationships between family SES and weekly mean time reading among high school students. Khan's (2012) ethnography of high-school students at an elite boarding school also includes observations that these students do not work nearly as hard on their academic assignments as they claim, with even some of the "best" students using shortcuts like reading abridged online summaries rather than the complete assigned texts.

Past studies of embodied cultural capital in the form of social competence largely support Lareau's findings, though again, many of these studies focus on younger children (e.g. Chin &

Phillips, 2001; Covay & Carbonaro 2010). However, in their interview-based study of middle school students, Bennett, Lutz, & Jayaram, (2012) confirm Lareau's finding that working class parents enroll their children in fewer organized activities than do middle class parents. Looking at a nationally representative sample of high school sophomores, Dumais (2008) also finds that SES is positively associated with participation in school sponsored extracurricular activities.

More so than with objectified cultural capital, previous researchers have clearly explored the associations between family background and embodied cultural capital in the form of social competence and technical capacity. But while research on the impact of parental characteristics on children of younger ages is extensive and fairly unanimous, the extent to which this holds with for older adolescents remains a more open question. With the exceptions of Khan's (2012) and Dumais' (2008) studies, research on embodied cultural capital for high school aged adolescents is relatively scarce. Yet, the relationship between family background and older adolescents' cultural capital acquisition warrants greater scrutiny, as the strong influence of parental characteristics that are evident among younger children may wane in the face of older adolescents' increased agency and receptivity to peer influence (Biddle, Bank, & Marlin, 1980; Tepper & Hargittai, 2009). At the same time, adolescent experiences may have especially strong effects on later socioeconomic status (Hagan 1991; Harris 2010). Though Bourdieu places greater emphasis on the importance of early childhood socialization for cultural capital acquisition (1984; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1968/1977), it seems reasonable to agree with Erickson (1996) and Aschaffenburg and Mass (1997) that there exist perhaps more equitably distributed opportunities for individuals to accumulate cultural capital during later life stages as well. The question of whether parental class continues to be associated with the development of embodied cultural capital among older adolescents.

2.4 Components of Class

Whether defined as familiarity with objectified forms or development of its embodied forms, research on cultural capital has inconsistently examined which aspects of family background contribute to cultural capital acquisition. This is evident even in Bourdieu's empirical research on class origins and cultural capital. In the survey analyses included within *Inheritors*, for instance, Bourdieu looks at the effect of father's occupation on college students' cultural knowledge. In both *Reproduction in Education, Society, and Culture* and *Distinction*, he describes respondents' social origins in terms of whether their fathers were upper, middle, or lower class. Most subsequent studies of cultural capital have relied upon similar composite groupings to describe family background. Ethnographic researchers often group families as belonging to two or three class categories, such as working class/poor, and middle (Bennett et al 2012; Calarco 2011; Chin & Phillips, 2004; Lareau, 2003). Quantitative studies also tend to rely on SES composites (Dumais 2002, 2008), parental educational attainment alone (Aschaffenburg & Maas, 1997), or occasionally income and education together (Jaeger 2011).

Yet, Duncan and Magnuson (2003/2012) reasonably point out that different components of socioeconomic status are associated with unique benefits for children's development. In the case of cultural capital acquisition, past research suggests that parental education, income, and occupation could each independently contribute to cultural capital acquisition, depending on the form under investigation. For instance, Duncan and Magnuson observe that parents' educational attainment is the most strongly associated with the language rich home environments that Lareau (2003) describes as crucial to technical capacity. In *Distinction*, educational credentials are the strongest predictor of adults' knowledge of objectified cultural capital, which could influence their children's consumption patterns as well.

Parental occupation also distinctly affects children's lives not only because of its close association with education, but because job characteristics affect adult tastes and social habits, which in turn may affect their children's lifestyles. Erickson (2006) for instance, argues that because managers often must network with workers at all levels of the social hierarchy, they possess greater cultural knowledge. Lizardo (2006a) also connects more culturally prestigious occupations to the adult development of highbrow tastes. Petev (2013) shows that holders of higher status occupations demonstrate greater sociability in terms of membership within diverse social organizations. Parents' occupations may therefore contribute to children's cultural capital acquisition through highbrow and omnivorous consumption, as well as social competence.

Financial resources may bear a more complicated relationship to different types of cultural capital acquisition. On the one hand, Bourdieu (1986) argues that social ease and the aesthetic disposition are far more likely among those who enjoy economic freedom from the exigencies of basic survival. Many forms of cultural capital require money: tickets, fees, and incidental expenses like transportation costs. However, economic and cultural capital do not correspond perfectly; as Weber early argued, economic capital can form a rival system of value to cultural capital. Adults whose jobs involve more economic capital than cultural capital rewards demonstrate weaker interest in objectified cultural capital compared to those whose jobs involve higher cultural capital and lower economic capital (Bourdieu 1984; Lizardo 2006b). Financial resources may not independently and directly lead to more cultural capital without the knowledge or disposition to spend those resources in particular avenues.

In one of the few studies to incorporate all three measures of SES, Covay and Carbonaro (2010) find that parental education, occupational prestige, and household income all have independent, significant, and positive association with young children's participation in

organized activities. Other studies have yet to verify that this is the case with other outcomes relevant to cultural capital acquisition, or for other age groups.

2.5 Time as a Mechanism

Bourdieu identifies time-use as a key mechanism through which family class advantage is transformed into children's cultural capital. It is through investments of certain kinds of time that knowledge, preferences, and skills are ingrained within the individual. In this spirit, Lizardo and Skiles (2012) call for a focus on habitual practice as the means through which class-differentiated cultural orientations develop.

Despite the centrality of time-use in theories of cultural capital, researchers have seldom used time diaries to approach questions of cultural capital and social reproduction, instead relying on basic participation rates or frequency estimates (Dumais 2008; Sullivan and Katz-Gerro 2007). Sociological studies have most often examined time diary data to explore questions related to household divisions of labor (e.g.; Burgard & Ailshire, 2013; Gager, Cooney, & Call, 1999). While many of these studies examine how these domestic arrangements affect parents' time with their children (Wight, Raley, & Bianchi, 2008), they rarely discuss the implications of this shared time in terms of cultural capital. These effects must be extrapolated from conclusions that most often concern the favorable associations between parental involvement and children's emotional health and risk behavior (e.g. Kalil, Ryan, & Corey 2012; Kendig & Bianchi, 2008). This focus on psychological adjustment and risk behavior is also present in studies on adolescents' time use (e.g. Desha, Nicholson, & Ziviani, 2011).

However, time diaries may be useful for obtaining more accurate estimates of cultural capital acquisition than closed option surveys. The time-diary format guides respondents in recounting their activities over the course of a recent day or days, without prompting as to what those

activities might be. For instance, a time-diary questionnaire might ask "What did you do at 10 am yesterday?" rather than "How much time did you spend doing schoolwork last week?" As a result, time-diaries can effectively reduce response bias for socially desirable behaviors (Hofferth, 2006; Presser & Stinson, 1998). Respondents are not alerted as to what kind of information is most salient to researchers, and are less tempted to affirm their affiliation with what they suspect are the positively viewed identities under study. Time diary data may therefore be ideal for studying whether class differences in cultural capital development are evident in time use patterns.

In sum, this paper investigates four gaps in prior research. First, is parental class positively associated with youths' consumption patterns, whether measured as omnivorous or highbrow consumption? Second, is parental class associated with the development of embodied cultural capital among older adolescents, whether measured as social competence or technical capacity? Third, are parental education, occupation, and income each independently associated with adolescents' cultural capital acquisition patterns? And fourth, does class show a positive relationship with the time that adolescents spend in developing cultural capital?

CHAPTER 3: DATA, MEASURES, AND METHODS

3.1 Data

The data source for this study is the 2003-2014 years of the nationally representative American Time Use Survey (ATUS), sponsored by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau. ATUS participants are selected from a subset of households who had completed their eighth and final interviews for the Current Population Survey (CPS). Once selected, ATUS respondents are interviewed 3-4 months after their last CPS interview about their activities during the previous 24 hour period. They report on what activities they participated in, for how long, who they were with, and where they were. Limited demographic information for the household is collected during the ATUS interview, but additional data is also available in the linked, slightly older CPS interviews.

As with the CPS, the ATUS sample universe consists of non-institutionalized, non-active military individuals over age 15 from across all 50 states. Computer-assisted telephone interviews are scheduled randomly over each week of the month, and split evenly between weekdays and weekends. The sample size was 40,500 households for the first survey in 2003; all subsequent surveys have a sample size of 26,400. ATUS response rates have remained around 50% since 2003, when they were at their highest at 57.8%. The 2014 response rate was 51.0%. These response rates may be between 1 to 3 percentage points lower after accounting for poor quality surveys that ATUS categorizes as “non-response” cases during post-survey data processing, and removes from the analysis files. Poor quality surveys are those containing fewer

than five activities, or surveys in which respondents refused or failed to specify their activities for three or more hours of their reported diary day.

Out of the almost 160,000 respondents in the pooled 2003-2014 ATUS surveys, I use time diary data for unmarried, childless respondents between the ages of 15-18 at the time of the survey, who reside with one or both parents, who are likely still enrolled in high school on a full-time basis[3], and for whom there is information on parental education, parental occupation, and household income. These parameters produced a sample of 5,923 adolescent respondents.

3.2 Dependent Variables

In all dependent variables, I measure both the odds of participating in eligible activities and extent of participation. I adopt this two part strategy, rather than simply looking at total average time spent in activities, for two reasons. First, the odds of participating at all and time spent participating capture two different aspects of stratified acquisition, with total time a theorized mechanism for cultural capital development that has not been previously tested. Second, several of the dependent variables have high zero counts, which would bias time estimates downward if they were included. I rely on the summary measures for each of the four forms of cultural category rather than examine each constituent activity in turn due to prohibitively low rates of participation for many of the individual constituent activities (see Table 2).

Objectified - Highbrow: Guided by DiMaggio and Useem (1978) and DiMaggio (1982), I measure the highbrow objectified form of cultural capital as respondents' participation in extracurricular music and performance, performing outside of school, attending performances,

[3] To include only those who were likely enrolled, I dropped teenaged respondents who were surveyed during the school year (September through June), and who reported that they were 1) currently not enrolled in school and 2) that they were two years older than would be appropriate for their highest grade completed.

and going to museums. I measure this as log odds of participating in any highbrow activities for all respondents, and as the time participants spend in highbrow activities.

Objectified – Omnivorous: Appendix Item 1 lists leisure activities I include in this measure. They range from activities as common as watching television and as stereotypically upper-class as equestrian sports. They exclude activities like cooking or shopping which might be undertaken for either recreation or necessity, because the data will not permit me to distinguish these cases from others.

I looked at this outcome in a few different ways: the log odds of engaging in any leisure in a diary day, the *total number* of different activities reported by respondents reporting any leisure time, and *the average amount of time per activity* that was spent by these respondents.

Embodied – Technical Capacity: Lareau and Weininger (2003) suggest that researchers include within their definitions of cultural capital the skills and aptitudes that are overtly rewarded in schools and work. I therefore include within this outcome reading for personal interest, doing research or homework for a degree, doing research or homework for fun, and writing for personal interest. I measure this as the log odds of participating in any of these activities, and as the time that participants spent in eligible activities.

Embodied – Social Competence: Following Lareau (2003), I measure this outcome as participation in extracurricular school activities, sports, volunteering, and working in skilled occupational positions (listed in Appendix Item 2). Again, I measure this as log odds of participating for all respondents, and as the time participants spent in activities.

3.3 Independent Variables

Parental educational attainment – I capture this measure of family SES as the highest educational level attained by either parent in the household, using six categories of educational

attainment: 1) High school graduate or less; 2) Some college but no degree; 3) Associates degree 4) College graduate; 5) Master's Degree, and 6) Professional Degree/Ph.D. Professional Degrees (e.g. M.D., D.D.S., J.D., D.V.M .).

Parental occupational category – With some updates, I largely followed Jonsson et al.'s (2009) meso-level occupational groupings to code ATUS' detailed parental occupational information into seven categories: 1) Services 2) Lower Manual/Crafts; 3) Sales/Clerical; 4) Other Professions; 5) Managers/Officials; 6) Classical Professions; and 7) Out of the Labor Force. The occupations grouped within each category are listed in Appendix Item 3. While Jonnson et al. argue that microclass occupational schema better predict social mobility/reproduction than big class schema, microclass groupings resulted in such small cell sizes that analysis was impossible. Meso-level groupings contain slightly more detail than the big class categories, so serve as a compromise.

I use the father's occupational category except when 1) the father is absent; 2) the father reports no occupation; 3) the mother's occupation is in the Classic Professions and the father's is not. In these cases, I use the mother's occupation.

Household Income – I recode available family annual income data into four roughly evenly distributed categories: 1) less than $30,000; 2) $30,000 - $59,999; 3) $60,000 - $99,999; 4) $100,000 and more.

Control Variables

Parental Marital Status – I code for parental marital status as 1) two biological/adoptive parents; 2) remarried parent/blended family; 3) single/divorced/widowed parents; and 4) single/divorced/widowed parent with other adult(s).

Other – I include controls for total siblings under age 18 in the household, respondent race/ethnicity, respondent gender, survey year, and whether or not the survey data reported on a school day or a weekend/holiday. I designated as a school day any day in which respondents reported taking a class for degree credit.

3.4 Analytic Method

I first conducted multivariate logistic regression to test the independent and combined associations of parental education, income, and occupation on respondents' log-odds of engaging in any activity to develop objectified-highbrow, objectified-omnivorous, embodied-technical, and embodied-social measures of cultural capital.

To examine the time that participants spent in activities, I conducted truncated Poisson regressions, again examining parental education, income and occupation independently and jointly. Truncated Poisson regression is appropriate for count data that do not display overdispersion (evident in Table 2) and in which values are not permitted be zero (Cameron & Trivedi, 2013; Long & Freese, 2006). While time is theoretically the epitome of a continuous variable, ATUS does not treat time as such. Instead, time is measured as counts of discrete minutes within a twenty-four hour period.

Of course, continuous data are nearly always presented in a discretized manner, and one could argue that the underlying concept measured in this particular data is a continuous one. Therefore, I also performed truncated regression on participants' time spent in activities, a method that adequately addresses the bias in continuous data truncated at zero (Cameron & Trivedi, 2013). Log transformations of the time variables were necessary to correct their strongly right skewed distributions. The substantively similar results are not presented here, but are available upon request.

For all descriptive and analytical statistics, I use survey weights provided by ATUS to correct for oversampling of some demographic groups, uneven distribution of samples across the days of the week, and gaps in response rates across genders. For both the logistic and truncated Poisson regressions, I ran multiple models using different comparison groups to obtain parameter estimates.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

4.1 Study Sample Characteristics

As Table 1 shows, the mean age of the study sample is 16 years, and males slightly outnumber females. Over half of respondents (60%) are White, 21% are Hispanic, 13% are Black, 4% are Asian, and 3% are Multiracial or Other. Almost two thirds of respondents reside with two biological or adoptive parents, while 19% belong to single parent households, 8% to blended families, and 6% to families consisting of a single parent and at least one other non-parent adult. Respondents share their households with an average of one sibling under the age of 18. More than half of respondents provide diary data on days that they attended school.

Table 1. Survey Weighted Characteristics of Adolescent Respondent Sample (N=5,923): American Time Use Survey, 2003-2014

Characteristic	Value
Gender, %	
Female	48.3
Male	51.7
Race, %	
White	59.7
Black	12.8
Hispanic	20.8
Asian	3.6
Other/Multiracial	3.0
Age, mean (SD)	16.3 (.02)
Reported on a Schoolday, %	47.8
Parents' Marital Status, %	
2 (bio or adoptive) parents	65.3
Blended family	9.4
Single parent household	19.2
Other	6.1
Household size	4.4(0.2)
Total Siblings less than 18 yo	1.0 (.02)
Highest Parental Education, %	
High School Graduate or less	30.4
Some college	15.8
Associates Degree	12.7
College Graduate	23.6
Master's Degree	12.0
Professional/PhD	5.5
Household Income, %	
< $30,000	21.1
$30 - $59,999	27.7
$60 - $99,999	27.6
$100,000+	23.6
Highest Parental Occupation, %	
Service	6.2
Lower manual/Crafts	19.4
Sales/Clerical	20.2
Other Professions	24.3
Managers/Officials	13.5
Classical Professions	11.0
Not in the Labor Force	5.3

Sample consists of unmarried adolescents who are enrolled full-time in high school, who report no children, residing with at least one biological or adoptive parent

The highest parental educational attainment is High School or less for roughly a third of respondents, Some College for 16% of respondents, Associate's Degree for 13% of respondents, and a Bachelor's Degree for almost 24% of respondents. 12% of respondents have parents who earned a Master's Degree, and almost 6% have at least one parent with a Professional degree or a Ph.D. The highest status parental occupations for 11-14% of respondents are the Classical Professions or Managers/Officials, while Other Occupations are the most common highest parental occupation, capturing a quarter of the sample. Sales/Clerical positions are the highest parental occupation for another fifth of the sample. Lower Manual/Crafts positions and Service jobs are the highest parental occupations for the remaining 19% and 6% of the sample, respectively. Respondent households are fairly evenly distributed across income categories, with each of the four categories containing between 21% to 28% of the sample.

Table 2. Adolescent Sample Participation in Activities Related to Cultural Capital Acquisition: American Time Use Survey, 2003-2014*

		Participants' Minutes/Day		
Objectified Cultural Capital - "Highbrow"	% Participating	Mean	SE	Max
Summary measure	4.0	143.9	7.9	630
Extracurricular Music & Performance	2.1	129.5	10.6	530
Performing	1.0	117.3	9.2	300
Visiting museums	0.2	137.8	14.9	480
Watching performance	0.9	183.4	19.0	630
		Participants' Activities/Day		
Objectified Cultural Capital - "Omnivorous"	% Participating	Mean	SE	Max
Any leisure activity	93.7	--	--	--
Total leisure activities	--	2.1	0.0	8
Total time in leisure	--	258.8	2.9	1138
Average time per leisure activity	--	146.5	1.9	1050
		Participants' Minutes/Day		
Embodied Cultural Capital - Technical Capacity	% Participating	Mean	SE	Max
Summary Measure	43.7	117.4	2.3	875
Reading for personal interest	10.4	74.1	3.7	690
Research/hw for a degree	38.1	13.4	2.4	875
Research/hw for personal interest	0.2	81.4	23.6	240
Writing for personal interest	0.4	71.9	16.6	480
		Participants' Minutes/Day		
Embodied Cultural Capital - Social Competence	% Participating	Mean	SE	Max
Summary Measure	31.8	135.9	2.9	805
Extracurricular School Activities	6.9	90.7	13.8	540
Organized sports	20.9	141.6	3.0	601
Volunteering	10.5	102.7	4.9	728
Work - skilled	2.2	107.6	18.0	805

*All values are weighted

Table 2 shows the sample's overall rates of participation in each cultural capital outcome, and participants' mean time in each category. Only a very small percentage (4%) of the sample reports participating in any activity to develop objectified-highbrow cultural capital during their diary days, with most of these reports based on extracurricular music and performance. However, the vast majority of respondents (almost 94%) participated in at least one leisure activity in the objectified-omnivorous category; unsurprising considering the broad range of eligible activities. These respondents engaged in an average of two leisure activities during their diary day, and spent an average of over four hours total on leisure. The average time they spent per activity was roughly two and a half hours. Over 40% of respondents participated in an activity to develop embodied cultural capital as technical capacity (most often homework), and almost a third participated in an activity to develop embodied cultural capital as social competence (most often sports).

Table 3 shows multivariate logistic and truncated Poisson regression results of the combined parental SES variables on the four cultural capital outcomes, with the lowest SES categories used as the reference groups. Tables 4-7 summarize the significant parameter estimates for education, income, and occupation across all reference categories, holding other factors constant.

Table 3: Weighted Logistic and Truncated Poisson Regressions of Parental Education, Household Income, and Parental Occupation on Adolescents' Development of Cultural Capital

	OBJECTIFIED CULTURAL CAPITAL				EMBODIED CULTURAL CAPITAL			
	Highbrow Consumption		**Omnivorous Consumption**		**Technical Capacity**		**Social Competence**	
	Log odds of participation b (se)	Participants' Log Minutes b (se)	Participants' Total activities b (se)	Participants' Log Minutes b (se)	Log odds of participation b (se)	Participants' Log Minutes b (se)	Log odds of participation b (se)	Participants' Log Minutes b (se)
Parental Ed.								
HS Diploma or less	ref	ref	ref	ref	ref	ref	ref	ref
Some college	0.675* (0.32)	0.018 (0.18)	0.111** (0.04)	-0.062 (0.04)	-0.086 (0.12)	0.078 (0.07)	0.108 (0.11)	-0.061 (0.06)
Associate Degree	0.467 (0.35)	0.158 (0.19)	0.152*** (0.05)	-0.104* (0.04)	-0.118 (0.13)	0.028 (0.07)	0.088 (0.13)	-0.146 (0.08)
College Graduate	0.523 (0.33)	0.065 (0.18)	0.161*** (0.04)	-0.109** (0.04)	0.340** (0.12)	0.243*** (0.07)	0.073 (0.11)	-0.100 (0.07)
Master's Degree	0.729* (0.37)	0.101 (0.20)	0.209*** (0.05)	-0.165*** (0.04)	0.692*** (0.15)	0.233** (0.08)	0.090 (0.15)	-0.082 (0.08)
Professional/PhD	0.716 (0.44)	-0.224 (0.21)	0.250*** (0.06)	-0.032 (0.06)	0.656*** (0.20)	0.486*** (0.09)	0.165 (0.19)	0.041 (0.10)
Household Inc.								
<$30,000	ref	ref	ref	ref	ref	ref	ref	ref
$30-$59,999	0.029 (0.31)	0.325 (0.19)	0.031 (0.04)	-0.016 (0.04)	-0.021 (0.11)	0.114 (0.06)	0.122 (0.11)	0.011 (0.06)
$60-$99,999	0.211 (0.33)	0.081 (0.20)	0.030 (0.04)	-0.037 (0.04)	-0.012 (0.12)	0.089 (0.07)	0.224 (0.12)	0.013 (0.07)
100,000+	-0.124 (0.36)	0.408 (0.22)	0.055 (0.05)	-0.077 (0.05)	0.038 (0.14)	0.145 (0.08)	0.246 (0.14)	-0.024 (0.08)
Parental Occ.								
Service	ref	ref	ref	ref	ref	ref	ref	ref
Manual/crafts	0.668 (0.53)	-0.192 (0.28)	-0.048 (0.06)	-0.086 (0.08)	0.096 (0.18)	-0.037 (0.12)	0.129 (0.18)	-0.077 (0.10)
Sales/Clerical	0.645 (0.50)	-0.322 (0.28)	-0.006 (0.06)	-0.111 (0.07)	0.214 (0.18)	-0.052 (0.11)	0.112 (0.18)	0.036 (0.10)
Other Professions	1.275* (0.51)	-0.242 (0.27)	-0.043 (0.07)	-0.108 (0.07)	0.303 (0.18)	-0.039 (0.11)	0.061 (0.18)	0.060 (0.10)
Managers/Officials	1.285* (0.52)	-0.167 (0.30)	0.018 (0.07)	-0.086 (0.07)	0.102 (0.19)	0.030 (0.12)	0.171 (0.19)	-0.020 (0.11)
Class. Professions	1.785** (0.55)	-0.148 (0.30)	0.035 (0.07)	-0.139 (0.08)	0.373 (0.21)	-0.015 (0.12)	-0.208 (0.21)	0.044 (0.11)
Not in Labor Force	0.492 (0.70)	-0.592 (0.45)	0.006 (0.08)	-0.087 (0.08)	-0.036 (0.22)	-0.052 (0.13)	0.255 (0.22)	0.010 (0.12)
Constant	-7.338*** (1.83)	4.804*** (0.84)	1.914*** (0.23)	5.537*** (0.24)	0.872 (0.67)	4.588*** (0.37)	0.090 (0.65)	4.732*** (0.34)
N	5923	228	5583	5583	5923	2433	5923	1833

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

With controls for gender, age, schoolday, race/ethnicity, parental marital status, number of young siblings, and year

Table 4: Parameter Estimates of Significant Parental SES Characteristics (all reference groups) on Development of Objectified Cultural Capital as Highbrow Consumption

Estimates obtained from weighted multivariate logistic (N=5923) and truncated Poisson (N=227) regressions, including all other SES variables and controls

	HS grad or less		Some college		Associate Degree		College Graduate		Master's Degree		Professional/PhD	
Parental Ed.	Log odds	Partic. Time	Log odds	Partic. Time	Log odds	Partic. Time	Log odds	Partic. Time	Log odds	Partic. Time	Log odds	Partic. Time
HS grad or less	ref	ref	**-0.675***	-0.018	-0.467	-0.158	-0.523	-0.065	**-0.729***	-0.101	-0.716	0.224
Some College	**0.675***	0.018	ref	ref	0.209	-0.140	0.153	-0.047	-0.054	-0.083	-0.041	0.242
Associates	0.467	0.158	-0.209	0.140	ref	ref	-0.056	0.093	-0.262	0.057	-0.250	0.382
College Grad	0.523	0.065	-0.153	0.047	0.056	-0.093	ref	ref	-0.207	-0.036	-0.194	**0.289***
Master's	**0.729***	0.101	0.054	0.083	0.262	-0.057	0.207	0.036	ref	ref	0.013	**0.325***
Professional/PhD	0.716	-0.224	0.041	-0.242	0.250	-0.382	0.194	-0.289*	-0.013	**-0.325***	ref	ref

	<$30,000		$30-$59,999		$60-$99,999		100,000+	
Household Inc.	Log odds	Partic. Time	Log odds	Partic. Time	Log odds	Partic. Time	Log odds	Partic. Time
<$30,000	ref	ref	-0.029	-0.325	-0.211	-0.081	0.124	-0.408
$30-$59,999	0.029	0.325	ref	ref	-0.182	0.244	0.153	-0.083
$60-$99,999	0.211	0.081	0.182	-0.244	ref	ref	0.335	**0.327****
100,000+	-0.124	0.408	-0.153	0.083	-0.335	**0.327****	ref	ref

	Service		Lower manual/crafts		Sales/Clerical		Other Professions		Managers/Officials		Class. Professions		Not in Labor Force	
Parental Occ.	Log odds	Partic. Time	Log odds	Partic. Time	Log odds	Partic. Time	Log odds	Partic. Time	Log odds	Partic. Time	Log odds	Partic. Time	Log odds	Partic. Time
Service	ref	ref	-0.668	0.192	-0.645	0.322	**1.275***	0.242	**-1.285***	0.167	**-1.785****	0.148	-0.492	0.592
Manual/Crafts	0.668	-0.192	ref	ref	0.023	0.130	-0.607	0.050	-0.617	-0.025	**-1.117****	-0.044	0.176	0.400
Sales/Clerical	0.645	-0.322	-0.023	-0.130	ref	ref	**0.630***	-0.080	**-0.639***	-0.155	**1.139*****	-0.174	0.153	0.270
Other Professions	**1.275***	-0.242	0.607	-0.050	**0.630***	0.080	ref	ref	-0.009	-0.075	-0.509	-0.093	0.783	0.351
Managers/Officials	**1.285***	-0.167	0.617	0.025	**0.639***	0.155	0.009	0.075	ref	ref	-0.500	-0.019	0.793	0.425
Class. Professions	**1.785****	-0.148	**1.117****	0.044	**1.139*****	0.174	0.509	0.093	0.500	0.019	ref	ref	**1.293***	0.444
Not in Labor Force	0.492	-0.592	-0.176	-0.400	-0.153	-0.270	-0.783	-0.351	-0.793	-0.425	**-1.293***	-0.444	ref	ref

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

4.2 Objectified - Highbrow

Parental education and occupation maintain some positive and independent associations with adolescents' log odds of participating in highbrow activities, while income's effects largely become non-significant (Tables 3-4). However, education's associations are inconsistent. Only the Some College and Master's Degree categories show positive associations (.675 - .729), and these are present only when compared to the lowest education category. Occupation's associations are somewhat more consistent. The three highest status occupation categories are associated with between 1.28 and 1.79 greater log odds of participation compared to the Services category and between .630 - 1.139 greater log odds compared to the Sales/Clerical category. The Classical Professions maintain significantly greater odds of participation compared to Lower Manual/Crafts as well.

When looking at participants' time in highbrow activities, parental occupation no longer shows any significant associations. The Professional/PhD education category is actually significant associated with *less* time (around 25% fewer minutes) compared to college graduates and Master's degree categories. Belonging to the highest income group shows a positive association, but only compared to the second highest income group.

Table 5: Parameter Estimates of Significant Parental SES Characteristics (all reference groups) on Development of Objectified Cultural Capital as Omnivorous Consumption

Estimates obtained from weighted multivariate logistic (N=5583) and truncated Poisson (N=5583) regressions, including all other SES variables and controls

	HS grad or less		Some college		Associate Degree		College Graduate		Master's Degree		Professional/PhD	
Parental Ed.	Partic. Tot # activ	Partic. Time	Partic. Tot # activ	Partic. Time	Partic. Tot # activ	Partic. Time	Partic. Tot # activ	Partic. Time	Partic. Tot # activ	Partic. Time	Partic. Tot # activ	Partic. Time
HS grad or less	ref	ref	**-0.111****	0.062	**-0.152*****	**0.104***	**-0.161*****	**0.109****	**-0.209*****	**0.165*****	**-0.250*****	0.032
Some College	**0.111****	-0.062	ref	ref	-0.042	0.042	-0.050	0.047	**-0.098***	**0.103***	**-0.139***	-0.030
Associates	**0.152*****	**-0.104***	0.042	-0.042	ref	ref	-0.009	0.006	-0.057	0.061	-0.097	-0.072
College Grad	**0.161*****	**-0.109****	0.050	-0.047	0.009	-0.006	ref	ref	-0.048	0.055	-0.089	-0.078
Master's	**0.209*****	**-0.165*****	**0.098***	**-0.103***	0.057	-0.061	0.048	-0.055	ref	ref	-0.041	**-0.133***
Professional/PhD	**0.250*****	-0.032	**0.139***	0.030	0.097	0.072	0.089	0.078	0.041	**0.133***	ref	ref

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

4.3 Objectified - Omnivorous

Respondents did not significantly differ by any parental class characteristic in their odds of engaging in at least one leisure activity. Among respondents who reported any leisure during their diary day, parental education maintains a significant and positive association with their total number of leisure activities, while income and occupation become non-significant regardless of reference category. Table 5 shows that participants in all parental education categories engage in more leisure activities per day compared to the High School category—between .11 and .25 more log activities. The Master's and Ph.D. categories are significantly associated ($p<.05$) with more activities compared to the Some College education category as well.

Respondents in many of the higher parental education categories appear to have participated in more leisure activities per day by spending less time per activity. Compared to the High School category, the Associates, College Graduate, and Master's categories were associated with .104, .109, and .165 fewer log minutes, respectively (or 8.9%, 10.4%, and 15.2% fewer minutes). Interestingly, although the PhD/Professional category was associated with more total activities per day, its average time per activity did not significantly differ, except in the negative direction compared to the Master's category.

4.4 Embodied – Technical Capacity

In multivariate models, only parental education bears a continued positive association with odds of participating in activities to develop technical capacity. Table 7 shows that the three highest education categories are associated with significantly greater odds compared to any of the lower three categories ($p<.001$). Furthermore, the Master's and Professional/PhD categories are each associated with .349 - .363 greater log-odds compared to the College category, though they do not differ significantly from one another.

When looking at the time participants spent developing technical capacity, the three higher education categories are again associated with greater time compared to the three lower education categories. However, here the Master's and College grad categories are not significantly different from one another, while the Professional/PhD category is associated with significantly more time than all other groups. Compared to the High School Grad or less category, for instance, the Professional/PhD group is associated with a .523 increase log count of minutes (or 69% more minutes). Even compared to the Master's Degree category, this group is still associated with a .273 increase (or 31% more minutes).

Table 6: Parameter Estimates of Significant Parental SES Characteristics (all reference groups) on Development of Embodied Cultural Capital as Technical Capacity

Estimates obtained from weighted multivariate logistic (N=5923) and truncated Poisson (N=2433) regressions, including all other SES variables and controls

	HS grad or less		Some college		Associate Degree		College Graduate		Master's Degree		Professional/PhD	
Parental Ed.	Log odds	Partic. Time	Log odds	Partic. Time	Log odds	Partic. Time	Log odds	Partic. Time	Log odds	Partic. Time	Log odds	Partic. Time
HS grad or less	ref	ref	0.086	-0.078	0.118	-0.028	**-0.340****	**0.243*****	**0.692*****	**-0.233****	**0.656*****	**0.486*****
Some College	-0.086	0.078	ref	ref	0.031	0.049	**0.427*****	**-0.165***	**0.778*****	-0.155	**0.743*****	**0.408*****
Associates	-0.118	0.028	-0.031	-0.049	ref	ref	**0.458*****	**-0.215****	**0.809*****	**-0.205****	**0.774*****	**0.458*****
College Grad	**0.340****	**0.243*****	**0.427*****	**0.165***	**0.458*****	**0.215****	ref	ref	**-0.351****	0.010	-0.316	**-0.243****
Master's	**0.692*****	**0.233****	**0.778*****	0.155	**0.809*****	**0.205****	**0.351****	-0.010	ref	ref	0.035	**0.253*****
Professional/PhD	**0.656*****	**0.486*****	**0.743*****	**0.408*****	**0.774*****	**0.458*****	0.316	**0.243****	-0.035	**0.253*****	ref	ref

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

4.5 Embodied – Social Competence

Analyses of social competence show almost no class differences in odds of engaging in activities to develop social competence (Table 7). The only significant association[4] goes in the opposite direction: having parent in the Classic Professions is associated with significantly *lower* odds (-.262 - .463) of engaging in activities to develop social competence compared to all reference groups save the lowest category, "Services."

There were no significant differences across between SES categories for participants' time developing social competence.

[4] See Appendix Item

Table 7: Parameter Estimates of Significant Parental SES Characteristics (all reference groups) on Development of Embodied Cultural Capital as Social Competence

Estimates obtained from weighted multivariate logistic (N=5923) and truncated Poisson (N=1833) regressions, including all other SES variables and controls

	Service		Lower manual/crafts		Sales/Clerical		Other Professions		Managers/Officials		Class. Professions		Not in Labor Force	
Parental Occ.	Log odds	Partic. Time	Log odds	Partic. Time	Log odds	Partic. Time	Log odds	Partic. Time	Log odds	Partic. Time	Log odds	Partic. Time	Log odds	Partic. Time
Service	0.000	0.000	-0.129	0.077	-0.112	-0.036	-0.061	-0.060	-0.171	0.020	0.208	-0.044	-0.255	-0.010
Manual/Crafts	0.129	-0.077	0.000	0.000	0.017	-0.113	0.068	-0.137	-0.042	-0.056	**0.337***	-0.121	-0.126	-0.087
Sales/Clerical	0.112	0.036	-0.017	0.113	0.000	0.000	0.051	-0.024	-0.059	0.056	**0.320***	-0.008	-0.143	0.026
Other Professions	0.061	0.060	-0.068	0.137	-0.051	0.024	0.000	0.000	-0.110	0.081	**0.269***	0.016	-0.194	0.050
Managers/Officials	0.171	-0.020	0.042	0.056	0.059	-0.056	0.110	-0.081	0.000	0.000	**0.379****	-0.064	-0.084	-0.031
Class. Professions	-0.208	0.044	**0.337***	0.121	**0.320***	0.008	**0.269***	-0.016	**0.379****	0.064	0.000	0.000	**0.463***	0.033
Not in Labor Force	0.255	0.010	0.126	0.087	0.143	-0.026	0.194	-0.050	0.084	0.031	**0.463***	-0.033	0.000	0.000

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

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

Scores of empirical studies on cultural capital have been published since the concept's emergence in the 1960s. Researchers focusing on cultural capital's objectified forms have debated whether highbrow or omnivorous consumption characterizes upper class tastes, and investigated whether objectified cultural capital can be converted successfully into social advantage. Studies of cultural capital as embodied technical capacity and social competence have detailed how children's domestic resources affect their success at school and work.

This study is inspired by these previous definitions of cultural capital, while addressing gaps in the research regarding their place in social reproduction. First, I examine whether parental class positively associated with youths' omnivorous and highbrow consumption patterns, because few studies on objectified cultural capital have examined the degree to which parental characteristics predict children's acquisition of either form. Second, I look at whether parental class continues to be associated with the development of embodied cultural capital among older adolescents, as previous researchers have primarily focused on early childhood, and population-level studies are scarce. Third, I analyze the independent associations of parental education, occupation, and income because almost no studies have attempted to disentangle the contributions of these characteristics to children's cultural capital acquisition, however defined. Finally, I use time diary data to test whether there are class differences in time spent developing cultural capital as well as differences in basic participation rates. No studies have used time-diary data to investigate questions of cultural capital, despite the centrality of the idea of time sacrifice

to Bourdieu's original theories and the advantages of the time diary format for reducing social desirability bias in in survey responses.

Regarding the first study question, I find some support that parental class is associated with greater odds of participating in activities to develop objectified cultural capital in both its highbrow and omnivorous forms. For the second study question, I find even larger and more consistently positive associations between parental class and embodied cultural capital in the form of technical capacity, confirming that what was previously observed among younger children holds for older adolescents as well. However, previous studies' observations regarding social competence development were not evident for this older age group. There seem to be no significant class associations for adolescents' odds of playing organized sports, participating in clubs, volunteering, or working in skilled positions. Time spent developing social competence also does not significantly vary by participant class, except that those whose parents are in the Classical Professions may actually spend *less* time in activities. This contradicts previous studies' findings that greater participation in organized activities is a distinguishing feature of upper class childhood. At least in terms of raw participation rates and time expended, high school students of different class backgrounds are not distinguishable in their formal extracurricular involvements. This may be attributable to the greater availability of organized activities through high schools than through elementary schools, which would enable adolescent engagement with less parental initiation or facilitation. Future qualitative work may look at whether high school students' experiences of organized activities nonetheless differ in ways that would lead to class-unequal opportunities to develop social competence. For instance, ethnographies may compare the norms, expectations, interaction styles, and social connections fostered within high school clubs of higher SES school districts and lower SES districts. It is also

possible that there are consequential differences in the ways that lower and higher class students engage in the same extracurricular activities.

The results of the third study question suggest that the development of different forms of cultural capital is associated with distinct family advantages. For instance, the impact of parental education is inconsistent for odds of participating in highbrow activities, while having a parent in a higher status occupation, particularly in the Classic Professions, appears to be more consequential. For omnivorous consumption, parental education is the only class characteristic that directly influences likelihood of engaging in multiple leisure activities in a day. Parental education is also the only class characteristic directly associated with the development of technical capacity. For this outcome, even fine distinctions in parental education, such as the distinction between having a Master's Degree and a Professional Degree/Ph.D., are associated with significant differences among adolescents. The importance of preserving finer measures of parental background is worth noting for future research, considering how many studies of cultural capital use composite measures of income, occupation, and/or education to describe family class background, or blunt working class versus middle class groupings. The lines of class distinction traverse groups that researchers have assumed to be similar.

Results having to do with time use are mixed. This study finds little evidence that a simple relationship of greater time investment is how higher class adolescents develop either highbrow or omnivorous objectified cultural capital. In fact, it appears that many higher class adolescents may be able to develop omnivorousness by spending *less* time in more activities. This pattern could facilitate the acquisition of shallow familiarity with a broad range of recreational and leisure pursuits. The key exception to this pattern is adolescents whose parents have Professional Degrees/Ph.Ds. Members in this group participate in more activities on average, but *do not* spend

significantly less time in them; thus, their knowledge may be deep as well as broad. Considering that this group also spends significantly more minutes developing embodied cultural capital as technical capacity, one wonders how this is accomplished. To address such questions, future time diary studies could examine class differences in the substance and structure of entire days, assessing how patterns in non-capital building activities like sleep and chores are associated with cultural capital development. Qualitative work may uncover how families are able to facilitate the domestic arrangements enabling advantageous time use among their children.

It is important to stipulate that because ATUS covers a single twenty-four hour period in respondents' lives, it is inappropriate to make claims regarding long-term participation patterns among respondents using ATUS data. For instance, one should not conclude that because lower class adolescents were less likely to report a highbrow activity during their diary day, they never go to museums or attend performance. But because the ATUS is a nationally representative sample of "person-days" (Frazis & Stewart, 2010), one may accurately state that a day in which a highbrow activity occurred was twice as likely to belong to an upper class adolescent as to a lower class adolescent. I have tried to restrict my statements regarding the study's results to these kinds of observations.

A second limitation of this study is that the cross-sectional nature of the ATUS prohibits conclusions regarding the consequences of observed patterns, such as whether adolescent time use predicts adult time use. Longitudinal time diary data would be ideal for such questions, but is yet unavailable. Nonetheless, it is possible to infer implications of this study's patterns from the wealth of previous studies on the cultural capital's effects on exclusion, mobility, and societal inequality. How families unequally shape adolescents' chances of developing cultural capital is a topic deserving continued scrutiny.

APPENDIX 1: OMNIVOROUS ACTIVITIES

Aerobics	Playing sports not elsewhere classified
Arts and crafts as a hobby	Playing volleyball
Attending movies/film	Reading for personal interest
Attending museums	Rodeo
Attending performing arts	Rollerblading
Attending sporting events, not elsewhere classified	Running
	Skiing, ice skating, snowboarding
Biking	Softball
Boating	Taking class for personal interest
Bowling	Television and movies (not religious)
Climbing, spelunking, caving	Using cardiovascular equipment
Computer use for leisure (exc. Games)	Vehicle touring/racing
Dancing	Walking
Doing gymnastics	Watching baseball
Doing yoga	Watching basketball
Extracurricular music & performance activities	Watching biking
Fencing	Watching billiards
Fishing	Watching dancing
Gambling	Watching equestrian sports
Golfing	Watching fencing
Hiking	Watching football
Hunting	Watching gymnastics
Listening to the radio	Watching hockey
Listening to/playing music (not radio)	Watching racquet sports
Participating in equestrian sports	Watching rugby
Participating in martial arts	Watching running
Participating in water sports	Watching soccer
Performing	Watching softball
Playing baseball	Watching vehicle touring/racing
Playing basketball	Watching volleyball
Playing billiards	Watching wrestling
Playing football	Weightlifting/strength training
Playing games	Working out, unspecified
Playing hockey	Wrestling
Playing racquet sports	Writing for personal interest
Playing rugby	
Playing soccer	

APPENDIX 2: OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES COUNTED AS SKILLED WORK

Architecture and engineering occupations
Arts, design, entertainment, sports, and design occupations
Business and financial operations occupations
Community and social service occupations
Computer and mathematical science occupations
Education, training, and library occupations
Healthcare practitioner and technical occupations
Healthcare support occupations
Life, physical, and social science occupations
Management occupations
Office and administrative support occupations

APPENDIX 3: PARENTAL OCCUPATION CATEGORIES

Service	
Animal control workers	Food preparation workers
Animal trainers	Food servers, nonrestaurant
Armed Forces (last job)	Food service managers
Baggage porters, bellhops, and concierges	Gaming managers
Bakers	Hairdressers, hairstylists, and cosmetologists
Barbers	Hosts and hostesses, restaurant, lounge, and coffee shop
Bartenders	
Cashiers	Lifeguards and other recreational, and all other protective service workers
Chefs and head cooks	
Childcare workers	Massage therapists
Combined food preparation and serving workers, including fast food	Meter readers, utilities
	Miscellaneous entertainment attendants and related workers
Cooks	
Counter and rental clerks	Miscellaneous personal appearance workers
Counter attendants, cafeteria, food concession, and coffee shop	Nonfarm animal caretakers
	Parking lot attendants
Couriers and messengers	Parts salespersons
Crossing guards	Personal care aides
Dining room and cafeteria attendants and bartender helpers	Personal care and service workers, all other
	Postal service clerks
Dishwashers	Postal service mail carriers
Dispatchers	Postal service mail sorters, processors, and processing machine operators
Firefighters	
First-line supervisors of firefighting and prevention workers	Production, planning, and expediting clerks
	Recreation and fitness workers
First-line supervisors of food preparation and serving workers	Residential advisors
	Shipping, receiving, and traffic clerks
First-line supervisors of gaming workers	Stock clerks and order fillers
First-line supervisors of personal service workers	T our and travel guides
	Transportation attendants
First-line supervisors of protective service workers, all other	Transportation security screeners
	Ushers, lobby attendants, and ticket takers
Fish and game wardens	Waiters and waitresses
Food preparation and serving related workers, all other	Weighers, measurers, checkers, and samplers, recordkeeping

Lower Manual/Crafts	
Adhesive bonding machine operators and tenders	Drywall installers, ceiling tile installers, and tapers
Aircraft mechanics and service technicians	Earth drillers, except oil and gas
Aircraft structure, surfaces, rigging, and systems assemblers	Electrical and electronics installers and repairers, transportation equipment
Automotive and watercraft service attendants	Electrical power-line installers and repairers
Automotive body and related repairers	Electrical, electronics, and electromechanical assemblers
Automotive glass installers and repairers	Electricians
Automotive service technicians and mechanics	Electronic equipment installers and repairers, motor vehicles
Boilermakers	Electronic home entertainment equipment installers and repairers
Bookbinders and bindery workers	Elevator installers and repairers
Brickmasons, blockmasons, and stonemasons	Engine and other machine assemblers
Bus and truck mechanics and diesel engine specialists	Extruding, forming, pressing, and compacting machine setters, operators, and tenders
Bus drivers	Fence erectors
Butchers and other meat, poultry, and fish processing workers	First-line supervisors of construction trades and extraction workers
Cabinetmakers and bench carpenters	First-line supervisors of farming, fishing, and forestry workers
Carpenters	First-line supervisors of housekeeping and janitorial workers
Carpet, floor, and tile installers and finishers	First-line supervisors of landscaping, lawn service, and groundskeeping workers
Cement masons, concrete finishers, and terrazzo workers	First-line supervisors of mechanics, installers, and repairers
Chemical processing machine setters, operators, and tenders	First-line supervisors of production and operating workers
Cleaners of vehicles and equipment	First-line supervisors/managers of farming, fishing, and forestry workers
Coin, vending, and amusement machine servicers and repairers	Fishers and related fishing workers
Computer control programmers and operators	Food and tobacco roasting, baking, and drying machine operators and tenders
Computer control programmers and operators	Food batchmakers
Computer, automated teller, and office machine repairers	Food processing workers, all other
Construction and building inspectors	Forest and conservation workers
Construction laborers	Furniture finishers
Control and valve installers and repairers	Glaziers
Crane and tower operators	Graders and sorters, agricultural products
Crushing, grinding, polishing, mixing, and blending workers	Grinding, lapping, polishing, and buffing machine tool setters, operators, and tenders, metal and plastic
Cutting workers	
Cutting, punching, and press machine setters, operators, and tenders, metal and plastic	
Derrick, rotary drill, and service unit operators, oil, gas, and mining	
Dredge, excavating, and loading machine operators	

Driver/sales workers and truck drivers	Miscellaneous construction and related workers
Grinding, lapping, polishing, and buffing machine tool setters, operators, and	Miscellaneous plant and system operators
Grounds maintenance workers	Miscellaneous vehicle and mobile equipment mechanics, installers, and repairers
Heating, air conditioning, and refrigeration mechanics and installers	Molders and molding machine setters, operators, and tenders, metal and plastic
Heating, air conditioning, and refrigeration mechanics and installers	Molders, shapers, and casters, except metal and plastic
Heavy vehicle and mobile equipment service technicians and mechanics	Motor vehicle operators, all other
Helpers, construction trades	Operating engineers and other construction equipment operators
Helpers--production workers	Other extraction workers
Highway maintenance workers	Other installation, maintenance, and repair workers
Hoist and winch operators	Other installation, maintenance, and repair workers
Home appliance repairers	Other transportation workers
Industrial and refractory machinery mechanics	Packaging and filling machine operators and tenders
Industrial truck and tractor operators	Packers and packagers, hand
Inspectors, testers, sorters, samplers, and weighers	Painters, construction and maintenance
Insulation workers	Painting workers
Janitors and building cleaners	Paper goods machine setters, operators, and tenders
Jewelers and precious stone and metal workers	Paperhangers
Job printers	Paving, surfacing, and tamping equipment operators
Laborers and freight, stock, and material movers, hand	Pest control workers
Lathe and turning machine tool setters, operators, and tenders, metal and plastic	Photographic process workers and processing machine operators
Laundry and dry-cleaning workers	Pipelayers, plumbers, pipefitters, and steamfitters
Locksmiths and safe repairers	Plasterers and stucco masons
Locomotive engineers and operators	Power plant operators, distributors, and dispatchers
Logging workers	Precision instrument and equipment repairers
Machine feeders and offbearers	Prepress technicians and workers
Machinists	Pressers, textile, garment, and related materials
Maids and housekeeping cleaners	Printing machine operators
Maintenance and repair workers, general	Production workers, all other
Maintenance workers, machinery	Pumping station operators
Manufactured building and mobile home installers	Structural metal fabricators and fitters
Material moving workers, all other	Supervisors of transportation and material moving workers
Metal workers and plastic workers, all other	
Milling and planing machine setters, operators, and tenders, metal and plastic	
Millwrights	
Mining machine operators	
Miscellaneous agricultural workers	

Miscellaneous assemblers and fabricators Radio and telecommunications equipment installers and repairers Railroad conductors and yardmasters Refuse and recyclable material collectors Roof bolters, mining Roofers Sailors and marine oilers Sawing machine setters, operators, and tenders, wood Security and fire alarm systems installers Semiconductor processors Sewing machine operators Sheet metal workers Ship and boat captains and operators Shoe and leather workers and repairers Small engine mechanics Stationary engineers and boiler operators Structural iron and steel workers	Tailors, dressmakers, and sewers Taxi drivers and chauffeurs Telecommunications line installers and repairers Textile winding, twisting, and drawing out machine setters, operators, and tenders Textile, apparel, and furnishings workers, all other Tool and die makers Transportation inspectors Upholsterers Water and wastewater treatment plant and system operators Welding, soldering, and brazing workers Woodworkers, all other Woodworking machine setters, operators, and tenders, except sawing

Sales/Clerical	
Advertising and promotions managers Advertising sales agents Appraisers and assessors of real estate Budget analysts Business operations specialists, all other Buyers and purchasing agents, farm products Claims adjusters, appraisers, examiners, and investigators Compliance officers Compliance officers, except agriculture, construction, health and safety, and Cost estimators Credit analysts Door-to-door sales workers, news and street vendors, and related workers First-line supervisors of non-retail sales workers First-line supervisors of retail sales workers Fundraisers Insurance sales agents Market research analysts and marketing	Bill and account collectors Billing and posting clerks Bookkeeping, accounting, and auditing clerks Computer operators Court, municipal, and license clerks Credit authorizers, checkers, and clerks Credit counselors and loan officers Customer service representatives Data entry keyers File clerks Financial analysts Financial clerks, all other Financial specialists, all other Hotel, motel, and resort desk clerks Information and record clerks, all other Insurance claims and policy processing clerks Insurance underwriters Interviewers, except eligibility and loan Library assistants, clerical Loan interviewers and clerks Mail clerks and mail machine operators, except

specialists Marketing and sales managers Meeting and convention planners Meeting, convention, and event planners Models, demonstrators, and product promoters Public relations and fundraising managers Public relations specialists Purchasing agents, except wholesale, retail, and farm products Real estate brokers and sales agents Retail salespersons Sales and related workers, all other Sales engineers Sales representatives, services, all other Sales representatives, wholesale and manufacturing Securities, commodities, and financial services sales agents Telemarketers Travel agents Wholesale and retail buyers, except farm products Miscellaneous legal support workers Library technicians Teacher assistants Other education, training, and library workers First-line supervisors of office and administrative support workers Switchboard operators, including answering service	postal service New accounts clerks Office and administrative support workers, all other Office clerks, general Office machine operators, except computer Order clerks Paralegals and legal assistants Payroll and timekeeping clerks Personal financial advisors Procurement clerks Proofreaders and copy markers Receptionists and information clerks Reservation and transportation ticket agents and travel clerks Secretaries and administrative assistants Statistical assistants Tax examiners and collectors, and revenue agents Tax preparers Telephone operators Tellers Word processors and typists Office and administrative support workers, all other Agricultural inspectors

Other Professions	
Actors	Administrative services managers
Archivists, curators, and museum technicians	Air traffic controllers and airfield operations specialists
Artists and related workers	Aircraft pilots and flight engineers
Bailiffs, correctional officers, and jailers	Announcers
Chemical technicians	Athletes, coaches, umpires, and related workers
Clergy	Broadcast and sound engineering technicians and radio operators
Computer and information systems managers	Chief executives
Computer programmers	Chiropractors
Computer scientists and systems analysts	Clinical laboratory technologists and technicians
Computer support specialists	Construction managers
Computer systems analysts	Dancers and choreographers
Counselors	Dental hygienists
Database administrators	Diagnostic related technologists and technicians
Dental assistants	Dietitians and nutritionists
Designers	Editors
Detectives and criminal investigators	Eligibility interviewers, government programs
Directors, religious activities and education	Emergency medical technicians and paramedics
Drafters	Farm, ranch, and other agricultural managers
Elementary and middle school teachers	Farmers and ranchers
Engineering technicians, except drafters	Farmers, ranchers, and other agricultural managers
First-line supervisors of correctional officers	Financial managers
First-line supervisors of police and detectives	Funeral directors
Geological and petroleum technicians	General and operations managers
Human resources managers	Health diagnosing and treating practitioner support technicians
Human resources workers	Health practitioner support technologists and technicians
Human resources, training, and labor relations specialists	Human resources assistants, except payroll and timekeeping
Information security analysts	Industrial production managers
Librarians	Licensed practical and licensed vocational nurses
Medical assistants	Lodging managers
Medical assistants and other healthcare support occupations	Logisticians
Medical transcriptionists	Management analysts
Miscellaneous community and social service specialists	Managers and Officials
Miscellaneous health technologists and technicians	Managers, all other
Network and computer systems administrators	
Network systems and data communications analysts	
Nuclear technicians	
Nursing, psychiatric, and home health aides	
Opticians, dispensing	
Other healthcare practitioners and technical	

occupations	Medical and health services managers
Other life, physical, and social science technicians	Medical records and health information technicians
Other teachers and instructors	Medical, dental, and ophthalmic laboratory technicians
Pharmacy aides	Miscellaneous media and communication workers
Physical therapist assistants and aides	Musicians, singers, and related workers
Police and sheriff's patrol officers	News analysts, reporters and correspondents
Postsecondary teachers	Occupational therapists
Preschool and kindergarten teachers	Operations research analysts
Private detectives and investigators	Other business operations specialists
Probation officers and correctional treatment specialists	Photographers
Producers and directors	Physical therapists
Religious workers, all other	Physician assistants
Secondary school teachers	Property, real estate, and community association managers
Social and community service managers	Purchasing managers
Social workers	Radiation therapists
Software developers, applications and systems software	Registered nurses
Special education teachers	Respiratory therapists
Surveying and mapping technicians	Security guards and gaming surveillance officers
Surveyors, cartographers, and photogrammetrists	Security guards and gaming surveillance officers
Training and development managers	Speech-language pathologists
Training and development specialists	Technical writers
Web developers	Television, video, and motion picture camera operators and editors
	Therapists, all other
	Transportation, storage, and distribution managers
	Writers and authors

Classical Professions	
Accountants and auditors	Chemists and materials scientists
Aerospace engineers	Civil engineers
Agricultural and food scientists	Computer hardware engineers
Architects, except naval	Conservation scientists and foresters
Architectural and engineering managers	Dentists
Astronomers and physicists	Economists
Audiologists	Education administrators
Biological scientists	Electrical and electronics engineers
Biomedical engineers	Engineers, all other
Chemical engineers	

Environmental engineers Environmental scientists and geoscientists Industrial engineers, including health and safety Judges, magistrates, and other judicial workers Lawyers Market and survey researchers Materials engineers Mechanical engineers Medical scientists Miscellaneous social scientists and related workers	Natural sciences managers Nuclear engineers Nurse practitioners Petroleum engineers Pharmacists Physical scientists, all other Physicians and surgeons Podiatrists Psychologists Registered nurses Statisticians Veterinarians

REFERENCES

Aschaffenburg, Karen and Ineke Maas. 1997. "Cultural and Educational Careers: The Dynamics of Social Reproduction." *American Sociological Review* 62(4): 573-587.

Alderson, Arthur S., Azamat Junisbai, and Isaac Heacock. 2007. "Social Status and Cultural Consumption in the United States." *Poetics* 35(2-3): 191-212.

Atkinson, Will. 2011. "The Context and Genesis of Musical Tastes. Omnivorousness Debunked, Bourdieu Buttressed." *Poetics* 39: 169-186.

Bennett, Pamela R., Amy C. Lutz, and Lakshmi Jayaram. 2012. "Beyond the Schoolyard: the Role of Parenting Logics, Financial Resources, and Social Institutions in the Social Class Gap in Structured Activity Participation." *Sociology of Education* 82(2): 131-157.

Biddle, Bruce J., Barbara J. Bank, and Marjorie M. Marlin. 1980. "Parental and Peer Influence on Adolescents." *Social Forces* 58(4): 1057-1079.

Bodovski, Katerina and George Farkas. 2008. "'Concerted Cultivation' and Unequal Achievement in Elementary School." *Social Science Research* 37: 903-919.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1979/1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard.

-- 1983. "The Field of Cultural Production, or: The Economic World Reversed." *Poetics* 12(4-5): 311-56.

-- 1986. "The Forms of Capital." Pp. 241-58 in *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Culture,* edited by John Richardson. New York: Greenwood Press.

-- 1991. "First Lecture: Social Space and Symbolic Space: Introduction to a Japanese Reading of *Distinction*." *Poetics Today* 12(4): 627-638.

-- 1996. *The State Nobility.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre and Jean-Claude Passeron. 1964/1979. *The Inheritors*: *French Students and Their Relation to Culture*, translated by Richard Nice. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

-- 1968/1977. *Reproduction in Education, Society, and Culture*, translated by Richard Nice. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Burgard, Sarah A. and Jennifer A. Ailshire. 2013. "Gender and Time for Sleep Among U.S. Adults." *American Sociological Review* 78: 51-69.

Bryson B. 1996. "'Anything but Heavy Metal': Symbolic Exclusion and Musical Dislikes." *American Sociological Review* 61(5): 884–99

Calarco, Jessica McCrory. 2011. "I Need Help!" Social Class and Children's Help-Seeking in Elementary School." *American Sociological Review* 76(6): 862-882.

-- 2014. “Coached for the Classroom: Parents’ Cultural Transmission and Children’s Reproduction of Educational Inequalities.” *American Sociological Review* 79: 1015-1037.

Cameron, A. C., and P. K. Trivedi. 2013. *Regression Analysis of Count Data*. 2nd ed. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Chin, Tiffani and Meredith Phillips. “Social Reproduction and Child-Rearing Practices: Social Class, Children’s Agency, and the Summer Activity Gap.” *Sociology of Education* 77(3): 185-210.

Covay, Elizabeth, and William Carbonaro. 2010. “After the Bell: Participation in Extracurricular Activities, Classroom Behavior, and Academic Achievement.” *Sociology of Education* 83(1): 20-45.

Desha, Laura N., Jan M. Nicholson, and Jenny M. Ziviani. 2011. “Adolescent Depression and Time Spent with Parents.” *Social Indicators Research* 101: 233-238.

DiMaggio, Paul. 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, Paul and John Mohr. 1985. “Cultural Capital, Educational Attainment, and Marital Selection.” *American Journal of Sociology* 90(6): 1231-1261.

DiMaggio, Paul and Toqir Mukhtar. 2004. “Arts Participation as Cultural Capital in the United States, 1982-2002: Signs of Decline?” *Poetics* 32: 169-194.

DiMaggio, Paul and Michael Useem. 1978. “Social Class and Art Consumption: Origins and Consequences of Class Differences in Exposure to the Arts in America.” *Theory and Society* 5:109–132.

Dumais, Susan A. 2002. “Cultural Capital, Gender, and School Success: The Role of Habitus.” *Sociology of Education* 75:44–68.

-- 2008. “Adolescents’ Time Use and Academic Achievement: a Test of the Reproduction and Mobility Models.” *Social Science Quarterly* 89(4): 867-886.

Dumais, Susan A. and Aaryn Ward. 2010. “Cultural Capital and First-Generation College Success.” *Poetics* 38: 245-265.

Duncan, Greg J. and Katherine Magnuson. 2003/2012. “Off with Hollingshead: Socioeconomic Resources, Parenting, and Child Development.” pp. 107-124 in *Socioeconomic Status, Parenting, and Child Development*, edited by Marc H. Bornstein and Robert H. Bradley. New York: Psychology Press.

Erickson, Bonnie H. 1996. “Culture, Class, and Connections.” *American Journal of Sociology* 102(1): 217-251.

Gager, Constance T., Teresa M Cooney, and Kathleen Thede Call. 1999. "The Effects of Family Characteristics and Time Use on Adolescents' Household Labor." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 61: 982-994.

Gripsrud, Jostein, Jan Fredrik Hovden, and Moe Hallvard. 2011. "Changing Relations: Class, Education, and Cultural Capital." *Poetics* 39(6): 507-529.

Hagan, John. 1991. "Destiny and Drift: Subcultural Preferences, Status Attainments, and the Risks and Rewards of Youth." *American Sociological Review* 56(5): 567-582.

Harris, Kathleen Mullan. 2010. "An Integrative Approach to Health." *Demography* 47(1): 1-22.

Hofferth, Sandra L. 2006. "Response Bias in a Popular Indicator of Reading to Children." *Sociological Methodology* 36: 301-315.

Holt, Douglas B. 1997. "Distinction in America? Recovering Bourdieu's Theory of Tastes from its Critics." *Poetics* 25: 93-120.

Jaeger, Mads Meier. 2009. "Equal Access but Unequal Outcomes: Cultural Capital and Educational Choice in a Meritocratic Society." *Social Forces* 87(4): 1943-72.

Jaeger, Mads Meier. 2011. "Does Cultural Capital Really Affect Academic Achievement? New Evidence from Combined Sibling and Panel Data." *Sociology of Education* 84(4): 281-298.

Jaeger, Mads Meier and Richard Breen. 2016. "A Dynamic Model of Cultural Reproduction." *American Journal of Sociology* 121(4): 1079-1115.

Johnston, Josée, and Shyon Baumann. 2007. "Democracy Versus Distinction: A Study of Omnivorousness in Gourmet Food Writing." *American Journal of Sociology* 113(1): 165-204.

Jonsson, Jan O., David B. Grusky, Matthew Di Carlo, Reinhard Pollak, and Mary C. Brinton. 2009. "Microclass Mobility: Social Reproduction in Four Countries." *American Journal of Sociology* 114(4): 977-1036.

Kalil, Ariel, Rebecca Ryan, and Michael Corey. 2012. "Diverging Destinies: Maternal Education and the Developmental Gradient in Time with Children." *Demography* 49: 1361-1383.

Kane, Danielle. 2003. "Distinction Worldwide?: Bourdieu's Theory of Taste in International Context." *Poetics* 31: 403-421.

Katz-Gerro, Tally. 2002. "Highbrow Cultural Consumption and Class Distinction in Italy, Israel, West Germany, Sweden, and the United States." *Social Forces* 81(1): 207-229.

Kendig, Sarah M. and Suzanne M. Bianchi. 2008. "Single, Cohabitating, and Married Mothers' Time with Children." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 70: 1228-1240.

Khan, Shamus. 2011. *Privilege: The Making of an Adolescent Elite at St. Paul's School*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Lamont, Michele. 2012. "How Has Bourdieu Been Good to Think With? The Case of the United States." *Sociological Forum* 27(1): 228-237.

Lareau, Annette. 2003. *Unequal Childhoods: Class, Race, and Family Life.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

-- 2015. "Cultural Knowledge and Social Inequality." *American Sociological Review* 80(1): 1-27.

Lareau, Annette and Elliot B. Weininger. 2003. "Cultural Capital in Educational Research: A Critical Assessment." *Theory and Society* 32: 567-606.

Lizardo, Omar. 2006a. "How Cultural Tastes Shape Social Networks." *American Sociological Review* 71(5): 778-807.

-- 2006b. "The Puzzle of Women's 'Highbrow' Culture Consumption: Integrating Gender and Work into Bourdieu's Class Theory of Taste." *Poetics* (34): 1-23.

-- 2011. "Cultural Correlates of Ego-Network Closure." *Sociological Perspectives* 54(3): 479-487.

Lizardo, Omar. 2012. "The Three Phases of Bourdieu's U.S. Reception: Comment on Lamont." *Sociological Forum* 27(1): 238-244.

Lizardo, Omar and Sara Skiles. 2012. "Reconceptualizing and Theorizing 'Omnivorousness': Genetic and Relational Mechanisms." *Sociological Theory* 30: 263-283.

Long, J. Scott, & Freese, Jeremy (2006). *Regression Models for Categorical Dependent Variables Using Stata*, 2nd Edition. College Station, TX: Stata Press.

Pereira, Virgilio Borges. 2011. "Experiencing Unemployment: The Roles of Social and Cultural Capital in Mediating Economic Crisis." *Poetics* 39(6): 469-490.

Peterson, Richard, and Roger M. Kern. 1996. "Changing Highbrow Taste: From Snob to Omnivore." *American Sociological Review* 61: 900-907.

Petev, Ivaylo D. 2013. "The Association of Social Class and Lifestyles: Persistence in American Sociability, 1974 to 2010. *American Sociological Review* 78(4):633-661.

Presser, Stanley and Linda Stinson. 1998. "Data Collection Mode and Social Desirability Bias in Self-Reported Religious Attendance." *American Sociological Review* 63(1): 137-145.

Prieur, Annick and Mike Savage. 2011. "Updating Cultural Capital Theory: A Discussion Based on Studies in Denmark and in Britain." *Poetics* 39(6): 566-580.

Rivera, Lauren A. 2012. "Hiring as Cultural Matching: The Case of Elite Professional Service Firms." *American Sociological Review* 77: 999-1022.

Roberts, Donald F. and Ulla G. Foehr. 2004. *Kids and Media in America.* NewYork: Cambridge University Press.

Roose, Henk, Koen van Eijck, and John Lievens. 2012. "Culture of Distinction or Culture of Openness? Using a Social Space Approach. *Poetics* 40(6): 491-513.

Roscigno and Ainsworth-Darnell. 1999. "Race, Cultural Capital, and Educational Resources: Persistent Inequalities and Achievement Returns." *Sociology of Education* 72(3): 158-178.

Sallaz, Jeffrey J. and Jane Zavisca. 2007. "Bourdieu in American Sociology, 1984-2004." *Annual Review of Sociology* 33: 21-41.

Sullivan, Oriel and Tally Katz-Gerro. 2007. "The Omnivore Thesis Revisited: Voracious Cultural Consumers." *European Sociological Review* 23(2): 123-137.

Tampubolon, Gindo. 2008. "Revisiting Omnivores in America Circa 1990s: The Exclusiveness of Omnivores?" *Poetics* 36(2-3): 243-264.

Tepper, Steven J. and Eszter Hargittai. 2009. "Pathways to Music Exploration in a Digital Age." *Poetics* 37(3): 227-249.

Weber, Max. 1925/1945. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, translated by A.M. Henderon and Talcott Parsons, edited by Talcott Parsons. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.

Wight, Vanessa R., Sara B. Raley, and Suzanne M. Bianchi. 2008. "Time for Children, One's Spouse and Oneself among Parents Who Work Nonstandard Hours." *Social Forces* 87(1): 243-271.