


**Please cite the Published Version**

Cutts, D and Widdop, P  (2016) Reimagining omnivorousness in the context of place. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 17 (3). pp. 480-503. ISSN 1469-5405

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469540516634413>

**Publisher:** Sage

**Version:** Accepted Version

**Downloaded from:** <https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/626256/>

**Usage rights:**  In Copyright

**Additional Information:** This is an Author Accepted Manuscript of a paper accepted for publication in *Journal of Consumer Culture*, published by and copyright Sage.

**Enquiries:**

If you have questions about this document, contact [openresearch@mmu.ac.uk](mailto:openresearch@mmu.ac.uk). Please include the URL of the record in e-space. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our Take Down policy (available from <https://www.mmu.ac.uk/library/using-the-library/policies-and-guidelines>)

## Introduction

Questions about how cultural omnivorousness is defined, measured and operationalised still remain the focus of much debate in cultural sociology (Warde and Gayo-Cal, 2009; Berghman and Van Eijck, 2009; Warde et al, 2008). While scholars have explored different dimensions of omnivorousness through volume and composition (Warde et al, 2008), others have examined the concept of omnivorousness with a theoretical emphasis on how people consume rather than just focussing on what they consume (Sullivan and Katz-Gerro, 2007; Stichele and Laermans, 2006). Increasingly researchers have also found that there are different types of omnivores in particular cultural fields (Van Eijck and Lievens, 2008; Sintas and Alvarez, 2002). There is also growing recognition that among high status groups, there are both ‘highbrow’ (liking for only legitimate genres) and ‘omnivorous’ patterns (Van Eijck, 2001; Peterson, 2005). Yet, relatively few studies have examined omnivorousness by measuring not just what individuals consume but also the differences in the way they consume cultural activities (Sullivan and Katz-Gerro, 2007). The omnivorousness literature now spans much of Europe, Australia and North America, and even some countries in South America (Alderson et al, 2007; Torche, 2007; Van Rees et al, 1999; Van Eijck, 2000; 2001). Despite the paucity of data, there have also been some attempts to specifically measure omnivorousness across countries (Lizardo and Skiles, 2009; Katz-Gerro, 2002) but very few studies have examined the importance of place on cultural consumption within a country (Widdop and Cutts, 2012).

In this article we make a number of contributions to the cultural omnivorousness literature. In the first part, using a latent class modelling approach, we examine whether there are different modes of omnivorousness in England based on the frequency of participation. Building on previous research, we aim to differentiate between voracious omnivores and a more general or infrequent omnivore group as well as distinguish between other cultural consumers

1  
2  
3 (Sullivan and Katz-Gero, 2007; Stichele and Laermans, 2006). Here we use a wide variety of  
4  
5 activities that cross cut the perceived symbolic boundaries of culture in England (Peterson,  
6  
7 2005). Our aim is to determine the socio-economic make-up of the different omnivore  
8  
9 groups, specifically the voracious omnivores, in order to examine whether members of this  
10  
11 lifestyle group have a distinctive socio-economic profile.  
12  
13

14  
15 The second part of the paper builds on these findings and makes an important substantive and  
16  
17 methodological contribution to the omnivorousness debate. Here we examine whether  
18  
19 cultural consumption patterns are clustered at the area level within England based on the  
20  
21 frequency and participation in cultural activities of individuals. Part of the theoretical  
22  
23 justification for this novel approach is to re-establish the importance of place as a key driver  
24  
25 in the formation and maintenance of cultural lifestyles. Place remains a constituent element of  
26  
27 social and cultural life, and historical change (Gieryn, 2000; Friedland and Boden, 1994), yet  
28  
29 place, the macro contextual mechanisms and the different spatial scales in which participation  
30  
31 occurs remains relatively ignored in studies of cultural omnivorousness. Here we seek to  
32  
33 readdress this anomaly by establishing whether clustering exists at the regional level in  
34  
35 England. However, our focus is on the voracious omnivore group and the expectation that  
36  
37 individual members of this lifestyle group, given their socioeconomic profile, will choose to  
38  
39 live in close proximity to individuals with similar values and cultural participation habits to  
40  
41 their own. We hypothesise that this lifestyle group would not only cluster in space but share  
42  
43 daily interaction with similar people in local networks. We stress that the context in which  
44  
45 such interactions occur is likely to be an important determinant on which preferences are  
46  
47 formed and the frequency in which they are consumed. Given this, we aim to determine  
48  
49 whether there are area level clusters of cultural consumption based on the latent class cultural  
50  
51 typologies at the individual level, and hypothesise that voracious omnivores will cluster in  
52  
53 distinct places when compared to other cultural consumers, including other omnivores. This  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 is methodologically innovative because conventional latent class models, which are widely  
4 used in the omnivorousness literature to capture cultural lifestyle types, make the assumption  
5 that observations are independent. If clustering exists then this assumption is violated. Here  
6 we employ a non-parametric multilevel latent class model to simultaneously capture latent  
7 class typologies at the individual level and types of areas. While this has been applied in  
8 other fields, at present, it has not been used in the cultural omnivorousness literature to  
9 measure between group heterogeneity.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

### 19 **The Omnivore Thesis**

20  
21  
22 Up until the early 1990s, the path-breaking work of Pierre Bourdieu's 'Distinction'  
23 represented the most comprehensive theoretical understanding and explanation of the  
24 apparent interrelationship between cultural and social hierarchies (Bourdieu, 1984). The  
25 existence of a homology in cultural stratification, that people belonging to the dominant  
26 classes affirmed their higher social status through the consumption of highbrow culture while  
27 those with lower social status preferred and consumed lowbrow culture, became the  
28 orthodoxy for twenty years or more. However, by the last decade of the twentieth century,  
29 scholars began to question whether Bourdieu's theory still reflected contemporary social  
30 reality (Van Eijck, 1999; Stichele and Laermans, 2006). In a number of important articles,  
31 Peterson and his colleagues (Peterson, 1992; Peterson and Kern, 1996) reformulated the  
32 relationship between status hierarchy and cultural taste. Put simply, high status groups had a  
33 broader cultural repertoire, appreciating more middlebrow and lowbrow activities than the  
34 orthodoxy suggested. These were labelled 'omnivores'. Whereas the lower status groups  
35 were restricted in their consumption patterns to only the mainstream or popular culture, and  
36 were, therefore, coined 'univores' (Peterson, 2005; Peterson and Kern, 1996). Following this  
37 ground-breaking work, numerous scholars have sought to classify cultural preferences in a  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 broadly similar way, with many supportive, although not exclusively so (Bryson, 1996; Van  
4  
5 Eijck, 1999; 2001; Sintas and Alvarez, 2002; Van Rees et al, 1999).  
6  
7

8  
9 Most scholars though have observed the existence of an omnivore group and claim that  
10  
11 greater socio-cultural heterogeneity reflects the rise in social mobility over recent decades  
12  
13 with the growth of the mass media and online technology, the development of the leisure  
14  
15 industry and easier access to higher education as important drivers (Peterson, 2005; Stichele  
16  
17 and Laermans, 2006). Omnivores also benefit from a broader and more diverse social  
18  
19 network where they can display knowledge gained from interaction with individuals in  
20  
21 different social circles which reinforces social approval within these circles (Van Eijck,  
22  
23 1999). Nonetheless, numerous empirical findings suggest that the omnivore group is  
24  
25 relatively small in number and that its socio-economic make-up does not purely reflect the  
26  
27 relationship between economic class and patterns of consumption (Sullivan and Katz-Gerro,  
28  
29 2007). Generally, studies have found that higher education, higher income and higher  
30  
31 occupational status are strongly associated with omnivorous cultural preferences (Van Eijck,  
32  
33 2001; Sintas and Alvarez, 2002). However, effects for gender and age are contested. Whether  
34  
35 gender is strongly associated with omnivorism depends upon the domain of activity selected  
36  
37 for the analysis, as shown by the differentiated gender effects found in a number studies (Van  
38  
39 Eijck, 2001; Sintas and Alvarez, 2002, Warde and GayoCal, 2009). Similarly, some scholars  
40  
41 suggest that younger age cohorts are more inclined to be omnivores (Stichele and Laermans,  
42  
43 2006; Van Eijck, 2000), whilst others disagree (Warde et al, 2007; Warde and Gayo-Cal,  
44  
45 2009; Van Eijck et al, 2002).  
46  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 Recent scholarly debate has focussed on the meaning and significance of cultural  
52  
53 omnivorousness and how the concept is currently operationalised (Warde et al, 2007;  
54  
55 Peterson, 2005). For instance, a number of studies have emphasised that appreciating a wide  
56  
57 range of cultural genres or activities is not in itself limited to higher status groups (Van Eijck,  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 1999). Omnivores may still discriminate against some particular forms of popular culture  
4  
5 (Bryson, 1996). Others have highlighted the existence of different types of omnivores in a  
6  
7 number of cultural fields (Van Eijck and Lievens, 2008; Sintas and Alvarez, 2002), while  
8  
9 there is increasing evidence of both ‘highbrow’ and ‘omnivorous’ patterns among high status  
10  
11 groups (Van Eijck, 2001; Peterson, 2005). This has led to refinements in the established  
12  
13 omnivore-univore dichotomy with new categorisations to reflect the small minority in the  
14  
15 higher social strata which reject popular culture as opposed to those with omnivorous  
16  
17 consumption habits, and equivalent sub-divisions to reflect similar consumption patterns  
18  
19 among ‘lowbrow’ groups (Peterson and Rossman, 2007). Alongside such refinements, some  
20  
21 scholars have explored different dimensions of omnivorousness through volume and  
22  
23 composition (Warde et al, 2008). Others have examined how omnivorousness is  
24  
25 differentiated between taste and participation (Warde and Gayo-Cal, 2009; Yaish and Katz-  
26  
27 Gerro, 2010) establishing what people like and what people do are different phenomena, with  
28  
29 different causes and effects.  
30  
31  
32

33  
34  
35 Cultural omnivourism is not without critics. As an explanation of contemporary cultural  
36  
37 engagement, it remains unclear whether such variations are due to a global trend regardless of  
38  
39 nationality, whether omnivorousness is indeed a peculiar feature of the American society, or  
40  
41 if it is confined to specific countries (Rimmer, 2012; Prior, 2013). When it first appeared, the  
42  
43 work of Peterson and his colleagues was interpreted as a challenge to the widely-accepted  
44  
45 approach of Bourdieu. However, questions persist about omnivourism as the sole explanation  
46  
47 of contemporary cultural engagement (Atkinson, 2011). Furthermore, Friedman (2012) notes  
48  
49 that rather than presuming the cultural eclecticism researchers should play closer attention to  
50  
51 both how and why omnivorous taste is established. Other scholars remain sceptical about the  
52  
53 true nature of the omnivore manifestation, specifically whether it represents a new form of  
54  
55 cultural capital or whether omnivorousness is an orientation which itself acts as a marker of  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 distinction (Bennett et al, 2009). Some are critical of the concept stating that it may be a  
4  
5 product of empiricist quantitative methods (Lahire, 2004), while evidence persists that  
6  
7 particular forms of less legitimate culture simply don't cross boundaries (Bryson, 1996). For  
8  
9 Savage (2006) this may be indicative of the reworking of highbrow culture. In summary,  
10  
11 although its true meaning remains unclear, nowadays it is broadly accepted that homology  
12  
13 and omnivorism are indeed compatible (Tampubolon, 2008; Lizardo and Skiles, 2012).  
14  
15

### 16 17 **Reconsidering Omnivorousness** 18

19  
20 The general aim of this paper is to revisit and further extend the boundaries of the  
21  
22 omnivorousness literature. Initially, we seek to achieve this by mapping cultural consumption  
23  
24 in England using a measure based on both the frequency and range of cultural participation.  
25  
26 Here we explore a range of cultural activities that cross the perceived cultural hierarchical  
27  
28 boundaries to determine an accurate account of cultural lifestyles (Alderson et al, 2007;  
29  
30 Peterson, 2005). By measuring both the range and frequency of participation, theoretically,  
31  
32 we stress the importance of examining not just what individuals consume but also the  
33  
34 differences in the way they consume cultural activities (Bourdieu, 1984; Sullivan and Katz-  
35  
36 Gerro, 2007).  
37  
38

39  
40 The theoretical basis for this analysis stems from scholarly work that emphasises the link  
41  
42 between the insatiable consumer, whose wants are seemingly endless, and the dynamic of  
43  
44 modern day consumption (Sullivan and Katz-Gerro, 2007; Campbell, 1987). The depiction of  
45  
46 a 'voracious' cultural consumer – someone who switches from one activity to another for  
47  
48 brief periods thus avoiding immersion in one specific activity – reflects wider social and  
49  
50 cultural developments for individuals in late modernity and the need to take time into account  
51  
52 when examining cultural participation (Rosa, 2003; Cotte et al, 2004). As the pace of life of  
53  
54 individuals accelerates, particularly for those who are well educated and high income earners,  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 time becomes scarcer and speed becomes more important, therefore, an intensification of  
4 activities occurs (Sullivan and Gershuny, 2004; Gershuny, 2000). Moreover, as intensity  
5 increases, more activities are done simultaneously, that inevitably spirals in to individuals  
6 increasingly compressing their time, resulting in ever shorter spells spent on each activity  
7 (Sullivan and Katz Gerro, 2007; Southerton, 2003). Therefore, the tension between limited  
8 free time and a broad taste or lifestyle has resulted in such consumers being coined 'cultural  
9 hoppers': those who 'take a little bit here, a little bit there, but never a lot of the same'  
10 (Stichele and Laemans, 2006). Yet, a growing literature also suggests that it is those  
11 individuals from high status groups that not only work more but consume more (Schor,  
12 1992). Another study also showed that as educational levels increased, participation in  
13 cultural activities increased, as did the frequency of participation (Stichele and Laemans,  
14 2006). Through their innovative use of cross sectional time data from different sources, one  
15 group of scholars found voraciousness in leisure participation shares similar relationships to  
16 that of omnivorousness – associated with high status, education and cultural capital – and that  
17 those individuals with 'insatiable' appetites for a broad range of cultural activities could not  
18 be just attributed to having more time or money than others (Sullivan and Katz-Gerro, 2007).  
19 Voraciousness is, therefore, a depiction of 'status distinction, a cultural boundary, and a sign  
20 of social exclusion' (Sullivan and Katz-Gerro, 2007: 133). The classification of this  
21 dimension of cultural behaviour has gone some way in reconciling the apparent contradiction  
22 between increases in leisure time and the increase in time devoted to work.

23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48 The scholarly works discussed here, therefore, provides the theoretical justification to take  
49 account of both how and what is consumed.<sup>1</sup> Given such consumption habits, it is apparent  
50 that we may not only be able to distinguish a voracious group from other cultural lifestyle  
51 groups, but also other omnivore types (Stichele and Laermans, 2006). After identifying this  
52 voracious omnivore group, the aim is to examine its socio-economic make up and to examine  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 if it is distinct from other cultural lifestyle groups, and whether our findings concur with  
4  
5 those stated above. Yet, if voraciousness is a depiction of 'status distinction', one might  
6  
7 expect such a group to cluster by geographical location or place. Given the tension between  
8  
9 limited free time and an insatiable appetite for a broad range of cultural activities, place is  
10  
11 likely to be an important driving force of the voracious lifestyle cluster. This is not only a  
12  
13 supply side issue, in terms of access to a range of cultural items, but reflects the fact that  
14  
15 many participation acts are socially learned and stimulated (Huckfeldt, 1979; Agnew, 1987).  
16  
17 Place mediates social life: it is a vital medium through which social life happens (Gieryn,  
18  
19 2000). While it is clear that high status individuals are more likely to both be voracious and  
20  
21 participate in a wider range of cultural activities than those from the lower echelons of  
22  
23 society, we hypothesise that living in a local context surrounded by higher status individuals  
24  
25 is also likely to encourage voracious omnivorousness.  
26  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 To date, much of the scholarly analyses of omnivorousness are based on a compositional  
32  
33 approach, whereby cultural consumption patterns are assumed to be largely influenced by an  
34  
35 individual's position within society or their personal evaluation of the contemporary cultural  
36  
37 field. From this compositional stance, any variation in cultural participation by place is likely  
38  
39 to be a reflection of the variation in the numbers of disadvantaged or affluent individuals in  
40  
41 that area. Individuals with similar lifestyles or socio-economic characteristics are, therefore,  
42  
43 likely to adopt comparable consumption habits wherever they live (Macintyre, 2007).  
44  
45 However, such explanations of cultural behaviour ignore the importance of contextual  
46  
47 effects, how they mediate social life, not only through social interaction and other macro-  
48  
49 level forces, but also how participation in the cultural field is enhanced through a sense of  
50  
51 belonging or place (Agnew, 1987). If beliefs, attitudes and expectations are socially  
52  
53 constructed, then any form of participation will be influenced by place, not only through the  
54  
55 interaction with others they reside with or share the same social world (Buck, 2001), but also  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 through geographical location, as this social interaction must take place somewhere (Agnew,  
4  
5 1987).  
6

7  
8 In this article we stress that the social context is a crucial connecting tie between individual  
9  
10 stratification and partaking in cultural activities. The decision to participate might be  
11  
12 heightened by interpersonal interaction with family, friends, neighbours, work colleagues or  
13  
14 others in local social networks (Huckfeldt, 1979), or even from information flows from the  
15  
16 local media as well as different cultural bodies that operate in the vicinity. For those  
17  
18 individuals who live close to a cultural venue, participation may be enhanced given that they  
19  
20 will be more exposed to its physical presence and what it offers (Curtis and Rees-Jones,  
21  
22 1998).  
23  
24

25  
26 We regard context, therefore, as complementary to compositional effects. Theoretically, high  
27  
28 status individuals may be more likely to participate, frequently, in a broad range of cultural  
29  
30 activities. But participation may reflect the local social environment, with individuals  
31  
32 stimulated to consume cultural activities both where they are around people who engage in  
33  
34 these cultural genres and through the adoption of prevalent group norms which enhances  
35  
36 participation. Hence, we may expect consumption of cultural activities to vary in some areas  
37  
38 than others. Given that these high status individuals will choose to locate in close proximity  
39  
40 to individuals with similar values, lifestyles and cultural participation habits to their own, it is  
41  
42 probable that such groups would not only cluster in space but share daily interaction with  
43  
44 likeminded people in active networks. The context in which such interactions occur is likely  
45  
46 to be a significant influence on how individuals' preferences are formed, the frequency of  
47  
48 participation and the consumption of cultural activities.  
49  
50  
51

52  
53  
54 These expectations can be linked to recent research on the importance of culture in cities, the  
55  
56 cultural economy and the creative class where scholars have rallied against those who seek to  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 devalue place by stressing that place and community are more critical factors than ever before  
4  
5 (Florida, 2005). For instance, Florida (2005) stresses that creativity lies at the heart of cities  
6  
7 and accounts for why consumption may vary by place. He argues that ‘regional economic  
8  
9 growth is driven by the location choices of creative people – the holders of creative capital –  
10  
11 who prefer places that are diverse, tolerant, and open to new ideas’ (Florida, 2002: 223). If  
12  
13 those with the highest levels of cultural capital are socially and geographically mobile, it is  
14  
15 inevitable that they would chose to reside in the very places Florida identifies, constructing  
16  
17 alternative cultural lifestyles in different places. Because creative people want to live there,  
18  
19 supply side creative and cultural institutions and companies then follow the people – or, in  
20  
21 many cases, are started by them. Creative centres provide the integrated habitat where all  
22  
23 forms of creativity – artistic and cultural, technological and economic – can take root and  
24  
25 flourish which in turns encourages similar people to locate in these places (Miles, 2010).  
26  
27 Florida’s human capital’ theory of regional development suggests that creative people require  
28  
29 ‘quasi- anonymity’ preferring the flexibility of weak community ties as opposed to the  
30  
31 constraints imposed by strong community ties (Miles, 2010). Recent research also suggests  
32  
33 that those with cultural omnivorous tendencies have weaker less dense networks and are  
34  
35 comprised of friends and acquaintances as opposed to the less culturally active who had  
36  
37 stronger family ties (Widdop et al, 2014)  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43  
44 But is it possible to differentiate between voracious omnivores and other cultural lifestyle  
45  
46 groups, including other omnivores, using measures of frequency and participation? Do  
47  
48 voracious omnivores exhibit the same socio-economic make-up as portrayed in previous  
49  
50 scholarly work? And if voraciousness is a depiction of ‘status distinction’, do voracious  
51  
52 omnivores, as our theoretical discussion of the role of place suggests, cluster in areas which  
53  
54 are distinct from other area clusters of cultural lifestyle groups? To address these questions,  
55  
56 we examine cultural participation in England using innovative statistical techniques.  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Data and Methods

Our analysis of cultural participation in England uses data drawn from the 2005-2006 Taking Part Survey (TPS). Whilst this wave of the TPS is not the most up to date version, we believe that it provides the most complete data at both the individual and area level when compared to more recent surveys; therefore we believe it is an appropriate survey to test the papers hypothesis. The TPS surveyed 28,117 adults via face to face interviews, about their participation in a range of cultural activities. Households were drawn from the postcode address file and interviews were conducted with a randomly selected member of each household aged 16 or over. The survey asked if respondents had taken part in a number of cultural activities in the last 12 months (1=Yes, 0= No). We use these questions to measure what cultural activity people take part in rather than their self-reported tastes for particular cultural genres. The decision to examine actual cultural practises than self-reported tastes is largely a reflection of available data in the TPS which does not contain information on individuals' reported tastes. However, a number of cultural scholars have stressed the need to examine actual claims about an individual's cultural consumption – as a form of social action – rather than tastes, and as such measure actual participation in cultural activities (Van Rees et al, 1999; Chan, 2010; Sullivan and Katz-Gerro, 2007; Sintas and Alvarez, 2002; Stichele and Laermans, 2006).

### *Operationalising Omnivourism*

A key concern of this paper is to measure omnivorousness using a wide range of cultural consumption practices that largely map onto conventional distinctions between 'mass'/'popular' culture and 'elite'/'high' culture (Alderson et al, 2007). To this end, we include a range of cultural activities from different fields: (1) attended a classical music or opera performance; (2) attended a live ballet performance; (3) attended a live play/drama; (4)

1  
2  
3 visited a museum or art gallery; (5) attended a theatre to watch a movie; (6) attended a live  
4  
5 rock/pop event. For each of the cultural items selected, the respondent was asked whether and  
6  
7 how many times they had engaged in the cultural activity over the past 12 months. Therefore,  
8  
9 rather than the standard dichotomous participation variable approach (did participate versus  
10  
11 did not participate), we use a trichotomous ordinal variable for each of these indicators. Three  
12  
13 response categories were used to measure how often the respondent consumed each cultural  
14  
15 item: 1) never; 2) 1-2 times a year; and 3) 3 or more times a year. The frequency distributions  
16  
17 in Table 1 illustrate that the cultural items chosen in the analysis cross the perceived symbolic  
18  
19 boundaries of cultural activities (Warde et al, 2007). For instance, going to the cinema and  
20  
21 visiting a museum were the most popular activities, with more than 35% of respondents  
22  
23 going to the cinema more than three times a year. Attending a live drama or a pop/rock music  
24  
25 concert was less popular, although more than 20% of respondents went to the former and  
26  
27 more than 15% attended the latter. More highbrow items such as attending a classical or  
28  
29 opera performance, or a ballet performance were the least popular of all the cultural items  
30  
31 chosen.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 In this article we operationalise omnivorousness through actual participation, rather than taste  
38  
39 or knowledge (Bennett et al 2009). Put simply, we are measuring a single specific aspect of  
40  
41 consumption and our results only lend themselves to participation in leisure outside of the  
42  
43 home. This has a number of limitations. Firstly, this form of cultural engagement may be  
44  
45 supply side specific. The more cultural items on offer the greater the opportunity for  
46  
47 engagement; this is especially true when examining place based participation. Secondly, by  
48  
49 not accounting for home-based consumption data, membership of typology groups and place  
50  
51 effects might be conflated. Indeed, perhaps individuals with similar characteristics may share  
52  
53 the same participation habits but choose to do it at home rather than in the physical form, and  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 this may be place specific. Unfortunately, there was no comparable home-based consumption  
4  
5 data available in the survey to determine whether this was the case here.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 *Insert Table I*  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

17 One of the major benefits of the 2005-06 TPS is that it contains a significant amount of socio-  
18 demographic information on a large number of respondents. All respondents were coded to  
19 the National Statistics Socio-Economic Classification (NSSEC) which is used as the standard  
20 measure of occupational class. Educational attainment is coded to the six official National  
21 Vocational Qualifications levels (England), ranging from degree level to no qualifications.  
22 We also use a wide range of other important individual socio-economic data including sex  
23 (female dummy variable), age (categorical variable from young 16-25 to old age 65 plus) and  
24 ethnicity (categorical variable including white and four non-white categories: Black, Asian,  
25 Mixed, Chinese and other).  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 The TPS has a hierarchical sample design; individuals are nested in different geographical  
39 locations. Given that we seek to simultaneously capture latent class typologies at the  
40 individual level and types of areas, we need to determine an appropriate spatial scale in which  
41 to base our empirical investigation. Using a nonparametric multilevel latent class approach  
42 does limit us computationally, to some extent, given the complexity of the analysis. As a first  
43 cut, given the methodological innovation employed to examine whether voracious omnivores  
44 cluster in areas which are distinct from other cultural lifestyle groups, it is important to use a  
45 spatial context which is both well established in the geographical literature and commonly  
46 used. For a combination of these reasons, we use regions as our collective unit of analysis.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Regions are groupings of individual units which are internally relatively homogenous,  
4  
5 although the standard regions used by the British government and official bodies are a very  
6  
7 coarse division of England. Hence, we use a larger number of internally more homogenous  
8  
9 regions by separating out the major urban conurbations from their surrounding 'rural' areas.  
10  
11 The sixteen regions used in the analysis are shown in Figure 1. Using the regional scale is a  
12  
13 strict test, given that some, although not all, of the contextual processes we identified –  
14  
15 interpersonal interaction with family, friends, neighbours, work colleagues or others in local  
16  
17 social networks – that may precipitate the clustering of voracious omnivorous behaviour  
18  
19 would be more likely to occur at lower spatial scales than the region. If we can identify a  
20  
21 distinct voracious omnivore cluster at this area level from other cluster lifestyle groups, then  
22  
23 it is likely that place will be a significant influence on such behaviour at varying geographical  
24  
25 spatial scales in England.  
26  
27  
28

29  
30 *Insert Figure 1*  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

### 36 **Multi-Level Latent Class Model**

37  
38  
39 As most statistical models, latent class (LC) analysis assumes that the dataset of interest  
40  
41 contains a sample consisting of independent observations. This is an assumption that is often  
42  
43 violated. So while standard LC models assume that the model parameters are the same for all  
44  
45 individuals (level 1 units), the multilevel LC model allows some of the model parameters to  
46  
47 differ across groups or clusters (level 2 or higher level units) where respondents share  
48  
49 common experiences and interactions. Not only is it vital to use multilevel techniques to  
50  
51 overcome any dependencies between observations, but it is often possible to examine the  
52  
53 extent to which the phenomenon of interest (in our case whether we can identify a voracious  
54  
55 omnivore cluster at the area level) can be found or even explained by macro-level forces  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 (Vermunt, 2008). Our approach uses a discrete unspecified mixing distribution (a  
4 multinomial distribution assumption) which ensures that both the latent classes of level 1  
5 units and the latent classes of the level 2 units share the same parameter values (Vermunt,  
6 2003; 2008). This non-parametric Multi-level Latent Class modelling approach is preferred  
7 here because it is more natural to classify groups into a smaller number of different types  
8 (e.g. countries or regions) than to make the assumption that they exist on a continuous scale  
9 (Vermunt, 2003). In this paper, we can examine the extent to which regions are homogenous  
10 in their cultural latent structure. In the LC component of the model we develop typologies of  
11 lifestyles of respondents based on their consumption habits; here the sixteen regions will  
12 belong to the same regional segments if they are highly similar in the within-regional  
13 structure of cultural segmentation (Vermunt 2003; 2008).<sup>2</sup>  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

### 31 **Fitting the Model**

32  
33  
34 At the individual level, the latent class analysis enables us to estimate the probabilities that an  
35 individual belongs to a certain class/typology given their participation frequency patterns in  
36 the six cultural variables. The initial aim is to determine the appropriate number of lifestyle  
37 types (classes) that exist in the population. In other words, the most parsimonious model that  
38 provides the best fit to the observed data.<sup>3</sup> In the modelling approach here a five class  
39 solution is the most appropriate model; each goodness-to-fit measure reaches its optimal  
40 point at a 'five class' solution. The fit statistics provide clear evidence that there are  
41 underlying types of consumers who share similar frequency participation patterns (Table 2).<sup>4</sup>  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



*Insert Table II***Profile of Latent Classes (Individual Level)**

The estimated size of the latent classes and the estimated conditional probability of consuming each of the cultural items given membership in a latent lifestyle class are reported in Table 3. Labels are assigned to each latent class based on their likely participation in each cultural item and the frequency of that participation. Of the five latent classes identified, two of these clusters can be characterised as omnivorous. Derived from the conditional probabilities, these two groups are engaged in the full range of cultural activities and have omnivorous tendencies by volume and through preferences that cross-cut the perceived hierarchy between legitimate and popular culture. It is possible to differentiate between these two omnivorous classes by the frequency measure of participation across the range of cultural activities used. Class 1 ('voracious omnivores') is populated by 6% of respondents and is highly distinguishable from the other omnivore group and the other lifestyle groups for its extremely active consumption and sheer insatiable appetite for all the cultural items. These 'voracious omnivores' not only have a high probability of consuming all of the cultural items of all the lifestyle groups, they are the most frequent consumers in a manner depicted in previous scholarly work (Sullivan and Katz-Gerro, 2007; Stichele and Laemans, 2006). The one exception is the attendance of live rock and pop concerts where members of the 'general omnivore' group have a higher probability of attending more than three times per year. A closer inspection of the LC results also suggests that members of the 'voracious omnivores' cluster are particularly frequent consumers of highbrow activities with just under three quarters of respondents in this group attending a classical music concert or opera performance over the past 12 months. And just to illustrate their breadth of consumption,

1  
2  
3 more than 85% of respondents attended three of the most popular items: going to the cinema,  
4  
5 attending a live play and visiting a museum.  
6  
7

8 In contrast to the ‘voracious omnivores’, the ‘general omnivore’ (cluster 2) group is  
9  
10 populated by nearly three times as many respondents (17% in total). While this cluster  
11  
12 exhibits omnivorous traits they do so without the voracious behaviour of their omnivorous  
13  
14 counterparts. However, they have a high probability of consuming each of the cultural  
15  
16 indicators here (in relation to the mean attendance), but are more likely to be frequent  
17  
18 consumers of the non-highbrow cultural activities. And their frequent consumption of cinema  
19  
20 and attending live rock and pop concerts suggests that this group may be much younger in  
21  
22 age than their more voracious counterparts.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 *Insert Table III*  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 The remaining three LC clusters at the individual level resemble those found in other  
37  
38 scholarly work. Cluster 3 (‘Highbrow’) is populated by 16% of the survey population and are  
39  
40 a high cultured group in the Bourdieusian tradition, engaging in legitimate culture but  
41  
42 distancing themselves (aesthetically) from more popularised activities (Bourdieu, 1984;  
43  
44 Peterson, 2005). They are not frequent consumers, even of highbrow activities, particularly  
45  
46 when compared against the ‘voracious omnivores’. A similar group has been identified in a  
47  
48 wide range of cultural activities and have been labelled everything from ‘highbrow snobs’  
49  
50 (Peterson and Kern, 1996) to ‘traditional participants’ (Stichele and Laermans, 2006). Cluster  
51  
52 4 (‘Univore’) is the popular active class and is made up of 28% of respondents. They exhibit  
53  
54 ‘univorous’ traits given their frequent consumption of one cultural item above all others –  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 going to the cinema – and their avoidance of more legitimate highbrow activities (Peterson,  
4 2005; Peterson and Kern, 1996). The final cluster is populated by a third of respondents and  
5  
6 can be labelled as ‘non-participants’. This group is highly distinguishable from their  
7  
8 counterparts through their inactivity, both in the range and frequency of consumption (Van  
9  
10 Rees et al 1999; Sintas and Alvarez, 2002).  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

### 18 **Socio-Economic Profile of Latent Clusters (Individual Level)**

19  
20  
21 Given that we have identified the existence of a ‘voracious omnivore’ cluster at the individual  
22  
23 level, we now examine whether they exhibit the same socio-economic make-up as portrayed  
24  
25 in previous scholarly work. To determine whether this was the case, Table 5 provides the  
26  
27 conditional probabilities of membership for each of the five latent classes by occupational  
28  
29 class, education, age, sex, and ethnicity.  
30  
31

32  
33 When compared against the other latent groups, ‘voracious omnivores’ are high status  
34  
35 individuals: largely from the higher occupational classes and well educated with more than  
36  
37 three quarters having a degree or a postgraduate qualification. There is some evidence that  
38  
39 both the ‘general omnivore’ and ‘highbrow’ groups share similar traits to the ‘voracious  
40  
41 omnivores’, albeit not on the same scale, hence some members of the former were also more  
42  
43 likely to be students and have level 3 educational qualifications. Likewise, a significant  
44  
45 proportion of those in the ‘highbrow’ group do not possess any educational qualifications.  
46  
47 The ‘voracious’ omnivores’ are mainly white and female when compared against the other  
48  
49 latent clusters. Those from non-white ethnic backgrounds have a higher probability of being  
50  
51 ‘univores’ than members of any other latent cluster. Another important distinction is age.  
52  
53 Unlike the less voracious omnivore group, which tends to contain individuals from a younger  
54  
55 age cohort, ‘voracious omnivores’ are predominantly from the middle older age group from  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 45-64. They are extremely unlikely to be from the youngest age cohort (18-24), which mainly  
4  
5 exhibits ‘univorous’ traits. Those aged 65 plus are either significantly more likely to be  
6  
7 ‘highbrow’ consumers or non-active participants.  
8  
9

10 Scholars have consistently found that high status individuals, particularly those who are well  
11  
12 educated, have omnivorous cultural preferences (Van Eijck, 2001; Sintas and Alvarez, 2002).  
13  
14 Those who have taken account of voraciousness have found similar relationships for age,  
15  
16 class and education (Sullivan and Katz-Gerro, 2007). Previous evidence suggests that  
17  
18 frequent participants with omnivorous traits are commonly found among the younger age  
19  
20 cohort reflecting the growth of mass entertainment, heightened forms of youth (sub) culture  
21  
22 and general societal context which has affected cultural practice over the past 30 years or so  
23  
24 (Stichele and Laermans, 2006). We found evidence to the contrary. While the less voracious  
25  
26 omnivore group largely contained individuals from the younger cohorts, more than half of the  
27  
28 ‘voracious omnivores’ in England were from the middle older 45-64 age group. Nonetheless,  
29  
30 ‘voracious omnivores’ exhibit a distinct socio-economic make up when compared to the other  
31  
32 cultural latent groups and as such one might expect these high status individuals to locate in  
33  
34 close proximity to others with similar cultural participation habits to their own. We would,  
35  
36 therefore, expect them to cluster in areas which are distinct from other area clusters of  
37  
38 cultural lifestyle groups.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 *Insert Table IV*  
49

### 50 **Does Place Matter?** 51

52  
53 Using the non-parametric Multi-level Latent Class modelling approach, it is not only possible  
54  
55 to identify latent class typologies at the individual level but to classify the sixteen regions of  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 England into a number of area types where individual cultural classes differ between areas  
4 (Figure 1). The model findings shown here take account of the socio-economic make up the  
5 latent classes at the individual level. The results are presented in Table 5. Based on the  
6 goodness of fit statistics (BIC), we find three area level types that exist at the regional scale.  
7 Two of the segments are relatively large, with both Area A ('Moderately Active') and Area B  
8 ('Inactive') consisting of eight regions. By examining the relative sizes of each of the five  
9 individual latent classes across these areas, it is clear that Area A cluster exhibits moderate or  
10 average consumption patterns. Most classes are close to the mean, with higher than average  
11 'general omnivores' in Area A than other clusters. Likewise, there are less non-active  
12 participants here than in the other two area clusters. Area B ('Inactive') is distinguished by  
13 the high level of non-consumers and low level of 'voracious omnivores', while the other  
14 classes are close to the mean as in Area A ('Moderately Active'). These two areas clusters are  
15 populated by 92% of respondents. A map of the regional clusters identified is shown in  
16 Figure 2 and suggests a salient north-south divide. The 'inactive' area (Area B) consists of  
17 regions which are all but confined to the North/Midlands of England.<sup>5</sup> Whereas the 'moderate  
18 consumption area', which does have higher than average levels of 'general omnivores' and  
19 noteworthy levels of 'voracious omnivores' has clusters of English regions concentrated in  
20 the more affluent South East, South West and Outer London.<sup>6</sup> But do 'voracious omnivores'  
21 cluster in areas distinct from other cultural groups?  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 *Insert Table V*

50  
51  
52 Area C ('Frequent Omnivores') is a small segment and consists of only one region. Closer  
53 inspection reveals that it contains 8% of respondents and is distinguished from the other area  
54 clusters by the much higher than average probability of containing 'voracious omnivores'.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Unlike the other active classes – ‘highbrow’ group shows no difference across the three area  
4 clusters; the ‘general omnivore’ group shows a slight difference; and the ‘univore’ class  
5 shows no difference between Area A (‘Moderately Active’) and B (‘Inactive’) – ‘voracious  
6 omnivores’, even after controlling for individual socio-economic characteristics, are  
7 predominately confined to one region in England. As Figure 2 shows, this region is Inner  
8 London. Part of the explanation undoubtedly lies in the supply of cultural goods available in  
9 Inner London, the depth and breadth of which is not matched elsewhere in England. It is also  
10 relatively small in geographical size compared to the other regions of England, so as the pace  
11 of life for high status individuals (‘voracious omnivores’) increases and intensification of  
12 activities accelerates, time and speed can be maximised given that a wide variety of cultural  
13 goods are easily accessible within short distances (Sullivan and Gershuny, 2004). The  
14 existence of this ‘voracious omnivore’ area cluster at the regional scale also suggests that  
15 high status individuals choose to reside in close proximity to individuals with similar values,  
16 lifestyles and cultural habits to their own. It is likely, although not explicitly tested here, that  
17 ‘voracious omnivores’ cluster in this area because they interact with likeminded people in  
18 active social networks. Place is therefore integral to our understanding of cultural  
19 consumption habits. It not only mediates social life for ‘voracious omnivores’, it is the critical  
20 tie between individual stratification and the consumption of cultural activities.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 *Insert Figure II*  
48

## 49 **Conclusion**

50  
51  
52 Our aim was to revisit and further extend the boundaries of the omnivorousness literature.  
53 We sought to map cultural consumption in England using a measure based on both the  
54 frequency and range of cultural participation. Based on the link between the insatiable  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 consumer and the dynamic of present day consumption, our primary focus was on the  
4  
5 'voracious omnivore' cultural consumer. Was it possible to distinguish between this group  
6  
7 and other cultural lifestyle groups in England, using measures of frequency and participation?  
8  
9 Our findings clearly suggest the existence of such a group, which is distinct not only from  
10  
11 lifestyle typologies, but also from a 'general omnivore' group which also exhibited an  
12  
13 insatiable appetite for cultural items but not with the depth, breadth and frequency of those  
14  
15 classed as 'voracious omnivores'. The socio-economic make-up of this 'voracious omnivore'  
16  
17 group shared many of the characteristics noted in other scholarly work: largely high status  
18  
19 individuals, particularly in relation to occupational class and educational qualifications but  
20  
21 there was little evidence that were from the younger age cohorts. As such, they could be  
22  
23 depicted as high status individuals who exhibited an intensely active cultural lifestyle and  
24  
25 enjoyed a diverse range of cultural experiences. Given these traits, and based on our  
26  
27 theoretical arguments about the role of place, we hypothesised that this 'voracious omnivore'  
28  
29 group were likely to cluster in areas which were distinct from other lifestyle groups.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 We fused the theoretical case for taking account of the importance of place in the cultural  
36  
37 literature with methodological innovation in order to empirically test our key hypothesis. Our  
38  
39 expectation of between group heterogeneity at the regional scale was realised in our non-  
40  
41 parametric multilevel analysis of both the range and frequency of cultural participation in  
42  
43 England. Even after controlling for individual socio-economic characteristics, we identified  
44  
45 three area level clusters. Of all the active individual latent groups, the 'voracious omnivores'  
46  
47 were distinct in being predominantly contained in one area level cluster. Place, therefore, is  
48  
49 integral to the consumption habits of those in the 'voracious omnivore' group both in terms  
50  
51 of the unparalleled supply of available cultural items (inner city London) and the likely  
52  
53 interaction of likeminded individuals in an active social network. While individuals in the  
54  
55 'voracious' omnivore group may reside in similar locations to themselves reflecting shared  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 cultural attitudes, values, preferences and habits, it is also apparent, given that we control for  
4  
5 shared socio-economic characteristics that the underlying mechanism behind these cultural  
6  
7 patterns at the area level is likely to be contextual in nature.  
8  
9

10  
11 Despite the robustness of our findings, there are some limitations. Due to data limitations we  
12  
13 were unable to include home-based consumption based items which are most often  
14  
15 undertaken by individuals lower in the social hierarchy. Clearly, future work needs to include  
16  
17 both out-of-the house and home-bound activities to offset any concerns about measurement  
18  
19 validity and to corroborate the existence of different lifestyle groups in England and the  
20  
21 socio-economic make-up of these groups identified here. More generally, when  
22  
23 distinguishing between omnivore groups, there is a lack of data about why some individuals  
24  
25 engage more frequently than others, for what purpose and with what expectations. Here  
26  
27 (along with other scholars) we hypothesise why but there is a lack of large N survey evidence  
28  
29 at the individual level which seek to explain this behaviour. Survey questions/modules that  
30  
31 unpick and differentiate between key drivers and motivations would aid our general  
32  
33 understanding about why individuals seek to become insatiable consumers. It is also  
34  
35 imperative, from our evidence here, that such surveys contain geographical information at  
36  
37 various spatial scales so that individuals can be placed in different settings, alongside network  
38  
39 data, to gauge the importance of contrasting mechanisms.  
40  
41  
42  
43

44  
45 One of the key findings of this paper is that the ‘voracious omnivores’ were distinct in being  
46  
47 predominantly contained in one area level cluster. Here we identified that place is important  
48  
49 and we identify the possible processes that could explain this but determining the actual  
50  
51 mechanism is beyond the scope of the paper given the data available. But it should be the  
52  
53 focus of further work. In combination with survey data, future research should examine  
54  
55 whether ‘voracious omnivorism’ exists as an individual trait – where individuals seek out  
56  
57 locations containing similar minded individuals and influence others through networks in a  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 variety of different contexts – or whether it is a behaviour that is furthered in some contexts  
4  
5 but not in others. There is some existing evidence of the former. A number of studies have  
6  
7 shown that omnivores benefit from a broader and more diverse social network, where they  
8  
9 can display knowledge gained from interaction with individuals in different social circles  
10  
11 which in turn reinforces social approval within these circles (Lizardo, 2006; Kane, 2004;  
12  
13 Relish, 1997). Furthermore, Widdop et al, (2014) find that whilst education and class remain  
14  
15 important aspects of the omnivore-univore thesis, consumption is mediated and constrained  
16  
17 through networks. They note that networks play a much more significant role in shaping  
18  
19 cultural behaviour than the theoretical frameworks suggest. Moreover, networks even in the  
20  
21 age of social media tend to be grounded geographically. Therefore, our findings offer support  
22  
23 to the role of networks and relational mechanisms (Crossley, 2011) in mediating  
24  
25 consumption, in that, network structure is different in different places. But the evidence is far  
26  
27 from conclusive with the urgent need for network questions or modules in different contexts  
28  
29 attached to respondent data.  
30  
31  
32

33  
34  
35 Despite the existence of three area level clusters and a distinct area level typology with a  
36  
37 higher than average probability of containing those from the ‘voracious omnivore’ individual  
38  
39 latent group, it is impossible to be certain that prevailing contextual influences dominate  
40  
41 without further testing. Here we used the regional scale. In light of the scholarly theoretical  
42  
43 contributions outlined in this paper, it is probable that the underlying mechanisms which may  
44  
45 explain any contextual effects are more likely to occur at much lower levels of geography.  
46  
47 Indeed, the clusters exhibited here may reflect aggregations of much finer contextual effects.  
48  
49 It was apparent, for instance, that ‘voracious omnivores’ were evident in the Area A  
50  
51 (‘Moderately Active’) cluster, possibly reflecting the existence of area clusters at much  
52  
53 smaller spatial scales e.g. smaller cities or towns, local neighbourhoods or perhaps network  
54  
55 based clusters from the work place etc. On the assumption of data availability at these  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 different spatial scales and further computational advances, statistical testing simultaneously  
4  
5 across the range of geographies along with network data will allow cultural scholars to  
6  
7 pinpoint at which scale such contextual processes operate and the underlying processes at  
8  
9 play. Place remains vital to our understanding of cultural behaviour. While scholars continue  
10  
11 to explore different dimensions of omnivorousness through volume and composition, the role  
12  
13 of place and the different contextual mechanisms in which such insatiable consumption  
14  
15 occurs remains largely ignored. Here we have taken a first step in readdressing this  
16  
17 anomaly.  
18  
19

## 20 21 22 23 24 **Endnotes**

25  
26  
27 <sup>1</sup> Our measure examines one dimension of the “how”. Literature that considers different ways of consuming the  
28  
29 same cultural material theoretically could go beyond the frequency question and as such provides a further  
30  
31 dimension of “how”.  
32

33  
34 <sup>2</sup> Conventional random effects models make strong assumptions about the distribution of the higher level  
35  
36 variance and is computationally intensive hence we use the non-parametric modelling approach here.  
37

38  
39 <sup>3</sup> We use the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC), the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC), and the Consistent  
40  
41 Akaike Information Criterion (CAIC) because they weight both model fit and parsimony and are useful to  
42  
43 compare models. A lower BIC value is preferred over a model with a higher BIC value.  
44

45 <sup>4</sup> We use the Latent Gold software package.  
46

47  
48 <sup>5</sup> The English regions in this area cluster include: North East, North West, Merseyside, South Yorkshire, East  
49  
50 Midlands, West Midlands and West Yorkshire.  
51

52  
53 <sup>6</sup> Regions in this cluster can be found in the North of England and include metropolitan areas - Greater  
54  
55 Manchester and Tyne and Wear – and the more rural North Yorkshire.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## References

Agnew, J.A. 1987. *Place and politics: The geographical mediation of state and society*.

Boston, MA: Allen & Unwin.

Alderson, A.S., Junisbai, A., Heacock, I., 2007. Social status and cultural consumption in the United States. *Poetics* 35, 191–212.

Atkinson, W. 2011. ‘The Context and Genesis of Musical Tastes: Omnivorousness Debunked, Bourdieu Buttressed’. *Poetics* 39, 169 – 186.

Bennett, T., Savage, M., Silva, E.B., Warde, A., Gayo-Cal, M., and Wright, D. 2009. *Culture, Class, Distinction*. London: Routledge.

Berghman, M. and van Eijck, K. 2009. Visual arts appreciation patterns: Crossing horizontal and vertical boundaries within the cultural hierarchy, *Poetics*, 37: 348-65

Bourdieu, P. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. London: Routledge.

Bryson, B. 1996. Anything but Heavy Metal: Symbolic Exclusion and Musical Dislikes, *American Sociological Review*, 61, 884–899.

Buck, N. 2001. Identifying neighbourhood effects on social exclusion. *Urban Studies*, 38(12), 2251–2275.

Campbell, C. 1987. *The Romantic Ethic and the Spirit of Modern Consumerism*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Chan, W. 2010. *Social Status and Cultural Consumption*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- 1  
2  
3 Crossley, N. 2011. *Towards Relational Sociology*. London: Routledge  
4  
5  
6 Cotte, J., Ratneshwar, S. and Mick, D.G. 2004. The Times of Their Lives: Phenomenological  
7  
8 and Metaphorical Characteristics of Consumer Timestyles. *Journal of Consumer Research*,  
9  
10 31, 333–345.  
11  
12  
13 Curtis, S., & Rees-Jones, I. 1998. Is there a place for geography in the analysis of health  
14  
15 inequality? *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 20, 645–672.  
16  
17  
18 Florida, R. 2002. *The Rise of the Creative Class*, New York: Basic Books.  
19  
20  
21 Florida, R. 2005. *Cities and the Creative Class*, New York: Routledge.  
22  
23  
24 Friedman, S. 2012. ‘Cultural Omnivores or Culturally Homeless? Exploring the Shifting  
25  
26 Cultural Identities of the Socially Mobile’, *Poetics* 40 (3).  
27  
28  
29 Friedland, R. and Boden, D. 1994. *NowHere: Space, Time and Modernity*. Berkeley: Univ.  
30  
31 California Press.  
32  
33  
34 Gershuny, J. 2000. *Changing Times: Work and Leisure in Postindustrial Society*. Oxford:  
35  
36 Oxford University Press.  
37  
38  
39 Gieryn, T. 2000. A sense of place in Sociology. *Annual Review Sociology*, 26, 463-96  
40  
41  
42  
43 Huckfeldt, R. 1979. Political participation and the neighbourhood social context. *American*  
44  
45 *Journal of Political Science*, 23(3)  
46  
47  
48 Kane, D. 2004. A network approach to the puzzle of women’s cultural participation. *Poetics*  
49  
50 32(2), 105-127  
51  
52  
53  
54 Katz-Gerro, T. 2002. Highbrow Cultural Consumption and Class Distinction in Italy, Israel,  
55  
56 West Germany, Sweden, and the United States. *Social Forces*, 81(1), 207–229.  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Lahire, B. 2004. *La Culture des individus. Dissonances culturelles et distinction de soi*,  
4  
5 *Paris*. La Découverte. Traduit au Brésil.

6  
7  
8 Lizardo, O. 2006. How cultural tastes shape personal networks. *American Sociological*  
9  
10 *Review*, 71(5), 778-807

11  
12  
13 Lizardo, O., and Skiles, S. 2009. Highbrow omnivorousness on the small screen? Cultural  
14  
15 industry systems and patterns of cultural choice in Europe. *Poetics*, 37, 1-23

16  
17  
18 Lizardo, O., and Skiles, S. 2012. Reconceptualizing and Theorizing "Omnivorousness":  
19  
20 Genetic and Relational. *Sociological Theory*, 30(4): 263-282.

21  
22  
23 Macintyre, S. 2007. Deprivation amplification revisited; or, is it always true that poorer  
24  
25 places have poorer access to resources for healthy diets and physical activity? *International*  
26  
27 *Journal of Behavioural, Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 4, 32.

28  
29  
30 Miles, S. (2010). *Spaces For Consumption: Pleasure and Placelessness in the Post-Industrial*  
31  
32 *City*, London: Sage

33  
34  
35 Peterson, R. 1992. 'Understanding Audience Segmentation: From Elite and Mass to  
36  
37 Omnivore and Univore'. *Poetics*, 21(4): 243-58.

38  
39  
40 Peterson, R. 2005. 'Problems in Comparative Research: The Example of Omnivorousness'.  
41  
42 *Poetics*, 33(5-6): 257-82.

43  
44  
45 Peterson, R. and Kern, R. 1996. 'Changing Highbrow Taste: From Snob to Omnivore'.  
46  
47 *American Sociological Review*, 61(5): 900-909.

48  
49  
50 Peterson, R. and Rossman, G. 2007. Changing art audiences: capitalizing on  
51  
52 omnivorousness, In Ivey, B. and Tepper, S. (eds) *Engaging Art: The next great*  
53  
54 *transformation of America's cultural life*, New York: Routledge

- 1  
2  
3 Prior, N. 2013. 'Bourdieu and the Sociology of Music Consumption: A Critical Assessment  
4 of Recent Developments', *Sociology Compass*, 7(3), 181-193.  
5  
6  
7  
8 Relish, M. 1997. It's not all education: Network measures as a source of cultural competency.  
9  
10 *Poetics*, 5(2), 121-139  
11  
12  
13 Rimmer, M. 2012. Beyond Omnivores and Univores: The Promise of a Concept of Musical  
14 Habitus. *Cultural Sociology*, 299-318  
15  
16  
17  
18 Rosa, H. 2003. Social Acceleration: Ethnical and Political Consequences of a  
19 Desynchronized High-Speed Society. *Constellations*, 10(1), 3–33.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24 Savage, M. 2006. The Musical Field. *Cultural Trends*, 15(2-3), 159-174.  
25  
26  
27 Schor, J. 1992. *The Overworked American*. New York: Basic Books.  
28  
29  
30 Sintas, J. L. and Alvarez, E. G. 2002. Omnivores Show up Again: The Segmentation of  
31 Cultural Consumers in Spanish Social Space. *European Sociological Review*, 18, 353–368.  
32  
33  
34  
35 Southerton, D. 2003. Squeezing Time: Allocating Practices, Coordinating Networks and  
36 Scheduling Society. *Time and Society*, 12(1), 5–25.  
37  
38  
39  
40 Stichele, A. V. and Laermans, R. 2006. Cultural Participation in Flanders: Testing the  
41 cultural omnivore thesis with population data. *Poetics*, 34: 45-64.  
42  
43  
44  
45 Sullivan, O. and Gershuny, J. 2004. Inconspicuous Consumption: Work-Rich, Time Poor in  
46 the Liberal Market Economy. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 4(1), 79–100.  
47  
48  
49  
50 Sullivan, O. and Katz-Gerro, T. 2007. The Omnivore thesis revisited: Voracious cultural  
51 consumers. *European Sociological Review*, 23 (2): 123-37  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Tampubolon, G. 2008. Distinction in Britain, 2001–2004? *European Societies*, 10(3): 403-  
4  
5 428.

6  
7  
8 Torche, F, 2007. Social status and cultural consumption: the case of reading in Chile. *Poetics*,  
9  
10 35, 70–92.

11  
12  
13 Van Eijck, K. 1999. ‘Socialisation, Education, and Lifestyle: How Social mobility increases  
14  
15 the cultural heterogeneity of status groups. *Poetics*, Vol. 26:309-328.

16  
17  
18 Van Eijck, K. 2000. Richard A. Peterson and the culture of consumption. *Poetics*, 28 (3):  
19  
20 207–224.

21  
22  
23 Van Eijck, K. 2001. Social differentiation in musical taste patterns. *Social Forces*, 79(3):  
24  
25 1163–1185.

26  
27  
28 Van Eijck, K and Lievens, J. 2008. Cultural omnivorousness as a combination of highbrow,  
29  
30 pop and folk elements: The relation between taste patterns and attitudes concerning social  
31  
32 integration. *Poetics*, 36:217-42.

33  
34  
35 Van Rees, K., Vermunt, J., Verboord, M. 1999. Cultural classifications under discussion:  
36  
37 Latent class analysis of highbrow and lowbrow reading, *Poetics*. 26: 349–365

38  
39  
40 Vermunt, J. 2003. Multilevel latent class models. *Sociological Methodology*, 33, 213-239.

41  
42  
43 Vermunt, J. 2008. Latent class and finite mixture models for multilevel data sets. *Statistical*  
44  
45 *Methods in Medical Research*, 17, 33-51.

46  
47  
48 Warde, A. and Gayo-Cal, M. 2009. The anatomy of cultural omnivorousness: The case of the  
49  
50 United Kingdom. *Poetics*, 37: 119-145

51  
52  
53 Warde, A., Wright, D. and Gayo-Cal, M. 2007. Understanding cultural omnivorousness: Or,  
54  
55 the myth of the cultural omnivore. *Cultural Sociology*, 1 (2): 143-164

1  
2  
3 Warde, A., Wright, D. and Gayo-Cal, M. 2008. The omnivorous orientation in the UK.  
4  
5 *Poetics*, 36: 148-165  
6

7  
8 Widdop, P., and Cutts, D. 2012. The impact of place on museum consumption. *Cultural*  
9  
10  
11 *Trends*, 21 (1): 47-66  
12


13  
14 Widdop, P., Cutts, D., and Jarvie, G. 2014. Omnivorousness in Sport: The importance of  
15  
16 social capital and networks. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*.  
17

18  
19 Yaish, M. and Katz-Gerro, T. 2010. Disentangling ‘cultural capital’: The consequences of  
20  
21 cultural and economic resources for taste and participation. *European Sociological Review*.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Figure I: Map of England (Regions included)**



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Figure II: Map of area typologies derived from multilevel latent class analysis**



## Tables

**Table I. Cultural Participation Frequency in England (TPS 2005-06; percentages)**

| <b>Cultural Item</b>           | <b>Never</b> | <b>1-2 times a year</b> | <b>3 or more times a year</b> |
|--------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Movie in theatre               | 51.4         | 13.4                    | 35.2                          |
| Museum or art gallery          | 59.6         | 25.0                    | 15.5                          |
| Live drama                     | 78.7         | 11.5                    | 9.8                           |
| Live pop/rock music concert    | 83.8         | 8.7                     | 7.6                           |
| Classical or opera performance | 90.0         | 6.4                     | 3.7                           |
| Ballet performance             | 96.3         | 3.0                     | 0.7                           |

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table II. Results of the estimated cluster models, covariates included (TPS 2005-06)**

| <b>Classes</b>        | <b>BIC</b>           | <b>AIC</b>           | <b>CAIC</b>          |
|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| 1-Class               | 207500               | 207368               | 207516               |
| 2-Class               | 197391               | 197152               | 197420               |
| 3-Class               | 196162               | 195816               | 196204               |
| 4-Class               | 195858               | 195405               | 195993               |
| <b><u>5-Class</u></b> | <b><u>195840</u></b> | <b><u>195279</u></b> | <b><u>195908</u></b> |
| 6-Class               | 195867               | 195299               | 195948               |

**Table III. Conditional probabilities of participating ‘3 or more times a year’, ‘1-2 times a year or ‘Never’ in a certain cultural activity, given that the individual belong to one of the five clusters (TPS 05-06)**

|  | <b>Class 1</b>            | <b>Class 2</b>          | <b>Class 3</b>        | <b>Class 4</b>  | <b>Class 5</b>          |
|--|---------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| <b>Class Size</b>                                | 0.06                      | 0.17                    | 0.16                  | 0.28            | 0.33                    |
| <b>Class Typology Label</b>                      | <i>Voracious Omnivore</i> | <i>General Omnivore</i> | <i>Highbrow Group</i> | <i>Univores</i> | <i>Non participants</i> |
| <i>went to a movie in theatre</i>                |                           |                         |                       |                 |                         |
| 3 or more times a year                           | 0.75                      | 0.75                    | 0.23                  | 0.50            | 0.01                    |
| 1-2 times a year                                 | 0.11                      | 0.13                    | 0.20                  | 0.20            | 0.06                    |
| Never  | 0.14                      | 0.12                    | 0.57                  | 0.30            | 0.93                    |
| <i>visited a museum or art gallery</i>           |                           |                         |                       |                 |                         |
| 3 or more times a year                           | 0.69                      | 0.31                    | 0.20                  | 0.06            | 0.03                    |
| 1-2 times a year                                 | 0.23                      | 0.42                    | 0.40                  | 0.23            | 0.11                    |
| Never  | 0.08                      | 0.27                    | 0.40                  | 0.70            | 0.86                    |
| <i>went to a live drama</i>                      |                           |                         |                       |                 |                         |
| 3 or more times a year                           | 0.66                      | 0.19                    | 0.13                  | 0.02            | 0.01                    |
| 1-2 times a year                                 | 0.19                      | 0.27                    | 0.21                  | 0.07            | 0.02                    |
| Never  | 0.14                      | 0.54                    | 0.66                  | 0.92            | 0.98                    |
| <i>attended a live pop/rock music concert</i>    |                           |                         |                       |                 |                         |
| 3 or more times a year                           | 0.12                      | 0.25                    | 0.01                  | 0.09            | 0.01                    |
| 1-2 times a year                                 | 0.09                      | 0.25                    | 0.03                  | 0.10            | 0.02                    |
| Never  | 0.79                      | 0.50                    | 0.95                  | 0.81            | 0.97                    |
| <i>attended a classical or opera performance</i> |                           |                         |                       |                 |                         |
| 3 or more times a year                           | 0.38                      | 0.01                    | 0.07                  | 0.00            | 0.00                    |
| 1-2 times a year                                 | 0.35                      | 0.10                    | 0.17                  | 0.00            | 0.01                    |
| Never  | 0.27                      | 0.89                    | 0.76                  | 1.00            | 0.99                    |
| <i>attended ballet performance</i>               |                           |                         |                       |                 |                         |
| 3 or more times a year                           | 0.08                      | 0.00                    | 0.01                  | 0.00            | 0.00                    |
| 1-2 times a year                                 | 0.23                      | 0.04                    | 0.05                  | 0.00            | 0.00                    |
| Never  | 0.69                      | 0.96                    | 0.94                  | 1.00            | 1.00                    |

**Table IV. Conditional probabilities of belonging to the different classes given  
response category of the variables within the model**

| <b>Overall Probability</b>          | <i>Voracious<br/>Omnivore</i> | <i>General<br/>Omnivore</i> | <i>Highbrow<br/>Group</i> | <i>Univores</i> | <i>Non<br/>participants</i> |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| <i>Occupational Status</i>          |                               |                             |                           |                 |                             |
| Large employers & higher managerial | 0.08                          | 0.07                        | 0.06                      | 0.02            | 0.02                        |
| Higher professional                 | 0.16                          | 0.09                        | 0.07                      | 0.03            | 0.02                        |
| Lower professional managerial       | 0.40                          | 0.30                        | 0.27                      | 0.14            | 0.09                        |
| Intermediate                        | 0.14                          | 0.17                        | 0.20                      | 0.17            | 0.11                        |
| Small employers/own account workers | 0.07                          | 0.06                        | 0.07                      | 0.07            | 0.08                        |
| Lower supervisory & technical       | 0.02                          | 0.05                        | 0.08                      | 0.12            | 0.13                        |
| Semi routine                        | 0.04                          | 0.08                        | 0.13                      | 0.18            | 0.19                        |
| Routine                             | 0.01                          | 0.03                        | 0.06                      | 0.13            | 0.25                        |
| Student                             | 0.08                          | 0.14                        | 0.04                      | 0.10            | 0.04                        |
| Never worked                        | 0.01                          | 0.00                        | 0.02                      | 0.03            | 0.08                        |
| <i>Educational</i>                  |                               |                             |                           |                 |                             |
| Level 4/5                           | 0.77                          | 0.57                        | 0.43                      | 0.22            | 0.09                        |
| Level 3                             | 0.10                          | 0.21                        | 0.12                      | 0.19            | 0.07                        |
| Level 2                             | 0.06                          | 0.14                        | 0.16                      | 0.28            | 0.14                        |
| Level 1                             | 0.01                          | 0.03                        | 0.04                      | 0.12            | 0.05                        |
| Other Qualifications (Trade)        | 0.01                          | 0.01                        | 0.05                      | 0.04            | 0.06                        |
| No Qualifications                   | 0.04                          | 0.03                        | 0.21                      | 0.15            | 0.59                        |
| <i>Gender</i>                       |                               |                             |                           |                 |                             |
| Male                                | 0.36                          | 0.44                        | 0.40                      | 0.48            | 0.47                        |
| Female                              | 0.64                          | 0.56                        | 0.60                      | 0.52            | 0.53                        |
| <i>Age</i>                          |                               |                             |                           |                 |                             |
| 16-24                               | 0.02                          | 0.16                        | 0.00                      | 0.23            | 0.03                        |
| 25-44                               | 0.22                          | 0.60                        | 0.13                      | 0.57            | 0.20                        |
| 45-64                               | 0.53                          | 0.24                        | 0.42                      | 0.20            | 0.33                        |
| 65+                                 | 0.23                          | 0.00                        | 0.44                      | 0.00            | 0.44                        |
| <i>Ethnicity</i>                    |                               |                             |                           |                 |                             |
| White                               | 0.96                          | 0.93                        | 0.90                      | 0.76            | 0.86                        |
| Mixed race                          | 0.01                          | 0.01                        | 0.01                      | 0.02            | 0.01                        |
| Asian                               | 0.02                          | 0.03                        | 0.03                      | 0.14            | 0.06                        |
| Black                               | 0.00                          | 0.02                        | 0.04                      | 0.07            | 0.05                        |
| Chinese or other                    | 0.01                          | 0.01                        | 0.01                      | 0.02            | 0.01                        |

**Table V. Probabilities of cultural class sizes given membership of an area level segment**

|                         | AREA A                   | AREA B          | AREA C                    |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|
| <i>Area Class Label</i> | <i>Moderately Active</i> | <i>Inactive</i> | <i>Frequent Omnivores</i> |
| <i>Area Class Size</i>  | 0.48                     | 0.44            | 0.08                      |
| Non-Active Participants | 0.31                     | <b>0.38</b>     | 0.32                      |
| Univores                | <b>0.29</b>              | <b>0.29</b>     | 0.20                      |
| Highbrow Group          | 0.16                     | 0.16            | 0.16                      |
| General Omnivores       | <b>0.18</b>              | 0.15            | 0.16                      |
| Voracious Omnivores     | 0.06                     | 0.02            | <b>0.16</b>               |

\*Bold denotes the larger probabilities of latent class size given membership of an area type.