Cultural and moral boundaries in the United States: Structural position, geographic location, and lifestyle explanations [1]

Michèle Lamont *, John Schmalzbauer, Maureen Waller, Daniel Weber

Department of Sociology, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA

Abstract

Using the culture module of the 1993 General Social Survey, this study proposes a multicausal model to assess the determinants of moral and cultural boundaries in the American population. We find that structural position – education, income, class, and gender – affects the likelihood that individuals draw one type of boundary rather than another. Furthermore, geographic location and participation in lifestyle clusters play an important role in supplying cultural repertoires that affect the drawing of boundaries. While both cultural and moral boundaries are predicted by structural position and geographic location, cultural boundaries are predicted by participation in high culture lifestyle clusters and moral boundaries are predicted by participation in religious lifestyle clusters. Geographic location and participation in lifestyle clusters have a stronger effect on the boundaries of non-college graduates than on those of college graduates, suggesting that local cultural repertoires have a less important impact on the boundaries of individuals who share a homogenizing educational experience.

1. Introduction

Postmodernist, feminist, and multicultural theorists have argued that identities are increasingly defined around dimensions other than class (Lemert, 1993; Seidman, 1994;

Scott, 1990). Similarly, recent empirical sociological studies suggest that classes are less distinct culturally than they were thirty years ago (Clark et al., 1993; Crane, 1992; Hurrelman, 1988; Lewis, 1988). In different ways, these strands of work put again the question of the role of class as a predictor of cultural differences at the forefront of the sociological agenda. Instead of presupposing that the cultural practices of various groups are homogeneous, this paper helps advance ongoing discussions by assessing the relative impact of class, race, gender, geographic location and participation in lifestyle clusters on cultural and moral boundaries, i.e. on the cultural and moral distinctions that people draw between more and less worthy individuals. While most research on the cultural segmentation of groups draws on site-specific evidence and does not systematically compare orientations across large aggregates (Duneier, 1992; Halle, 1984), we use the 1993 General Social Survey to compare cultural patterns across groups. This national survey includes items specifically designed to tap symbolic boundaries.

We propose a multi-causal explanation of cultural and moral boundaries that takes into consideration the structural position of individuals, as measured by class, race, and gender, as well as their lifestyle and geographical location. Whereas class is the variable most often used in the sociological literature to explain group differences in boundaries (e.g., Beisel, 1992; DiMaggio, 1982a; Holt, forthcoming; also Lamont and Fournier, 1992), we propose that these boundaries can be explained by both *local cultural supply-side factors* that tap the cultural tool-kit most easily available to individuals (Swidler, 1986), given the geographic location in which they live and the lifestyle in which they are involved, and by their *structural position* – class, race, and gender – which increases the likelihood that individuals will draw one type of boundary instead of another. Our aim is to assess the relative importance of both types of factors. Although sociologists have stressed the urgency of understanding the role of cultural repertoires in shaping individual action (Berger, 1992), none have specified their importance in relation to structural position for shaping boundaries. We also pay special attention to how access to repertoires shapes intragroup differences among college graduates and non-college graduates in order to assess whether positions and repertoires affect boundaries differently for specific segments of the population. This comparison is an important one because holding a college degree is the primary determinant of occupational mobility in the United States, and, as such, remains one of the foremost principles of division within the American population (Hout, 1988). Because college graduates share a uniformizing educational experience, we would expect this group to be more culturally homogeneous and their symbolic boundaries to be less affected by local cultural repertoires than is the case for the non-college graduates.

Lasch (1995) and others have argued that elites increasingly define themselves by a shared lifestyle instead of by a commitment to collective goals. Along similar lines, Bellah et al. (1985) argue that lifestyle enclaves are now shaping in an important way the cultural orientations of Americans, because private life and consumption patterns are not anymore directly "expressions of social status, in turn linked to social class". Lifestyle enclaves are made of individuals who choose to organize their private life, especially leisure and consumption, in a similar way. They provide an important arena for self-expression and a collective bond, "an appropriate form of collective support in an otherwise radically individualizing society" (p. 73; also Griswold, 1994: 147).

Patterns of recreation, dress, and taste bring people together, as does involvement in religious communities (p. 74). Therefore, lifestyle plays a central role in the creation of networks and in the definition of reference groups (Fischer, 1982). Lifestyle enclaves can also generate social boundaries because they strengthen conformity to group and occur concurrently with the creation of fields where specific cultural orientations come to be highly valued as a result of cultural constraints or preferences. By strengthening associations based on similar cultural orientations, symbolic boundaries indirectly shape inequality by creating distance toward those who do not share these orientations (Bourdieu, 1984).

Whereas sociologists who study lifestyle enclaves focus on tightly-bounded groups, we use the term 'lifestyle cluster' to refer to both tightly and loosely-bounded groups. [2] We focus on two significant lifestyle clusters: religion and high culture. These are particularly important suppliers of repertoires in American society because they play a significant role in providing individuals with non-kin-based reference groups. [3] The General Social Survey contains items that tap each of these clusters.

We also explore the influence of geographic location on cultural and moral boundaries because we expect the cultural tool-kits available to the population to vary across geographic locations and to shape these symbolic boundaries. Indeed, sociologists have suggested that attitudes vary across regions. For instance, Reed (1983) and Marsden et al. (1982) among others, provide evidence of the cultural distinctiveness of Southerners, who attach more importance to traditional values that are likely to shape their moral boundaries. Similarly, Blau (1988) and others have documented how residing in a large city influences exposure to high culture. Both region and place size are consequential dimensions of geographic location that need to be explored in relation to the boundaries people draw.

An important literature documenting cultural differences across groups draws on both qualitative and quantitative data. The distinctive feature of this paper is that it focuses on a limited number of attitudes that tap symbolic boundaries, that is, the criteria that individuals use to distinguish people they consider desirable from others. Whereas attitudinal surveys typically view moral attitudes as discrete and independent from one another, we focus on boundaries, i.e., on patterns of responses supported by common criteria of evaluation. We deal exclusively with subjective symbolic boundaries and neglect objective boundaries that are revealed by the existence of ghettos and exclusive

---

[2] Bellah et al. (1985) deplore the growing presence of lifestyle enclaves in American society and its correlate, the declining importance of community. In contrast, we use the concept of 'lifestyle cluster' to refer in a descriptive manner to patterns of lifestyle choices common to groups of individuals. The importance of leisure activities and taste for the definition of the self and the construction of subculture has been widely discussed in the sociological literature (for instance Bourdieu, 1984; Davis, 1992; Douglas and Isherwood, 1979; Fine, 1979; Gans, 1974; Halle, 1993; Hebdige, 1979; and Hughes and Peterson, 1984.

[3] The importance of high culture in American society is evidenced by the fact that it receives governmental and corporate subsidies and is given a privileged, although threatened, position in the curriculum of post-secondary education. Furthermore, in 1980, 14 percent of white Americans eighteen years of age and older attended one or more symphonic concerts (DiMaggio and Ostrower, 1990) – a percentage comparable to that found in the French population (Donnat and Cogneau, 1990).

social clubs. Furthermore, we take subjective boundaries to be a necessary but insufficient condition for exclusion, i.e., for the creation of objective boundaries.

We focus on two types of boundaries, namely cultural and moral boundaries. [4] In-depth interviews conducted in the New York suburbs with eighty randomly sampled professionals, managers, and businessmen and with seventy-five blue collar and low-status white collar workers suggest that these boundaries play an important role in the way people distinguish between 'their sort of folks' and 'the sorts they don't like much' and in how they describe abstractly and concretely people they perceive as better or worse than themselves (Lamont, 1992, 1995). [5] Other studies have also shown the importance of cultural and moral boundaries in the United States (Beisel, 1992; DiMaggio, 1982b; Erikson, 1966; Gusfield, 1963; Luker, 1984; also Lamont and Fournier, 1992). We define these boundary dimensions as follows:

Cultural boundaries are based on self-actualization (including intellectual curiosity), manners, tastes, education, and appreciation of high culture. Those who feel superior toward people who are less culturally sophisticated than themselves are said to draw cultural boundaries. For instance, while an artist says that he feels superior to people who have no sense of cultural sophistication, a lawyer feels superior to "narrow-minded people who don't bother to pick up a newspaper, ... who have nothing better to talk about than what their children are doing and how their golf game is going". People who draw cultural boundaries emphasize the importance of broad cultural knowledge when describing the people with whom they want to associate.

Moral boundaries are drawn on the basis of moral character. They are centered around such qualities as honesty, work ethic, personal integrity, sexuality, religiosity, solidarity and consideration for others. One draws moral boundaries when one feels superior to people who have low moral standards and are dishonest, or when one criticizes others for being selfish. For instance, a consultant near retirement draws moral boundaries when he says: "I feel superior to people who have unclean minds and unclean bodies, and I feel superior to people who think they've accomplished something but they've done it immorally or illegally". [6] People who draw moral boundaries are

---

[4] Whereas in *Distinction* and elsewhere, Bourdieu predefines high status signals to focus, for instance, on cultural capital defined as familiarity with high status culture (Lamont and Lareau, 1988), the symbolic boundary approach identifies high status signals by the type of criteria that people use to draw boundaries. According to this approach, cultural boundaries can be drawn on the basis of a wide-range of high status signals, including familiarity with high culture. Furthermore, cultural boundaries are only one of many possible types of boundaries, and their relationship with other types of boundaries, such as moral boundaries, is understood to vary across time and space, and to be empirically observable. For an in-depth discussion of these issues, see Lamont, 1992: ch. 7.

[5] In these studies, feelings of superiority and inferiority were explored with the following probes: "Whether we admit it or not, we all feel inferior or superior to some people at times. In relation to what types of people do you feel inferior? Superior? Can you give me concrete examples? What do these people have in common?" To explore likes and dislikes in others, participants were asked "What kind of people would you rather avoid? What kind of people leave you indifferent? What kind of people attract you in general? Can you give me specific examples? Which qualities do these people have in common?"

[6] These citations are taken from interviews conducted with randomly sampled upper-middle class men residing in Indianapolis and in the New York suburbs.

likely to stress moral criteria when discussing the qualities they appreciate in their friends and the values they want to pass on to their children.

In the next section we explain why we expect that (1) structural position increases the likelihood that individuals will draw one type of boundary rather than another; (2) geographic location and participation in lifestyle clusters significantly affect cultural and moral boundaries; and (3) participation in lifestyle clusters and geographic location have a stronger effect on the symbolic boundaries of respondents without a college degree compared to those with a college degree.

2. Hypotheses

First, we present hypotheses concerning the effect of structural position and availability of cultural repertoires (mediated by geographic location and participation in lifestyle clusters) on cultural and moral boundaries. Second, we present hypotheses concerning the effect of these factors on the cultural and moral boundaries of college graduates and non-college graduates.

2.1. Cultural boundaries

A large sociological literature argues that cultural orientations are shaped in an important way by social class. This literature has focused in part on how appreciation for culture, knowledge, and self-actualization is shaped by occupational membership and level of education (Bourdieu, 1984; DiMaggio and Useem, 1978; Kerckhoff, 1972). Historically, the members of the elite have been found to use their involvement and familiarity with culture as a source of prestige and as a way to demarcate themselves from other classes (Baltzell, 1979; Coleman and Rainwater, 1978; DiMaggio, 1982b; Gans, 1974; Veblen, 1912). Middle class people stress intellectual development and self-actualization more than working class people in their child-rearing values while the latter group emphasizes intellectualism and high culture less (Gecas, 1979; Halle, 1984; Jeffries and Ransford, 1980; Kohn, 1987). Middle class people have also been described as cultural omnivores who value cultural variety, having, for instance, an appreciation for a wide range of musical genres (Peterson and Simkus, 1992; Bryson forthcoming). Finally, Davis (1982) has shown that education is now a stronger predictor of attitudinal orientations than income. This literature suggests that individuals with higher incomes and college graduates would be more likely to support cultural boundaries than individuals with lower incomes and the non-college graduates (hypothesis 1a).

Turning our attention to racial differences, we focus on African-Americans and whites only. Survey research and ethnographic studies document that African-Americans greatly stress the importance of education, expressive culture, and style (Hochschild, 1995; Jones, 1991; Kelley, 1993). Furthermore, the presence of African-Americans in arts audiences is comparable to that of whites after controlling for education (Greenberg

and Frank, 1983; Marsden, Reed, Kennedy and Stinson, 1982). [7] Therefore we can expect African-Americans to be more likely to draw cultural boundaries than whites (hypothesis 1b). In addition, middle class African-Americans have become increasingly interested in celebrating black cultural distinctiveness, as reflected in activism in favor of the creation of multicultural curricula and the consolidation of a very influential black intellectual elite. A similar trend is present among black workers: when asked in interviews to discuss the significance of culture in their life, they also often refer to the importance of celebrating the African-American experience. For instance, Dereck Louis, a worker in a recycling plant, discusses what it meant for him to see the movie *Malcolm X*. He points to the fact that in Georgia where he grew up, "We didn't have black history, we wasn't taught how we came over on the ship .... They took our heritage away from us, our names .... When this movie came out, it gave me ideas as of what was going on throughout the whole world". Both an interest in high culture and in promoting cultural distinctiveness should strengthen cultural boundaries among African-Americans.

Collins (1992) argues that women participate more in the production and consumption of cultural capital (defined as familiarity with high culture) than men. More specifically, he suggests that the management of symbolic status is a feminine specialty given that women are often employed in occupations concerned with the presentation of self (see also Mohr and DiMaggio, forthcoming). On the basis of a small number of interviews, Lamont (1992: 133) indicated that in their descriptions of the qualities they appreciate in friends, women are more likely than men to mention tastes in clothes, foods, books, art, travel, and so forth. This leads us to predict that women are more likely to support cultural boundaries than men (hypothesis 1c).

Geographic location should also shape cultural boundaries in important ways. Specifically, the size of the place of residence should affect the likelihood that individuals have access to high culture events and value culture. As shown by Judith Blau (1986: 897), larger cities do offer more cultural events than smaller ones. Therefore, they should make cultural boundaries more present in local cultural repertoires. Hence, we predict that residents of large metropolitan areas are more likely to support cultural boundaries than residents of smaller residential areas (hypothesis 1d). In interviews conducted with upper-middle class men, Lamont (1992) has found little variation in the importance of cultural boundaries for New Yorkers and Midwesterners. Therefore we expect that region has no significant effect on cultural boundaries.

Finally, we predict that participation in the high culture lifestyle cluster is likely to lead to stronger support for cultural boundaries (hypothesis 1e): the literature on cultural capital has shown that individuals who appreciate and participate in high culture are more likely to value people who share their taste, i.e., who define culture as important in their lives (Bourdieu, 1984; DiMaggio and Mohr, 1985). Furthermore, participation in

---

[7] Drawing on the 1982 Survey of Public Participation in the Arts, DiMaggio and Ostrower (1990) find that participation in high culture events is lower among African-Americans than it is among Euro-Americans, even after controlling for education. However, blacks do participate substantially more than whites in historically Afro-American art forms. Middle class blacks are involved in both elite Euro-American and historically Afro-American art forms.

high culture provides individuals with a supply of references, knowledge, and networks that sustain the drawing of cultural boundaries. [8]

2.2. Moral boundaries

Membership in low status categories should increase the likelihood that individuals draw moral boundaries. Upholding high moral standards allows individuals in low social status position to gain empowerment by raising their status at the symbolic level, thereby attenuating their low social status (Bourdieu, 1984). Furthermore, historically, low status groups have often resisted the culture of dominant groups by adopting a distinct view of morality that provides them with a sphere of cultural autonomy (Davis, 1975; Scott, 1990). Along these lines, social scientists find that groups in positions of dependency or with limited access to power value solidarity and interpersonal morality (Gilligan, 1982; Kanter, 1977; Stack, 1986). With this in mind, we discuss how structural position, as measured by class, race, and gender, is likely to shape moral boundaries.

Working class people are strong supporters of moral crusades, thereby strengthening their moral status in relation to the poor and upper class groups (Gusfield, 1963; Luker, 1984). In particular, previous studies have found that the defense of traditional sexual morality is more important for working class men and the non-college graduates (Davis, 1982). These groups have been found to be less supportive of freedom of choice and self-expression, particularly in the area of sexual morality, divorce, and abortion (Brint, 1985: 389), in part because these freedoms weaken traditional gender roles (Halle, 1984). Working class men also give more support to "cultural fundamentalism", the cluster of values that motivate moral reform activists who support "adherence to traditional norms, respect of family and religious authority, asceticism and control of impulse" (Wood and Hughes, 1984: 89). [9] In contrast, middle class people talk about morality differently, putting more emphasis on self-directiveness in child-rearing values, partly due to their own work conditions that often require autonomy (Kohn, 1987). They also consider self-actualization, tolerance, and conflict avoidance to be important qualities, leading to greater moral permissiveness, at least in areas of traditional Judeo-Christian morality. However, these values, including tolerance, are used as basis of exclusion toward individuals who do not share them (Lamont, 1992). In contrast, class differences in attitudes toward family orientation should be small because these attitudes are central to American culture. This leads us to predict that individuals with higher incomes and college graduates would be less likely to support moral boundaries than individuals with lower incomes and individuals who do not hold college degrees (hypothesis 2a).

Interviews suggest that African-Americans workers perceive themselves as valuing morality more highly than whites. Indeed, they often describe whites as exploitative and

---

[8] In contrast, involvement in religious organizations is unlikely to affect cultural boundaries positively or negatively.

[9] But note that in the past American elites have frequently drawn boundaries against the "lax" moral and sexual mores of the lower class (e.g., Beisel, 1992).

egotistic and adopt a system of evaluation that places great emphasis on solidarity as a way to assert their own values in contrast to that of whites (Lamont, forthcoming). This leads us to predict that African-Americans would be more likely to support moral boundaries than whites (hypothesis 2b).

Research that points to gendered differences in morality would suggest that women are more likely to assess people using moral criteria. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, American women used their moral claims as mothers and wives to enter the public sphere and gain power in the home. Women continue to draw upon maternalist symbols of morality to criticize male domination in American culture and to challenge male violence and power (Ginsburg, 1989; Di Leonardo, 1985; Ruddick, 1980). Furthermore, other authors argue that women's experience of inequality in the sexual division of labor, particularly as mothers, leads them to value morally grounded conceptions of community (Collins, 1990; Hartsock, 1983). This literature suggests that moral boundaries are unequally distributed in the population and that women are more likely to support moral boundaries than men (hypothesis 2c).

Availability of a repertoire of moral boundaries should also be shaped by geographic location. This is suggested by the literature on regional cultural differences in the United States. Indeed, Marsden et al. (1982) have found Southerners to be more oriented toward home, family, and church than residents of other regions and Lamont (1992) has shown that Midwestern professionals and managers are more likely than Northeasterners to draw moral boundaries. This literature leads us to predict that Midwesterners, Westerners, and Southerners would be more likely to support moral boundaries than Northeasterners (hypothesis 2d)

Residents of large cities are exposed to a wide range of moral behavior. They also live in a relatively anonymous environment and have wider networks than individuals who live in smaller cities (Fischer, 1982). Consequently, they should be more indifferent to 'deviant' behavior, more tolerant of differences, and more likely to be morally permissive. Accordingly, we predict that residents of large metropolitan areas are less likely to support moral boundaries than residents of small metropolitan areas (hypothesis 2e).

Finally, social scientists from Tocqueville to Lipset have emphasized the link between moral boundaries and religious participation and affiliation (Bellah et al., 1985; Lipset, 1979; Tocqueville, 1954; Weber, 1946; Wilkinson, 1988, 1992). The strongest links between religion and morality are in the area of 'individual morality' that involves sexuality and other personal lifestyle matters. Traditional sexual mores are often seen as key markers of religious belonging (Bellah et al., 1985; Cochran, 1991; Herberg, 1955; Lipset, 1963; Wuthnow, 1988). Evangelicals give stronger support to traditional sexual mores because 'moral asceticism' in sexuality is still a major principle of inclusion and exclusion among Evangelicals (Ammerman, 1987; Hunter, 1983; Hunter, 1987; Roof and McKinney, 1987; Schmalzbauer, 1993). Furthermore, they attach more importance to God than mainline Protestants (Hunter, 1983). [10] Consequently, we predict that

---

[10] We do not expect participation in the high culture lifestyle cluster to have an effect on the supply of moral boundaries that individuals have access to.

participants in the religious lifestyle cluster and Evangelicals are more likely to support moral boundaries than non-attendees and mainline Protestants while the religiously non-affiliated are less likely to draw moral boundaries than mainline Protestants (hypothesis 2f).

2.3. College graduates and non-college graduates

A close look at differences between college graduates and non-college graduates will demonstrate that available repertoires differentially affect the symbolic boundaries of these populations. When the sample is divided, we expect to find different social mechanisms operating to provide differing access to moral and cultural boundaries for each population. (As an alternative to dividing the sample between college and non-college degree holders, we attempted to perform a similar type of analysis using interaction terms. We tested the effect of interactions between college degree and cultural participation and between college degree and large metropolitan area on the cultural boundary dependent valuables. However, because of multicollinearity among the interaction items, standard errors became unacceptably large. Therefore we decided to take a divided sample approach.)

Because of the college experience they share and their relatively small size as a group, college graduates are more homogeneous than non-college graduates: Their educational socialization provides them with a somewhat unifying worldview which exposes them to repertoires conducive to valuing culture. Size of the place of residence should not increase the likelihood that they draw cultural boundaries given their cultural similarity. However, it should increase the likelihood that the non-college-educated draw cultural boundaries by providing them with exposure to activities that supply high culture repertoires (hypothesis 3a). Following our earlier predictions, region of residence should have no effect on the cultural boundaries of the college educated or the non-college educated. Moreover, most significantly, because the non-college graduates have not undergone the educational socialization that would lead them to value culture, voluntary participation in high culture activities should play a more important mediating role in their exposure to culture, and by extension their attitudes toward cultural boundaries, than it does for the college graduates (hypothesis 3b).

Finally, the moral boundaries of college graduates should not be significantly affected by geographic location and participation in religious lifestyle clusters because of the homogenizing effect of college education. However, because the non-college graduates are more affected by the cultural repertoires that are available to them locally, these variables should have significant effects on the moral boundaries of the non-college-educated: residence in a large metropolitan area is more likely to be a negative significant predictor of moral boundaries for the non-college educated than for the college-educated (hypothesis 3c), as is residence in the South, Midwest, or West (hypothesis 3d). Finally, participating in the religious lifestyle cluster should reinforce the moral boundaries of the non-college graduates who attend church, differentiating them from the large and heterogeneous group of non-college graduate respondents (hypothesis 3e).

3. Data and methods

To document symbolic boundaries, we draw on the 1993 General Social Survey that provides information on the opinions of 1,606 randomly selected English-speaking residents of US. households. It also provides socio-demographic data on these individuals (Davis and Smith, 1992). This survey includes a module of questions particularly designed to measure aspects of culture, and more specifically the "tastes, preferences and activities that serve as symbolic indicators of membership in and boundaries between social groups" (Marsden and Swingle, 1994). More specifically, following Bourdieu (1984) and Lamont (1992), these items tap qualities valued in friends and the importance of various aspects of life. We analyze these data using regression models to identify the best predictors of different types of symbolic boundaries (see Appendix for descriptive statistics). The data are ordinal, and we are making the assumption that adjacent categories in our dependent variable are equally spaced along an underlying continuous dimension. Therefore, we feel multiple regression is appropriate for this analysis. We consider attitudes toward behaviors and values as indicative of attitudes toward individuals exhibiting these behaviors and upholding these values. [11] The following GSS items are used to tap the two types of boundaries:

Cultural boundaries: (1) An item in which respondents are asked whether it is important to them that their personal friends be cultured; (2) An item that asks people whether it is important for them to be cultured. The wording for the first item is: "I am going to read seven qualities one might look for in a personal friend. All the qualities may be desirable ones for a personal friend, but I'm interested in those that are most important to you. As I read each one, could you tell me whether it is extremely important, very important, fairly important, not too important or not at all important". Choices include: creative, cultured, dynamic, fun-loving, honest, intelligent, and responsible. [12] The wording for the question concerning the importance of being cultured is: "I am going to read you a list of some things that different people value. Some people say these things are very important to them. Other people say they are not so important. Please tell me how important each thing is to you personally, using the responses on this card. How about being financially secure? Is it one of the most important values you hold, very important, somewhat important, not important or not at all important?" Choices include: being married, having children, having faith in God, and being cultured (Marsden and Swingle, 1994).

Moral boundaries: (1) Items that ask respondents their attitudes toward premarital sex and homosexuality; (2) Items that ask respondents how much importance they attach to marriage, children, and faith in God. While the question for this last group of items is

---

[11] For instance, evidence from social psychology surveys shows that negative attitudes toward homosexuality shape exclusionary behavior such as avoidance and discrimination against homosexuals (DeCecco, 1984).

[12] Valuing intelligence and creativity in personal friends can also be viewed as criteria for drawing cultural boundaries. However, we do not include them as indicators of cultural boundaries because many people who value intelligence and creativity do not value culture. To include these items in our analysis would prevent us from isolating individuals who attach a particularly great importance to this dimension (Marsden and Swingle, 1994).

the same as that concerning the importance of being cultured, the questions for the first items are: "If a man and a woman have sex relations before marriage, do you think it is always wrong, almost always wrong, wrong only sometimes, or not wrong at all?"; "What about sexual relations between two adults of the same sex? Do you think it is always wrong, almost always wrong, only sometimes wrong, or not wrong at all?". [13] These items are measured continuously using four- or five-point scales. In all cases, high scores indicate stronger moral or cultural boundaries. [14]

We analyze attitudes on each of these items separately in order to identify cases where specific groups value different definitions of morality (stressing traditional sexual ethics versus family orientation for instance). A factor analysis with varimax rotation of the dependent variables produced a coherent three-dimensional solution – organized respectively around the importance of being cultured, family orientation, and sexual morality and God – which suggests that the items used to tap the two types of boundaries are not only discrete attitudes: they also cluster together and are indicators of underlying boundary patterns. We report the significant variables and their loadings. The first factor includes anti-premarital sexuality (0.797); anti-homosexuality (0.822) and importance of God (0.707). The second factor is composed of importance of marriage (0.824) and importance of kids (0.880). The third factor consists of importance of being cultured (0.875) and cultured friends (0.871).

We operationalize independent variables pertaining to *structural position* as follows: To tap class differences, we look at education and income. [15] Rather than using a continuous measure of education, we compare the college graduate population with the non-college graduate population because having a college degree is the best predictor of mobility in the contemporary United States (Blau and Duncan, 1967; Collins, 1979; Hout, 1988). [16] We use the log of annual family income as a continuous measure. To tap gender differences we compare women to the reference category of men. Finally,

---

[13] Sociological research on attitudes toward premarital sex and homosexuality has often described these attitudes as indicative of 'intolerance'. We conceptualize them in terms of symbolic boundaries because attitudes toward premarital sex and homosexuality can be taken to be indicative of reactions toward individuals who engage in such practices. We want to avoid the pejorative connotations of 'intolerance' while retaining the idea that sexual mores are salient in definitions of group inclusions and exclusion. We do not include items that ask respondents whether it is important to them that their friends be honest and responsible because these attitudes are viewed as important by respectively 98 percent and 89 percent of the sample and show little variance across groups.

[14] Items pertaining to attitudes toward premarital sex and homosexuality are used because the distribution of responses for these items is more polarized than responses for other items pertaining to sexual attitudes. Items pertaining to qualities valued in friends are used because they are explicitly designed to tap symbolic boundaries. Items pertaining to the importance of various aspects of life are used because they indirectly tap attitudes toward individuals who agree and disagree on the importance of these aspects (Lamont, 1992). Items pertaining to the importance of God, children, and culture are used because they get at what individuals value for self, and indirectly, for others – which affects boundary work.

[15] We use a Weberian definition of class that focuses on the relative position and life-chances of individuals in the labor market, as measured by education and income. The GSS does not include items pertaining to relationship with the means of production, or to position in relations of authority in the workplace.

[16] Twenty-three percent of the sample have graduated from college, and 76 percent have not (this figure includes 6 percent who have graduated from a junior college).

instead of contrasting whites with all other non-whites, we focus our attention on African-Americans and Euro-Americans to identify cultural differences between racial groups that are best and worst off in the American labor market (Jaynes and Williams, 1989).

Independent variables pertaining to *geographic location* are operationalized by using items pertaining to region of residence and place size. We compare individuals living in metropolitan areas of 250,000 inhabitants and more with others. We also compare residents of the West, the South, and the Midwest to residents of the Northeast. [17]

Independent variables pertaining to *lifestyle clusters* are operationalized as follows: we create a participation in the high culture cluster scale by combining items asking respondents if they watch PBS, went to a classical music and opera event, or visited an art museum or gallery in the last year. [18] Participation in the religious lifestyle cluster is tapped by religious attendance (measured continuously). Because denominations comprise distinct socio-cultural traditions (Roof and McKinney, 1987; Smith, 1986), participation in the religious lifestyle cluster is also tapped by items asking respondents about their affiliation (measured categorically). This operationalization is theoretically congenial with our focus on symbolic boundaries because of the tendency of religious *groups* to dramatize moral boundaries of inclusion and exclusion. [19] The analysis takes three categories into consideration: mainline Protestant denominations, evangelical denominations, and the religiously non-affiliated. [20] Because we acknowledge the important effect of age, marital status, and having children in the household on cultural orientations, we include them in the model as control variables.

The items used to tap cultural boundaries might be open to a wide-range of interpretations. For instance, respondents may interpret questions asking whether culture is important in their lives in many ways. Also, they might avoid equating 'culture' with 'high culture'. As an illustration, a New Jersey maintenance worker whom we interviewed, says "When you say culture to me I think more of ethnicity, ethnic celebrations, weddings, and things like that". Similarly, a warehouse worker associates refinement with culture and says "refined ... That's how I define myself ... I'm laid back, I'm easy going and I'll do anything in the world for a person, as long as they don't

---

[17] We use the standard GSS categorization of states by region. Although geographic mobility is more frequent in the United States than in most advanced industrial societies, geographic location is stable for most Maericans. For instance, in 1991, non-movers included 83 percent of the population (*Statistical Abstract of the Unites States 1993*, p. 32).

[18] Visiting an art museum or gallery and attending a classical music and opera event are binary variables. 'Watching PBS' is a question with five response categories and the choices are (1) never; (2) rarely; (3) several times a month; (4) several times a week; (5) every day.

[19] Others have classified denominations into broad religious groupings such as fundamentalist, moderate, or liberal (e.g., Smith, 1986). Our classification scheme was developed by political scientist Lyman Kellstedt and pays special attention to the historical links between denominations and larger movements such as evangelicalism (Leege and Kellstedt, 1993; Green et al., 1992)

[20] We control for Catholics, Jews, and members of other religious denominations. Members of the mainline Protestant denominations (the reference category) represent 29 percent of the population; the percentages for the other denominations; 22 percent of Catholics; 9 percent for the religiously non-affiliated; 5 percent for members of other religions; and 2 percent for Jews. Religious attendance is measured continuously.

just jerk me around. So a refined person is the best person to get along with''. The interpretation of the results should take into consideration the unavoidable multivocality of the GSS items. A larger set of items pertaining to both cultural and moral boundaries, of the type used in Lamont (1992), would have allowed us to tap in greater depth group differences in definitions of culture and morality. Furthermore, questions pertaining directly to exclusion and feelings of superiority and inferiority would have provided more specific information on the relationship between structural position, available repertoires, and boundaries than do available questions. Nevertheless, the available data can help us begin to make sense of the *determinants* of symbolic boundaries, which constitute the distinct focus of this paper.

4. Findings

Table 1 presents the coefficients from the model in which we investigate the effects of structural position, geographic location, and involvement in lifestyle clusters on the drawing of cultural boundaries.

Among the structural position variables, as predicted by hypothesis 1a, education is a strong determinant of cultural boundaries, with college graduates more likely to value culture than non-college graduates. Income, however, is not a significant predictor of cultural boundaries. As expected by hypothesis 1b, race has a powerful impact on cultural boundaries, with African-Americans significantly more likely to report valuing culture than whites. But, contrary to our predictions, findings show no significant relationship between gender and valuing the importance of being cultured and cultured friends. While region has no effect on cultural boundaries, people who reside in large metropolitan areas do report appreciating the importance of being cultured and cultured friends more than people who do not reside in these areas, supporting hypothesis 1d.

As predicted, participation in the high culture lifestyle cluster has a strong effect on cultural boundaries, providing support for hypothesis 1e. Respondents who watch PBS, went to a classical music and opera event, and visited an art museum or gallery in the last year, i.e. respondents who score high on our cultural participation scale, are much more likely to emphasize the importance of being cultured and value cultured friends than those who do not participate in these lifestyle clusters. These results bolster our multicausal model of determination of symbolic boundaries: structural position, geographic location, and participation in high culture lifestyle clusters predict cultural boundaries.

In Table 2, we examine the results from our moral boundary regressions. Income is a significant predictor of moral boundaries and is associated with the dependent variables on three out of six regressions. As predicted by hypothesis 2a, individuals with higher incomes are less likely to oppose homosexuality than individuals with lower incomes and they are less likely to value the importance of God. Contrary to predictions, they put more importance on children than lower income individuals. Also supporting hypothesis 2a, college graduates are less likely to oppose pre-marital sex and to oppose homosexuality and less likely to value the importance of God than non-college graduates.

Table 1

Unstandardized coefficients for regressions of structural position, geographic location, and lifestyle enclave variables on cultural boundary items: 1993 General Social Survey

	Importance of being cultured	Cultured friend
College degree	0.210 **	0.165 **
	(0.063)	(0.065)
Log of income	−0.036	0.007
	(0.031)	(0.031)
African-Americans	0.421 **	0.344 **
	(0.081)	(0.083)
Women	0.038	−0.071
	(0.051)	(0.052)
South	−0.052	0.030
	(0.072)	(0.073)
Midwest	−0.022	0.076
	(0.075)	(0.077)
West	−0.010	0.048
	(0.078)	(0.080)
Large metro. area	0.143 **	0.145 **
	(0.053)	(0.054)
Cultural participation	0.135 **	0.129 **
	(0.029)	(0.030)
Age	−0.000	0.003
	(0.002)	(0.002)
Single	0.136	0.179 *
	(0.079)	(0.081)
Divorced/separated	0.098	0.110
	(0.071)	(0.072)
Widowed	−0.011	0.181
	(0.102)	(0.104)
Children in household	−0.098	−0.079
	(0.062)	(0.064)
R^2	0.07	0.06

* $p \leq 0.05$; ** $p \leq 0.01$. Standard errors are in parentheses.

With regard to the other structural position variables, race is significant on only one item: African-Americans are less likely than Euro-Americans to draw boundaries against pre-marital sex, contrary to hypothesis 2b. Gender emerges as a significant predictor of moral boundaries on four out of five measures. However, our results indicate that men and women value different aspects of morality and draw different kinds of moral boundaries. While women are less likely than men to draw moral boundaries against homosexuality and to stress the importance of marriage, they score higher than men on the importance of children and the importance of God. Therefore gender is an important predictor, but hypothesis 2c receives mixed support. This underscores the importance of considering various aspects of moral boundaries in our model. In general, results provide weak support to the notion that individuals belonging to groups with lower social status draw comparatively stronger moral boundaries.

Table 2
Unstandardized coefficients for regressions of structural position, geographic location, and lifestyle enclave variables on moral boundary items: 1993 General Social Survey

	Anti-premarital sexuality	Anti-homo-sexuality	Importance of marriage	Importance of children	Importance of God
College degree	− 0.228 **	− 0.538 **	0.004	0.097	− 0.215 **
	(0.088)	(0.099)	(0.071)	(0.077)	(0.061)
Log of income	− 0.046	− 0.165 **	0.003	0.085 *	− 0.076 **
	(0.041)	(0.048)	(0.035)	(0.037)	(0.029)
African − Americans	− 0.403 **	0.074	− 0.036	− 0.113	0.151
	(0.119)	(0.128)	(0.095)	(0.103)	(0.081)
Women	0.055	− 0.251 **	− 0.200 **	0.177 **	0.191 **
	(0.071)	(0.080)	(0.058)	(0.062)	(0.049)
South	0.364 **	0.257 *	0.003	0.166	0.217 **
	(0.103)	(0.120)	(0.085)	(0.091)	(0.072)
Midwest	0.323 **	0.277 *	0.067	0.161	0.217 **
	(0.104)	(0.122)	(0.086)	(0.093)	(0.073)
West	0.305 **	0.056	0.011	0.201 *	0.064
	(0.108)	(0.127)	(0.089)	(0.096)	(0.076)
Large metropolitan area	− 0.213 **	− 0.080	− 0.079	− 0.109	− 0.025
	(0.072)	(0.084)	(0.059)	(0.064)	(0.051)
Attend religious service	0.169 **	0.104 **	0.040 **	0.060 **	0.137 **
	(0.014)	(0.016)	(0.011)	(0.012)	(0.010)
Evangelical	0.382 **	0.221 *	− 0.061	− 0.020	0.117
	(0.094)	(0.103)	(0.075)	(0.081)	(0.064)
No religion	− 0.089	− 0.288	− 0.371 **	− 0.383 **	− 1.119 **
	(0.134)	(0.163)	(0.111)	(0.119)	(0.094)
Catholic	− 0.184	− 0.081	− 0.136	0.084	− 0.015
	(0.097)	(0.112)	(0.079)	(0.086)	(0.068)
Jewish	− 0.284	− 0.320	− 0.442 *	− 0.063	− 0.946 **
	(0.251)	(0.296)	(0.209)	(0.225)	(0.178)
Other	0.371 *	− 0.422 *	− 0.097	− 0.103	− 0.126
	(0.168)	(0.190)	(0.133)	(0.143)	(0.113)
Age	0.020 **	0.009 **	− 0.005 *	− 0.003	0.004 *
	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Single	0.050	− 0.295 *	− 1.139 **	− 0.593 **	− 0.131
	(0.109)	(0.126)	(0.090)	(0.097)	(0.077)
Divorced/separated	− 0.439 **	− 0.252 *	− 1.600 **	− 0.314 **	− 0.011
	(0.102)	(0.112)	(0.081)	(0.088)	(0.069)
Widowed	− 0.233	− 0.138	− 0.647 **	0.010	− 0.207 *
	(0.140)	(0.155)	(0.115)	(0.123)	(0.097)
Children in household	0.120	− 0.031	− 0.026	0.436 **	− 0.033
	(0.087)	(0.100)	(0.070)	(0.078)	(0.060)
R^2	0.36	0.22	0.33	0.17	0.39

* $p \leq 0.05$; ** $p \leq 0.01$. Standard errors are in parentheses.

Some geographic location items are associated with moral boundaries. First, we find some support for hypothesis 2d, that Midwesterners, Westerners and Southerners value moral boundaries more than Northeasterners because residing in these regions is strongly associated with opposition to pre-marital sexuality. Furthermore, residents of

the Midwest and the South are also more likely to value the importance of God and oppose homosexuality than Northeasterners. However, we find limited support for hypothesis 2e, that residents of large metropolitan areas are less likely to support moral boundaries than residents of smaller urban units: place size is highly significant for the anti-premarital sexuality item only.

As predicted by hypothesis 2f, participants in the religious lifestyle cluster are more likely to support moral boundaries than non-participants. Religious attendance emerged as a significant predictor of all five moral boundary variables. In fact, it is the only independent variable that is significant on every moral boundary item. We also find that the religiously non-affiliated are less likely to put importance on marriage, children, and God than mainline Protestants. Religious affiliation is also a significant predictor in a few regressions. Evangelicals oppose premarital sex and homosexuality more strongly than the reference group of mainline Protestants while the religiously non-affiliated are less likely to support the importance of marriage, children, and God than mainline Protestant.

These results again support our multicausal model of determination of symbolic boundaries: structural position, geographic location, and participation in the religious lifestyle clusters predict moral boundaries. Participation in the religious lifestyle cluster plays a more significant role in affecting moral boundaries than do structural position and geographic location.

Table 3 presents the coefficients from the model in which we investigate the effects of geographic location and involvement in lifestyle clusters on the drawing of cultural boundaries for the college graduates and non-college graduates.

Following hypothesis 3a, none of the geographic location variables are significant predictors of cultural boundaries for college graduates, while residence in a large metropolitan area has a significant positive effect on the cultural boundaries of non-college graduates on both cultural boundary items. This confirms that college graduates are fairly homogeneous in the extent to which they stress cultural boundaries and that for non-college graduates, residing in a large metropolitan area can compensate for a weak exposure to high culture due to a short educational experience.

Furthermore, the high culture lifestyle cluster scale is more significant as a predictor of cultural boundaries among the non-college graduates than among college graduates, in accordance with hypothesis 3b. Participation in high culture lifestyle clusters can mediate individual exposure and appreciation for culture and separate participants from the large and heterogeneous group of non-college graduates.

Table 4 presents the coefficients from the model in which we investigate the effects of geographic location and involvement in lifestyle clusters on the drawing of moral boundaries for the college graduates and non-college graduates.

As stated in hypothesis 3c and 3d, we expect that geographic location is more often significant as a predictor of moral boundaries for non-college graduates than it is for college graduates due to the homogenizing effects of the college experience. Consistent with this prediction, we find that geographic location has no significant effect on the moral boundaries of college graduates. However, we find one exception: college graduates who reside in the Midwest are more likely to draw boundaries around homosexuality than Northeasterners. In contrast, place size and region of residence are

Table 3
Unstandardized coefficients for regressions of structural position, geographic location, and lifestyle enclave variables on cultural boundary items among college degree holders and non-college degree holders: 1993 General Social Survey

	College degree holders		No college degree	
	Importance of being cultured	Cultured friend	Importance of being cultured	Cultured friend
Log of income	− 0.061	− 0.054	−0.033	0.006
	(0.081)	(0.082)	(0.034)	(0.035)
African-Americans	0.261	0.397	0.451 **	0.341 **
	(0.252)	(0.258)	(0.087)	(0.089)
Women	0.132	0.075	0.015	−0.114
	(0.100)	(0.102)	(0.060)	(0.061)
South	− 0.196	− 0.146	−0.002	0.087
	(0.138)	(0.141)	(0.084)	(0.087)
Midwest	− 0.117	− 0.126	0.018	0.150
	(0.142)	(0.144)	(0.089)	(0.091)
West	− 0.133	− 0.184	0.040	0.123
	(0.146)	(0.149)	(0.093)	(0.095)
Large metro. area	0.153	− 0.045	0.127 *	0.200 **
	(0.101)	(0.102)	(0.062)	(0.063)
Cultural participation	0.091	0.100	0.152 **	0.134 **
	(0.051)	(0.052)	(0.035)	(0.036)
Age	0.002	0.006	0.001	0.003
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Single	0.131	0.158	0.135	0.172
	(0.145)	(0.147)	(0.095)	(0.097)
Divorced / separated	0.342	0.319	0.061	0.078
	(0.178)	(0.182)	(0.078)	(0.080)
Widowed	− 0.002	0.178	−0.012	0.192
	(0.272)	(0.279)	(0.111)	(0.114)
Children in household	− 0.085	− 0.118	−0.090	−0.058
	(0.123)	(0.125)	(0.073)	(0.074)
R^2	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.06

* $p \le 0.05$; $p \le 0.01$. Standard errors are in parentheses.

significantly associated with several moral boundary items for the non-college graduates: residing in the South and Midwest is significantly associated with two items (anti-premarital sexuality and importance of God), and residing in the West with two items (anti-premarital sexuality and importance of kids). Residing in a large metropolitan area is negatively associated with two moral boundary items (anti-premarital sexuality and importance of children). This indicates that non-college graduates are more affected by the cultural repertoires that are at their disposal locally than college graduates.

Finally, hypothesis 3e predicted that religious lifestyle cluster variables would more often be significant as predictors of moral boundaries among non-college graduates than among college graduates. In our results, several measures of participation in the religious lifestyle cluster are significant predictors of moral boundaries for college

Table 4
Unstandardized coefficients for regressions of structural position, geographic, and lifestyle enclave variables on moral boundary items among college degree holders and non-college degree holders: 1993 General Social Survey

	Anti-premarital sexuality	Anti-homo-sexuality	Importance of marriage	Importance of children	Importance of God
College degree holders					
Log of income	0.107	− 0.178	0.154	0.174	− 0.034
	(0.116)	(0.127)	(0.089)	(0.097)	(0.091)
African-Americans	− 1.254 * *	− 0.677	− 0.157	− 0.084	0.111
	(0.418)	(0.412)	(0.283)	(0.307)	(0.293)
Women	0.024	− 0.472 * *	− 0.251 *	0.109	0.213
	(0.137)	(0.168)	(0.112)	(0.122)	(0.115)
South	− 0.005	0.268	0.165	0.120	0.002
	(0.203)	(0.241)	(0.158)	(0.172)	(0.163)
Midwest	0.122	0.562 *	0.053	0.132	0.174
	(0.194)	(0.250)	(0.159)	(0.174)	(0.169)
West	0.009	− 0.200	− 0.084	0.034	− 0.060
	(0.206)	(0.264)	(0.164)	(0.179)	(0.170)
Large metropolitan area	− 0.217	− 0.176	0.082	0.139	− 0.029
	(0.135)	(0.178)	(0.111)	(0.121)	(0.115)
Attend religious service	0.179 * *	0.116 * *	0.040	0.022	0.206 * *
	(0.030)	(0.040)	(0.025)	(0.027)	(0.026)
Evangelical	0.929 * *	0.906 * *	0.055	− 0.049	0.249
	(0.217)	(0.255)	(0.172)	(0.188)	(0.178)
No religion	− 0.038	− 0.232	− 0.233	− 0.343	− 0.848 * *
	(0.232)	(0.334)	(0.204)	(0.222)	(0.005)
Catholic	− 0.083	− 0.148	0.050	− 0.103	0.032
	(0.174)	(0.219)	(0.142)	(0.155)	(0.148)
Jewish	− 0.100	0.261	− 0.398	− 0.701 *	− 1.194 * *
	(0.329)	(0.440)	(0.284)	(0.310)	(0.295)
Other	0.229	− 0.525	− 0.006	0.087	0.053
	(0.321)	(0.363)	(0.232)	(0.253)	(0.240)
Age	0.024 * *	0.018 *	− 0.018 * *	− 0.018 * *	0.002
	(0.005)	(0.007)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Single	0.212	− 0.277	− 1.052 * *	− 0.828 * *	− 0.086
	(0.194)	(0.243)	(0.160)	(0.174)	(0.165)
Divorced/separated	0.055	− 0.163	− 1.704 * *	− 0.368	0.131
	(0.273)	(0.304)	(0.199)	(0.217)	(0.206)
Widowed	− 0.360	0.104	0.116	0.997 * *	0.079
	(0.392)	(0.452)	(0.308)	(0.328)	(0.311)
Children in household	0.189	− 0.203	0.225	0.469 * *	− 0.180
	(0.167)	(0.217)	(0.132)	(0.148)	(0.140)
R^2	0.42	0.34	0.39	0.25	0.44
No college degree					
Log of income	− 0.064	− 0.162 * *	− 0.018	0.442 * *	0.084 * *
	(0.046)	(0.052)	(0.038)	(0.088)	(0.030)
African-Americans	− 0.328	− 0.197	− 0.011 * *	− 0.107	0.171 *
	(0.128)	(0.134)	(0.103)	(0.110)	(0.082)

Table 4 (continued)

	Anti-premarital sexuality	Anti-homo-sexuality	Importance of marriage	Importance of children	Importance of God
Women	0.069	0.172	0.187 **	0.219 **	−0.230 *
	(0.083)	(0.091)	(0.067)	(0.073)	(0.099)
South	0.507	0.304 *	0.024	0.210	0.293 **
	(0.122)	(0.138)	(0.100)	(0.108)	(0.080)
Midwest	0.409 **	0.264	0.062	0.196	0.240 **
	(0.124)	(0.141)	(0.102)	(0.109)	(0.082)
West	0.452 **	0.172	0.074	0.282 *	0.115
	(0.130)	(0.154)	(0.106)	(0.114)	(0.085)
Large metro. area	−0.220 *	−0.081	−0.116	−0.185 *	−0.036
	(0.086)	(0.095)	(0.070)	(0.075)	(0.056)
Attend	0.169 **	0.096 **	0.041 **	0.068 **	0.118 **
	(0.016)	(0.171)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.010)
Evangelical	0.264 *	0.102	−0.103	−0.017	0.075
	(0.106)	(0.112)	(0.085)	(0.091)	(0.068)
No religion	−0.108	−0.252	−0.429 **	−0.426 **	−1.187 **
	(0.164)	(0.187)	(0.132)	(0.142)	(0.106)
Catholic	−0.243 *	−0.052	−0.229 *	0.141	−0.052
	(0.117)	(0.128)	(0.095)	(0.102)	(0.076)
Jewish	−0.573	−0.732	−0.487	0.466	−0.450
	(0.377)	(0.429)	(0.305)	(0.328)	(0.244)
Other	0.352	−0.311	−0.146	−0.230	−0.184
	(0.198)	(0.223)	(0.160)	(0.172)	(0.128)
Age	0.019 **	0.007 *	−0.002	9.322	0.004 *
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Single	0.014	−0.322 *	−1.149 **	−0.497 **	−0.142
	(0.131)	(0.147)	(0.108)	(0.116)	(0.086)
Divorced/separated	−0.516 **	−0.341 **	−1.587 **	−0.309 **	−0.046
	(0.112)	(0.121)	(0.090)	(0.096)	(0.072)
Widowed	−0.237	−0.174	−0.790 **	−0.156	−0.229 *
	(0.153)	(0.162)	(0.124)	(0.134)	(0.099)
Children in household	0.106	−0.046	−0.094	0.442 **	0.030
	(0.102)	(0.112)	(0.082)	(0.088)	(0.066)
R^2	0.35	0.40	0.32	0.17	0.37

* $p \leq 0.05$; ** $p \leq 0.01$. Standard errors are in parentheses.

graduates: religious attendance and Evangelical affiliation are strongly significant on three and two moral boundaries items respectively. Therefore, participation in the religious lifestyle cluster appears to play an important role in supplying moral boundaries independently of college education. This suggests that the college graduate population is less homogeneous in its support of moral boundaries than it is in its support of cultural boundaries. However, religious attendance is more often significant as a predictor of moral boundaries among non-college graduates (on five moral boundary items) than among college graduates (on only three moral boundary items), providing support for Hypothesis 3e. Religious affiliation is also significant for 6 items for the non-college educated compared to 5 items for the college graduates. Furthermore, religious non-affiliation is a significant predictor for three dependent variables for the non-college educated compared to one for the college educated. Overall, the picture

that emerges is one where geographic location and participation in the religious lifestyle cluster are more often significant predictors of moral boundaries for non-college graduates than for college graduates.

5. Discussion

Our findings suggest that moral and cultural boundaries are best explained by both structural position and the cultural repertoires made available by geographic location and participation in lifestyle clusters. Of the structural position variables, education and race are highly significant predictors of cultural boundaries. Furthermore, income, education, race and gender influence several moral boundaries items, providing some support that low status individuals stress moral boundaries more than high status individuals. Gender is also a significant predictor of moral boundaries, but results suggest that women value different aspects of morality than men.

Geographic location also has an important effect on cultural and moral boundaries: place size affects cultural boundaries and moral boundaries while region influences moral boundaries only. These variables do not shape the cultural and moral boundaries of the college graduates. However, place size impacts the cultural and moral boundaries of non-college graduates and region affects the moral boundaries of this group only, indicating that regional variations are more important for non-college graduates. Therefore, geographic location plays a substantial role in making cultural repertoires available to the non-college graduates, influencing the likelihood that they draw one type of boundary rather than another. College education weakens in a significant way the effect of geographic location on boundaries because of greater cultural homogeneity among college graduates.

Finally, participation in lifestyle clusters has an important effect on cultural and moral boundaries alike, with involvement in the high culture lifestyle cluster reinforcing cultural boundaries and participation in the religious lifestyle cluster bolstering moral boundaries. This influence persists among college graduates for both moral boundaries. However, it is more strongly present among non-college graduates than among college graduates.

The overall picture suggests that geographic location and participation in lifestyle clusters have particularly important effects on boundaries. Their role is especially significant for the boundaries of the non-college graduates because they mediate the availability of cultural repertoires from which respondents can draw for cultural and moral boundaries.

It should be noted that class affects symbolic boundaries both directly and indirectly. Indeed, participation in both lifestyles clusters are correlated with income and education, high participants having higher status. [21] This suggests that participation in lifestyle

---

[21] Income and education are significantly and positively correlated with church attendance. Three negative correlations appear between: (1) income and no religious affiliations (-0.056 *); (2) income and evangelical affiliation (-0.094 * *); and (3) college degree and evangelical affiliation (-0.142 * *) – with * indicating significance at the 0.05 level and * * indicating significance at the 0.01 level. Income is significantly correlated with visiting art museums (0.266 * *), going to classical music and opera events (0.229 * *) and watching PBS (0.093 * *). Furthermore, having a college degree is also correlated with visiting art museums (0.300 * *), going to classical music and opera events (0.322 * *) and watching PBS (0.065 * *).

clusters is reflective of class differences, but also influences cultural and moral bound-aries independently of class. Therefore, class and lifestyle cluster explanations are not competing hypotheses but complementary ones: structural position shapes lifestyles which in turn shapes how people draw boundaries, the latter being also shaped directly by class. It is possible that over the last thirty years, the impact of participation in lifestyle clusters on boundaries has grown as individuals have become increasingly involved in specialized leisure activities. However, research shows no significant differences in the effect of participation in lifestyle clusters on the boundaries of older and younger respondents. [22]

Another significant finding is that race is one of the strongest predictors of cultural boundaries, with African-Americans scoring higher on relevant items than whites. Again, this might point in part to the fact that African-Americans read questions about the importance of being cultured differently than whites, emphasizing their cultural distinctiveness. More qualitative research, of the type reported in Lamont (1992) is needed to map the heterogeneous definitions of culture that exist in the different status groups that make up a multicultural society. Moreover, differences in the way various groups conceive of morality should be explored, as suggested by our results that indicate that African-Americans and women are less likely to support traditional sexual morality than whites and men. Future research should also explore these issues.

Finally, our model predicts less variance for cultural boundaries than for moral boundaries. Two explanations could be offered for this. On the one hand, our measure of cultural boundaries is based on fewer items. On the other hand, these boundaries are less central to people's lives than moral boundaries. [23] Again, this is suggested by the fact that less than twenty percent of Americans participate in high culture activities (fn. 2). People are likely to have less polarized attitudes toward cultural boundary items than toward moral boundaries items. Indeed, sociologists argue that moral divisions are more salient to American society than divisions based on high culture (Hunter, 1990; Lamont, 1992).

Our findings are relevant to the debate on the survival of distinct class cultures. The powerful effect of lifestyle cluster variables bolsters the claim made by Hall (1992) that attempts to map symbolic boundaries must take into account multiple status groups.

---

[22] Furthermore, exploratory research does not suggest that geographic location and participation in lifestyle enclaves affect differently African-Americans and whites, women differently than men, and residents of the Northeast differently than residents of other regions.

[23] The greater centrality of moral boundaries is confirmed by frequencies in the GSS: Respectively 62 percent, 50 percent, and 62 percent of respondents say that God, marriage, and children are important and 70 percent and 37 percent say that homosexuality and premarital sex is wrong. These figures are quite polarized but they all suggest that respondents feel strongly in favor or against moral items. In contrast, 20 percent and 23 percent of Americans say that culture is a valued quality in friends and that culture is important in their lives and many view culture as irrelevant. This is the case of a postal service worker who criticizes cosmopolitan and cultured people because they are too much "into their looks and think they are too pretty or too handsome or something. I get sick of that ... because to me they are too much into themselves to be interested in anyone else or to even be bothered with anyone else". Similarly, a policeman says that he likes people who are a little rough on the edges because he is rough on the edges: "I burp when I want to burp. I might not use the proper fork that I'm supposed to".

Indeed, individuals often belong to many cross-cutting status groups. Theories on symbolic boundaries must be de-centered from a wholly class-centered approach to be able to account for this reality.

Appendix: Descriptive statistics

Variable name	Mean	Standard deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Dependent variables				
Importance of culture	2.99	0.93	1	5
Cultured friend	2.74	0.97	1	5
Anti-premarital sex	2.22	1.25	1	4
Anti-homosexuality	3.15	1.26	1	4
Importance of marriage	3.34	1.24	1	5
Importance of children	3.59	1.18	1	5
Importance of God	4.10	1.09	1	5
Independent variables				
College degree	0.23	0.42	0	0
Log of income	10.13	0.96	6	11
African-Americans	0.12	0.32	0	1
Women	0.57	0.50	0	1
South	0.35	0.48	0	1
Midwest	0.25	0.44	0	1
West	0.21	0.41	0	1
Large metropolitan area	0.39	0.49	0	1
Age	46.04	17.37	18	89
Watch PBS	3.28	1.25	1	5
Visit art museum	0.41	0.50	0	1
Go to classical music/opera	0.16	0.37	0	1
Attend religious services	1.12	0.32	1	8
Evangelical	0.32	0.46	0	1
Catholic	0.22	0.41	0	1
No religion	0.09	0.29	0	1
Jewish	0.02	0.14	0	1
Other religion	0.05	0.23	0	1
Single	0.18	0.39	0	1
Divorced/separated	0.17	0.38	0	1
Widowed	0.11	0.31	0	1
Children in household	0.26	0.44	0	1

References

Ammerman, Nancy, 1987. Bible believers: Fundamentalists in the modern world. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Baltzell, E.D., 1979. Puritan Boston and Quaker Philadelphia: Two protestant ethics and the spirit of class authority and leadership. New York: Free Press.

Beisel, Nicola, 1992. Constructing a shifting moral boundary: Literature and obscenity in nineteenth-century America. In: Michèle Lamont and Marcel Fournier (eds.), Cultivating differences: Symbolic boundaries and the making of inequality, 104–128. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Bellah, Robert N., Richard Madsen, William W. Sullivan, Ann Swidler and Steve Tipton, 1985. Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Berger, Bennett, 1992. Structure and choice in the sociology of culture. Theory and Society 20, 1–19.

Blau, Judith R., 1986. The elite arts, more or less de rigueur: A comparative analysis of metropolitan culture. Social Forces 86, 875–905.

Blau, Judith R., 1988. The context of art attendance. Social Science Quarterly 69, 930–941.

Blau, Peter M. and Otis D. Duncan, 1967. The American occupational structure. New York: Wiley.

Bourdieu, Pierre, 1984. Distinction. A social critique of the judgment of taste. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brint, Steven, 1984. 'New class' and cumulative trend explanations of the liberal political attitudes of professionals. American Journal of Sociology 90, 30–71.

Brint, Steven, 1985. The political attitudes of professionals. Annual Review of Sociology 11, 389–414.

Bryson, Bethany, forthcoming. 'Anything but Heavy Metal'? Identity, ideology, and exclusion in musical tastes. American Sociological Review.

Clark, Terry N., Seymour Martin Lipset and Michael Rempel, 1993. The declining political significance of social class. International Sociology 8, 293–316.

Cochran, John K., 1991. The influence of religion on attitudes toward non-marital sexuality: A preliminary assessment of reference group theory. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 30(1), 45–62.

Coleman, Richard and Lee Rainwater, with Kent A. McClelland, 1978. Social standing in America: New dimensions of class. New York: Basic Books.

Collins, Patricia Hill, 1990. The social construction of black feminist thought. In: M. Malson, E. Mudimbe-Boyi, J. O'Barr and M. Wyer (eds.), Black women in America: Social science perspectives, 297–326. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Collins, Randall, 1979. The credential society. New York: Academic Press.

Collins, Randall, 1992. Women and the production of status culture. In: Michèle Lamont and Marcel Fournier, Cultivating differences: Symbolic boundaries and the making of inequality, 213–231. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Crane, Diana, 1992. The production of culture: Media and the urban arts. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Davies, Christie, 1982. Sexual taboos and social boundaries. American Journal of Sociology 87, 1032–1063.

Davis, Fred, 1992. Fashion, culture, and identity. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Davis, James A., 1982. Achievement variables and class cultures: Family schooling, job, and forty-nine dependent variables in the cumulative GSS. American Sociological Review 47, 56–86.

Davis, James and Tom Smith, 1992. The NORC general social survey: A user's guide. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Davis, Natalie Zemon, 1975. Society and culture in early modern France. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

DeCecco, John (ed.), 1984. Homophobia: An overview. New York: Hawthorn Press.

Di Leonardo, Micaela, 1985. Morals, mothers and militarism: Anti-militarism and feminist theory. Feminist Studies 11, 599–617.

DiMaggio, Paul, 1982a. Cultural entrepreneurship in nineteenth-century Boston: The creation of an organizational reinterpretation of mass culture. Journal of Popular Culture 11, 436–452.

DiMaggio, Paul, 1982b. Cultural capital and school success: The impact of status culture participation on the grades of US 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, 12341–12346.

DiMaggio, Paul and Francie Ostrower, 1990. Participation in the arts by black and white Americans. Social Forces 68, 753–778.

DiMaggio, Paul and Michael Useem, 1978. Social class and arts consumption: The origins and consequences of class differences in exposure to the arts in America. Theory and Society 5, 141–161.

Donnat, Olivier and Denis Cogneau, 1990. Les pratiques culturelles des français 1973–1989. Paris: La Découverte/Documentation Française.

Douglas, Mary and Baron Isherwood, 1979. The world of goods: Toward an anthropology of consumption. New York: W.W. Norton.

Duneier, Mitchell, 1992. Slim's table. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Erikson, Kai T., 1966. Wayward puritans: A study in the sociology of deviance. New York: Wiley.

Fine, Gary Alan, 1979. Small groups and culture creation: The idioculture of little league baseball teams. American Sociological Review 44, 733–745.

Fischer, Claude, 1982. To dwell among friends: Personal networks in town and city. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Gans, Herbert J., 1974. Popular culture and high culture: An analysis and evaluation of taste. New York: Basic Books.

Gecas, Viktor, 1979. The influence of social class on socialization. In: Wesley R. Burr, Reuben Hill, F. Ivan Nye and Ira L. Reiss, Contemporary theories about the family, vol. 1, 365–404. New York: Free Press.

Gilligan, Carol, 1982. In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ginsburg, Faye, 1989. Contested lives: The abortion debate in an American community. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Green, John, James Guth, Lyman Kellstedt and Corwin Smidt, 1992. National survey of American Evangelicals. Paper presented at the meetings of the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion.

Greenberg, Marshall G. and Ronald E. Frank, 1983. Leisure lifestyles: Segmentation by interests, needs, demographics and television viewing. American Behavioral Scientist 26, 439–458.

Griswold, Wendy, 1994. Cultures and societies in a changing world. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Gusfield, Joseph, 1963. Symbolic crusades. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Hall, John, 1992. The capital(s) of culture: A non-holistic approach to gender, ethnicity, class, and status groups. In: Michèle Lamont and Marcel Fournier (eds.), Cultivating differences: Symbolic boundaries and the making of inequality, 257–288. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Halle, David, 1984. America's working man: Work, home, and politics among blue-collar property owners. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Halle, David, 1993. Inside culture: Art and class in the American home. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Hartsock, Nancy, 1983. Money, sex and power: Toward a feminist historical materialism. New York: Longman.

Hebdige, Dick, 1979. Subculture: The meaning of style. London: Methuen.

Herberg, Will, 1955. Protestant, Catholic, Jew. New York: Doubleday.

Hochschild, Jennifer, 1995. Facing up to the American dream: Race, class and the soul of the nation. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Holt, Douglas B., forthcoming. Does social class structure contemporary American consumption? A reformulation and empirical investigation of cultural capital theory. International Journal of Consumer Research.

Hout, Michael, 1988. More universalism, less structural mobility: The American occupational structure in the 1980s. American Journal of Sociology 93(3), 1358–1400.

Hunter, James Davidson, 1983. American evangelicalism: Conservative Protestants and the quandary of modernity. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Hunter, James Davidson, 1987. Evangelicalism: The coming generation. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Hunter, James Davidson, 1993. Culture wars: The struggle to define America. New York: Basic Books.

Hurrelman, Klaus, 1988. Social structure and personality development: The individual as a productive processor of reality. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jaynes, Gerald David and Robin M. Williams, Jr., 1989. A common destiny. African-Americans in American society. Washington, DC: Academic Press.

Jeffries, Vincent and Edward Ransford, 1980. Social stratification: A multiple hierarchy approach. Boston, MA: Alley and Bacon.

Jones, James M., 1991. The politics of personality: Being black in America. In: Reginald L. Jones (ed.), Black psychology, 305–319. Berkeley, CA: Cobb and Henry.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss, 1977. Men and women of the corporation. New York: Basic Books.

Keil, Charles, 1966. Urban blues. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Kelley, Robin D.G., 1993. Check the technique: Black urban culture and the predicament of social science. Paper presented at the Conference on Re-Configuring the Culture Concept. Center for the Comparative Studies in Social Transformation. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Kerckhoff, Alan C., 1972. Socialization and social class. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kohn, Melvin L., 1987. Cross-national research as an analytic strategy. American Sociological Review 52, 713–731.

Lamont, Michèle, 1992. Money, morals and manners: The culture of the French and the American upper-middle class. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Lamont, Michèle, 1995. National identity and national boundary patterns in France and the United States. French Historical Studies 19(2), 349–365.

Lamont, Michèle, forthcoming. Colliding moralities between black and white workers. In: Elizabeth Long (ed.), Sociology and cultural studies. New York: Blackwell.

Lamont, Michèle and Marcel Fournier (eds.), 1992. Cultivating differences: Symbolic boundaries and the making of inequality. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Lamont, Michèle and Annette Lareau, 1988. Cultural capital: Allusions, gaps, and glissandos in recent theoretical developments. Sociological Theory 6(2), 153–168.

Lasch, Chirstopher, 1995. The triumph of the elite and the betrayal of democracy. New York: W.W. Norton.

Leege, David and Lyman Kellstedt, 1993. Rediscovering the religious factor in American life. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Lemert, Charles (ed.), 1993. Social theory: The multicultural and classic readings. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Lewis, G., 1980. Taste cultures and their composition: Towards a new theoretical perspective. In: E. Katz and T. Szeckso (eds.), Mass media and social change, 201–218. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lincoln C. Eric and Laurence Mamiya, 1990. The black church in the African-American experience. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Lipset, Seymour Martin, 1979. The first new nation: The United States in historical and comparative perspective. New York: Norton.

Luker, Kristin, 1984. Abortion and the politics of motherhood. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Marsden, Peter V. and Joseph F. Swingle, 1994. Conceptualizing and measuring culture in surveys: Values, strategies, and symbols. Poetics 22, 269–289.

Marsden, Peter V., John Shelton Reed, Michael Kennedy and Kandi M. Stinson, 1982. American regional cultures and differences in leisure time activities. Social Forces 60, 1023–1049.

Mohr, John and Paul DiMaggio, forthcoming. The intergenerational transmission of cultural capital. In: Michael Wallace (ed.), Resarch on social stratification and mobility. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Peterson, Richard A. and Albert Simkus, 1992. How musical tastes mark occupational status groups. In: Michèle Lamont and Marcel Fournier (eds.), Cultivating differences: Symbolic boundaries and the making of inequality, 152–186. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Peterson, Richard A. and Michael Hughes, 1989. Isolating patterns of cultural choice to facilitate the formation of culture indicators. In: F. Melischek, K.E. Rosengren and J. Stappers (eds.), Cultural indicators: An international symposium, 443–452. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Reed, John Shelton, 1983. Southerners. The social psychology of sectionalism. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Roof, Wade Clark and William McKinney, 1987. American mainline religion: Its changing shape and future. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Ruddick, Sara, 1980. Maternal thinking. Feminist Studies 6(2): 342–366.

Ryan, John and Larry Debord, 1991. High culture orientation and the attitudes and values of college students. Sociological Inquiry 61, 346–358.

Schmalzbauer, John, 1993. Evangelicals in the new class: Class versus subcultural predictors of ideology. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 32, 330–343.

Scott, James C., 1990. Domination and the art of resistance: Hidden transcripts. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Scott, Joan Wallach, 1988. Gender and the politics of history. New York: Columbia University Press.

Seidman, Steven (ed.), 1994. The postmodern turn. New perspectives on social theory. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, Tom, 1986. Classifying protestant denominations. GSS Technical Report No. 67. Chicago, IL: National Opinion Research Center.

Stack, Carol, 1974. All our kin. Strategies for survival in a black community. New York: Harper and Row.

Stack, Carol, 1986. The culture of gender: Women and men of color. Signs 11, 321–324.

Swidler, Ann, 1986. Culture in action: Symbols and strategies. American Sociological Review 51, 273–286.

Tocqueville, Alexis de, 1954. Democracy in America. New York: Vintage Books.

U.S. Department of Commerce, 1993. Statistical abstract of the United States 1993. Washington, DC: Bureau of the Census.

Veblen, Thorstein, 1912. The theory of the leisure class. New York: B.W. Huelbsh.

Weber, Max, 1958 [1904]. The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism. New York: Scribners.

Wilkinson, Rupert, 1988. The pursuit of American character. New York: Harper and Row.

Wilkinson, Rupert, 1992. American social character: Modern interpretations from the 40's to the present. New York: Icon Editions.

Wood, Michael and Michael Hughes, 1984. The moral basis of moral reform: Status discontent vs. culture and socialization as explanations of anti-pornography social movement adherence. American Sociological Review 49, 86–99.

Wuthnow, Robert, 1988. The restructuring of American religion. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.