

Networks segregation, reference groups and preferences for redistribution

Julio César Iturra Sanhueza

2023-04-23

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Reference groups, personal networks, and perceived inequality	5
2.1	Reference groups and images about inequality	5
2.2	Comparison and reference groups	7
2.3	Perceived inequality and redistributive preferences	9
3	Structure of association and social networks	11
3.1	Positions, association and tie formation	11
3.2	Social networks and resources	12
3.3	Class-based inequality in social networks	14
3.4	The role of macro-social conditions	15
4	Social networks, perceived and preferred inequality	17
4.1	Social segregation and inequality perceptions	17
4.2	Social ties on the demand for redistribution and welfare	19
5	Research plan	22
5.1	Study 1 (S1)	22
5.2	Study 2 (S2)	22
5.3	Study 3	23
	References	24

Introduction

Rising economic inequality over the past few decades (Piketty & Goldhammer, 2014) and the ongoing sanitary crisis have raised citizens' concerns about economic inequality pushing governments to enact redistributive policies, which has tested the capacity of welfare systems to provide sufficient risk protection for the population (Brenzau, 2021). However, while the crisis has impacted societies, its consequences have been unequally distributed across the social structure. Therefore, the privileged access to resources held by the upper and intermediate classes has consolidated affluent groups' resilience capacity, allowing them to maintain a relatively stable standard of living, in contrast to the decline in the material conditions of working-class families (Moawad & Oesch, 2023). In addition, these transformations have been accompanied by a subjective corollary in which economic inequality experiences strengthen subjective economic deprivation and undermine perceived social status (Nolan & Weisstanner, 2022; Oesch & Vigna, 2022).

The research on individual preferences toward economic redistribution constitutes an interdisciplinary field in the social sciences (Alesina & Giuliano, 2010; Steele & Brenzau, 2019). Across this body of literature, the common conceptual denominator is that individuals tend to hold different views about what should be the government's role in taking redistributive measures for providing welfare to their citizens. Likewise, different explanatory mechanisms for preference formation have been proposed, including explanations derived from the economic self-interest mechanism (Alesina et al., 2018; Meltzer & Richard, 1981) as well as the normative or value-driven motivations (Feldman & Steenbergen, 2001; Maldonado et al., 2019). Recently, the study of preferences towards redistribution has turned attention to the psychosocial processes involved in forming perceived economic inequality at the micro-level, focusing on (i) one's structural positions and (ii) the role of reference groups in social networks.

The idea that friends, family, or acquaintances influence how people experience social life has been previously addressed in the social network literature in sociology (McPherson et al., 2001). However, there has been no systematic dialogue regarding the role of social circles in subjective perceptions of economic inequality and preferences for redistribution from a social network perspective. In this regard, one theoretical claim of the Reference Group and Reality blend hypothesis (Evans, 2004; Kelley & Evans, 1995) suggests that structural positions imply a certain level of social closure which is reflected in the homophily of reference groups, making individuals embedded in more homogeneous and segregated networks hold inaccurate views about others' experiences regarding economic inequality, as well as their perceived position in the social hierarchy. Therefore, the level of segregation in social networks between different structural positions is not only a reflection of economic inequality but also represents the social distance between members of society, which can threaten social attachment and solidarity (Joye

et al., 2019; Otero, Volker, Rözer, et al., 2022). Consequently, it is argued that redistributive preferences may be influenced by social networks, where the socioeconomic diversity of social ties provides a broader window for learning about others' lifestyles, economic conditions, and worldviews, which in turn contributes to supporting more egalitarian policy measures to strive against inequality (Lee, 2023; Lindh et al., 2021; Paskov & Weisstanner, 2022)

This research aims to contribute to the literature on preferences toward redistribution from a social network approach, focusing on how the structural properties of networks can influence people's preferences toward economic redistribution. Therefore, the question this research aims to answer is *What is the role of social networks on the preferences for economic redistribution?* Therefore, the present research proposal presents three main sections in which the related literature has addressed the role of (i) reference groups in shaping views about inequality, (ii) the structure of association and networks, and (iii) the consequences of both in the study of redistributive preferences. Finally, a research plan composed of three independent studies is proposed to address the claimed research gap.

Reference groups, personal networks, and perceived inequality

2.1 Reference groups and images about inequality

Building on the early work of Kluegel & Smith (1981), the study of economic inequality from a subjective approach has suggested that people's beliefs about economic affairs are stratified according to their position in the social hierarchy (Aalberg, 2003; Kluegel et al., 1995). In addition, the sociological distributive justice literature has contributed to explaining how people form their judgments based on how their structural position, as well as by their perceptions of economic inequality and social status (Jasso, 2001; Wegener, 1987). However, regardless of these contributions, there is still a gap knowledge gap between the formation of inequality perception and the study of redistributive preferences (Condon & Wichowsky, 2020a; García-Sánchez et al., 2019). In this line, further research on redistributive preferences should go beyond the rational self-interest model and value-driven explanations by focusing on the influence of reference groups on perceived and preferred economic inequality.

For the material self-interest model (Meltzer & Richard, 1981), the position within the income distribution is crucial for explaining preferences for redistribution. However, two propositions have been discussed in that regard. 1) individuals are *aware* of their income relative to others in society, and 2) their inference about the income of others is *accurate*. Recent research on perceived inequality has questioned these assumptions, suggesting that the claimed utilitarian motivation in the self-interest model could be confounded by the influence of reference groups on perception (Becker, 2021; Condon & Wichowsky, 2020a; Hvidberg et al., 2020; Trump, 2023).

The role of reference groups on perception has been previously addressed by social psychology and sociology. Social comparison theory suggests self-evaluation is driven by comparison with reference groups that are conceived as similar (Festinger, 1954). This implies that comparison can be performed across objective or subjective domains, like physical ability or opinions, but also about economic wealth or social prestige. Equity Theory has contributed to the idea of proportionality of outcomes in justice evaluation. In this regard, when an exchange is carried out by individuals of similar characteristics, it is expected that the output corresponds with the initial investment (Adams, 1965). Consequently, justice evaluations will be a function of the input and output equivalence. For instance, disproportionately low results regarding the initial investment could lead to negative justice evaluations and more prominent experiences of deprivation. Likewise, contributions from the Relative Deprivation Theory (Merton & Rossi, 1968) highlight the perceived status of reference groups in the evaluation process. The assumption

of inequality is crucial when evaluating the outcome of an exchange between multiple actors that are perceived as asymmetric. Moreover, the distributive justice literature has suggested that judgments about distributional outcomes are linked with previous perceptions of actual distribution (Wegener, 1990). The explanation suggests that the observer's social status can lead to illusionary distributional perceptions that consequently could bias distributional judgments (Wegener, 1987). Hence, even if there is a relative consensus about the relevance of reference groups in social comparison and justice evaluations, there is still little evidence that links their attributes to perceptions and preferences toward income inequality in a more comprehensive way.

Evans et al. (1992) early contributions have proposed two dimensions to analyse the role of reference groups on perceived images of stratification and social status. First, one aspect is to consider income or wealth, educational level, or occupation as the individual socioeconomic basis that constitutes and shapes individual experience with economic inequality. Therefore, they argue that perceptions of economic inequality and status would be partially explained by these material conditions. However, they just tell a piece of the story because objective conditions by themselves are not enough to explain the psychosocial processes involved in the emergence of images about social stratification (Evans et al., 1992). On the other hand, they suggested that socioeconomic status entails a type of social closure generated by the homophily of personal networks, arguing that the socioeconomic composition of reference groups can influence subjective images about stratification and social status (Evans, 2004). These circumstances contribute to what is called a subjective sampling phenomenon, described as a type of availability heuristic that generates inaccurate perceptions. The main argument is that individuals perceive society according to the distribution of income, education, occupations, and authority from the people around them (Evans et al., 1992, p. 465). In this line, they suggest that individuals in both high and low-status groups tend to misperceive the size of those who are above or below them, like a family doctor compared to a medical school professor, or a skilled worker compared to a garbage collector. Therefore, as people tend to prefer to engage in comparisons with similar others, there is a tendency of perceiving themselves in the middle of the social hierarchy due to the overestimation of the size of their reference groups.

In order to inquire about the validity of previous findings in broader contexts, Evans & Kelley (2017) tested to what extent the reference group theory is consistent in cross-national comparisons. They demonstrate that economic development as a macro condition has a micro consequence on perceived economic inequality because it influences the size of potential high-status reference groups (Evans & Kelley, 2017, p. 32). They suggest as long as economic prosperity rise, socioeconomic status in terms of income, education, and occupation increases at the individual level, but also the average economic conditions of others around such as relatives, friends or co-workers. However, a limitation of this conclusion is the theoretical assumption of reference groups on perceived structural inequality without systematic evidence in this regard. In turn, they provide exceptional evidence of the influence of the subjective position of (1) friends, co-workers, and one's occupation, and (2) family or origin, demonstrating that at least in the United States and Australia, reference groups with higher subjective status do indeed perceive society as more egalitarian (Evans & Kelley, 2017, p. 33)

The literature on subjective social status has contributed with three main remarks. First, the middle-class perceptual bias is a persistent phenomenon across countries, showing that economic prosperity increases subjective status, while income inequality diminishes it (Lindemann & Saar, 2014). Second, there is a moderate association with structural position measures, such as social class or education (Andersson & Lindh, 2022; Castillo et al., 2013; Iturra & Mellado,

2018). However, has been shown that income has a strong positive effect in cross-national (Lindemann & Saar, 2014) and longitudinal studies (Chen & Williams, 2018). Furthermore, it has been demonstrated that personal wealth increases perceived individual social status (Andersson, 2018). Third, the argument of the relevance of reference groups in personal networks and the influence of structural conditions has been named by Kelley & Evans (1995) as the Reference Group and Reality blend (R&R-blend) hypothesis. This approach claims that economic growth, income inequality, and the homophily of reference groups jointly shape perceptions about the stratification system. In addition, these images have an anchor effect on how individuals perceived themselves in the social hierarchy. For example, if society is perceived as more egalitarian, people tend to perceive their inner social circle and themselves in higher structural positions, but also if society is seen as more elitarian they will perceive their reference groups and themselves in lower status positions (Evans & Kelley, 2017).

Previous literature has described reference groups as those who are close to the individual, like family and friends, but also refer to acquaintances that are not necessarily persons with whom frequent contact is made. In this line, given that interaction is not only limited to the closest personal networks, it would also be reasonable to consider them as the most significant interactions, but not as the unique source of information about the distribution of socioeconomic resources in society. Taking this point into consideration, the claimed link between income inequality and preferences for redistribution should shed light on (1) how comparisons with reference groups are performed in the social environment, (2) the characteristics of reference groups in personal networks, and (3) to what extent their composition affects experiences and perceptions about economic inequality as an explanatory mechanism of redistributive preferences.

2.2 Comparison and reference groups

When addressing the influence of reference groups, an important dimension relies on *who* are the observed target groups. The previous argument suggests that inequality perceptions are influenced by social comparison processes, which can be theoretically explained by the R&R-blend hypothesis through the homophilic tendency of social ties formation. However, this approach assumes that comparison focuses on individuals with similar attributes from the closest network without specifying if this mechanism could apply to diverse groups, implying that asymmetric comparison could lead to different outcomes. A recent review suggests that studying the role of reference groups in comparison processes might consider three dimensions: *direction* (e.g., upward, downward), *target* (e.g., friend, stranger), and *dimension* (e.g., status, appearance) (Arigo et al., 2020). For example, it would be possible to expect that contact could lead to experiencing more relative deprivation when the reference group is considered to dent higher status and social prestige (Smith et al., 2020). Furthermore, it has been emphasised that upward comparison, rather than downward experiences, can trigger experiences of relative deprivation and increase perceived economic inequality (Jasso, 1990), which could undermine life satisfaction and subjective well-being (Schneider, 2019). However, one implication of these claims requires identifying the relevance of certain reference groups and their attributes when addressing economic affairs. An additional inquiry is to examine the hypothetical link between homophilic social ties embedded in personal networks on perceptions and preferences toward economic inequality.

Previous studies have addressed the theoretical claim that certain groups are preferred when personal economic conditions are described and evaluated. For example, Clark & Senik (2010) examined the intensity and direction of income comparisons. A first remark is that the greater

importance attributed to income comparison, the higher the chances of declaring work colleagues as the preferred reference group, followed by family and friends. Furthermore, those without a marital partner, highly educated, less affluent, and self-employed are less likely to compare. Additionally, almost all employees are more likely to compare with work colleagues than with family and friends. Another study scrutinised the preferred reference groups for economic comparisons of former socialist and European citizens, showing that friends and neighbours are the most prevalent choice in both regions (Gugushvili, 2021, p. 12). Furthermore, those active in the labour market, living in an urban area, and with higher subjective status preferred to compare with friends and neighbours. Additionally, individuals with tertiary education and perceived downward mobility tend to prefer the family of origin as the reference group. However, a limitation of this study is that preferred groups are not freely declared, including other groups like domestic elites, the western European region, or the country of residence in 1989, excluding other relevant groups such as co-workers in economic comparisons (Clark & Senik, 2010).

Research on the influence of asymmetric reference groups on perceived inequality and preferences for redistribution has gained increasing attention recently. Clark & Senik (2010) found that individuals who prioritize social comparisons and choose family members as their reference group tend to demand higher levels of redistribution. Similarly, Cansunar (2021) reported that high-income individuals tend to support progressive taxation when they perceive themselves as occupying the highest rungs of the social hierarchy but also believe that others earn substantially more than them. Also, García-Castro et al. (2022) showed that frequent interaction with individuals considered “much richer (poorer)” has a positive effect on redistributive preferences when the reference group is deemed poorer, but no effect when it is considered richer. Experimental research has also provided supportive evidence. For example, Brown-Iannuzzi et al. (2015) conducted a study on an online sample of American participants and found that redistributive preferences are likely to increase when individuals make upward social comparisons and perceive themselves to be worse than average in economic terms. Meanwhile, Condon & Wichowsky (2020b) analyzed a representative sample of American adults and discovered that upward social comparison diminishes subjective social status, but has no significant impact on general redistributive preferences. Instead, it increases demands for specific policies, such as poverty relief and unemployment insurance. Additionally, the upward comparison effect is more pronounced among upper-income individuals, suggesting that they imagine the advantaged others as individuals with outstanding amounts of wealth and power (Condon & Wichowsky, 2020a, p. 80 - 100).

The aforementioned observational and experimental evidence offers valuable insights into the social psychological mechanisms that link reference groups and redistributive preferences. However, an important consideration is how these interactions occur in everyday life, given that social, economic, and institutional factors often segregate individuals and groups (Mijs & Roe, 2021). An assumption in this regard is that nuances in social interactions with reference groups, such as their intensity and direction, provide a framework for inferring how economic resources are distributed in society. Yet, limitations of the reference group approach exist, such as (1) the difficulty of identifying specific groups relevant to an individual, (2) the challenge of describing groups in terms of socioeconomic or demographic characteristics, and (3) the ambiguity of their relevance to the individual. Evans & Kelley (2017) suggested that the homophilic nature of personal networks could serve as an inferential framework for inequality perceptions in general, and redistributive preferences in particular. Empirical research has partially supported their theoretical claims about the importance of family, friends, neighbours,

and coworkers as relevant reference groups (Clark & Senik, 2010; Gugushvili, 2021).

2.3 Perceived inequality and redistributive preferences

The debate concerning the role of economic inequality in increasing the demand for redistribution established by the self-interest approach through the median voter hypothesis has received partial empirical support, being consistent when addressing between-country differences but absent in within-country variations on income inequality (Franetovic & Castillo, 2022; Schmidt-Catran, 2016). Notwithstanding, an ongoing debate around an alternative mechanism that might explain the connection of economic inequality with redistributive preferences has focused on the socio-psychological processes involved in forming subjective appraisals of economic inequality and social status (Castillo et al., 2022). Empirical efforts have been quite robust in establishing that among the different conceptualisations of perceived economic inequality, demand for redistribution increases when people perceive that economic inequality is higher (Bobzien, 2019; Evans & Kelley, 2018; García-Castro et al., 2022; García-Sánchez et al., 2019; García-Sánchez & De Carvalho Galvão, 2022). A recent study by Trump (2023) has simultaneously discussed two crucial aspects of the claims of Meltzer & Richard (1981) employing comparative survey data. First, she demonstrates that actual income inequality is not linked to perceived inequality (as salary gaps). Second, preferences for inequality and redistribution are associated with perceived inequality. Third, income inequality is not associated with either redistributive or inequality preferences. Hence, these results align with the idea that the comparison process between perceived inequality and desired (lower) economic inequality is what theoretically increases demand for redistribution (Trump, 2023).

Part of the literature has argued that the divided results regarding the link between current inequality and demand for redistribution might be related to the lack of information about the distribution of economic resources in society leading people to misperceive economic inequality (Kelley & Evans, 1993; Osberg & Smeeding, 2006). However, the argument can be discussed in two aspects. First, survey instruments can cognitively challenge respondents when addressing quantiles, distributions, or numeric representations, such as wage inequality in contrast to graphical representations, which can lead to substantial differences in the size of the claimed misperception (Hadavand, 2018, p. 249). Second, even when experimental studies have shown that providing accurate information about economic inequality can influence perceptions that align preferences with self-interest (see Stantcheva, 2021; Hvidberg et al., 2020; Karadja et al., 2017; McCall et al., 2017), the question of how this mechanism operates in everyday life social environments has yet to be further investigated.

Given that an individual's experience and information about society are often limited by their personal networks composed of family, friends, and acquaintances (Mijs, 2018), a first implication is to focus on describing and analysing these attributes as a subsequent analytical step for understanding their consequences on perceptual and attitudinal outcomes. Therefore, echoing Evans & Kelley (1992; 2004; 1995) original claims about the influence of homophily on perceived economic inequality and subjective status, recent research has focused on social networks as a way of describing social environments and assessing their consequences for perceived and preferred economic inequality. It is worth mentioning that the R&R blend hypothesis relies on the concept of *homophily* of reference groups for developing their argument without directly referring to the longstanding literature on social networks (McPherson et al., 2001). Notwithstanding, recent research has adopted a network analysis approach for studying the influence of network composition and social capital on perceptual and attitudinal outcomes. Since

both bodies of literature have little dialogue, analysing redistributive preferences from a social network approach constitutes a comprehensive way of understanding the link between social networks, perceived inequality and economic preferences.

Structure of association and social networks

3.1 Positions, association and tie formation

The study of personal networks requires describing the social structure as the basis for association patterns among individuals. The influential work of Peter Blau (1977b) suggested that examining the nexus between people's positions and social relations implies paying attention to social differentiation, understood as the distribution of social position across the population. These positions are determined by hierarchical status and group membership, representing two forms of differentiation: inequality and heterogeneity. However, the foundations of social structure analysis count on the observable patterns of social association between these positions. The claimed emphasis on social processes of differentiation is rooted in how they shape interpersonal relations in the social structure, often conceptualised as relational networks (Blau, 1977b). Given the distribution and intersection of nominal (groups) and graduated (status) parameters, such as religious diversity or income distribution, the substantive focus is on how society's structural conditions shape social barriers providing opportunities for contact and association (Blau, 1977a, p. 51). The strength of the intersection between parameters reveals the degree of consolidation, for example, the correlation of graduated parameters such as education and income and their intersection with ethnicity as a nominal parameter. Consequently, consolidation influences social integration in order that intervenes in the chances of interaction between persons from diverse groups and statuses (Blau, 1977a, p. 33).

Structural and individual conditions that allow associativity are at the core of social network analysis. One of the most significant findings in the field is homophily, understood as the observed tendency of higher frequency of contact and tie formation between individuals of similar characteristics (McPherson et al., 2001). These associations are structurally differentiated, tending to be segregated by hierarchical status and group membership (*status homophily*), such as education, gender, age, religious affiliation (Bargsted et al., 2020), social class (Wright & Cho, 1992) or ethnicity (Plaza et al., 2022). Furthermore, sociopsychological factors affect homophilic association as well, where behaviour and individual preferences tend to reinforce in-group dynamics (*value homophily*), isolating individuals from others' worldviews and opinions (Diprete et al., 2011; Visser & Mirabile, 2004). However, it is assumed that the influence of these factors strongly depends on the dynamic provided by structural constraints, such as group size and diversity (Blau, 1977b). Thus, it is expected that both contact opportunities and association preferences contribute to establishing relatively isolated social environments (McPherson & Smith, 2019). Furthermore, this homophilic tendency generates that resources, information and behaviour tend to be segregated, implying that network structure introduces a certain degree of social distance, establishing boundaries among people's social worlds (McPherson et

al., 2001).

Associativity depends on people's similarities, but intergroup contact in everyday social activities makes meeting opportunities possible. According to Feld (1981), the *foci* can be a social, psychological or physical entity around which joint activities are organised (e.g. places, persons, families, voluntary organisations). Therefore, when people participate in activities around the same focus, they tend to be interpersonally tied and form a dense cluster group. The focused organisation of social activities is considered more determinant than individual similarities. For example, even if two individuals are similar in their characteristics, the absence of a *foci* and the joint activities around it will decrease their chances of association. This approach is critical of Homan's group balance theory (Homans, 1951), which proposes that attitudinal and value similarities foster association, paying less attention to status or group membership similarities on tie formation around a *foci*. Notwithstanding, the focus theory recognises the relevance of the psychological dimension. Still, it suggests that organised activity spaces constitute a dominant source of ties and represent a significant aspect of people's social environments.

The strength of ties depends on the nature of the association. As focus theory suggests (Feld, 1981), the multiplexity of social positions implies that certain activity spaces matter most in forming social ties (Blau, 1977a). For example, the size of friendship networks tends to decrease through the transition to adulthood, while kinship ties such as the family of origin or partner choices tend to be more stable (Gugushvili, 2021; Lin et al., 2017). Additionally, considering that intergroup associativity is influenced by the degree of social differentiation, certain social ties that cross boundaries are prompt to dissolution in the absence of spaces that integrate people around a *foci*, such as voluntary organizations, schools or workplaces (Kossinets & Watts, 2009; McPherson et al., 2001). Hence, given that social integration entails the degree of intergroup relations through personal ties of association, network segregation reflects the social distance between groups and the availability of social resources embedded in social networks.

3.2 Social networks and resources

Social capital scholars have provided insightful contributions to studying resource inequality through social networks (Lin, 2001). This approach suggests that a person's social environment can be studied through ego-centred networks in which the dyads between a person (*ego*) and their contacts (*alteri*) represent the tie that provides access to resources, arguing that it is possible to characterise the access to valued resources like wealth, status or power through social ties, which provide researchers with an image of how stratified social environments are according to personal and social resources embedded in the ego's social network (Lin & Dumin, 1986). From this perspective, personal resources are those possessed by an individual that can be used and disposed of freely without much concern for compensation. On the other hand, social resources are temporary and borrowed resources that can be accessed through one's direct and indirect ties (Lin, 1999).

According to social capital theory, the mobilisation of resources embedded in social networks is conceptualised in two types of outcomes: instrumental and expressive actions (Lin, 2001). Instrumental actions are described as the expected returns because of access to resources through social ties, such as the influence of acquaintances on the status attainment process (Contreras et al., 2019; Granovetter, 1973). It has been suggested that instrumental actions take the form of three types of possible returns: economic, political, and social (Lin, 2001). It is argued that these three added social capital forms are objects of exchange processes. For example, increas-

ing occupational status can be the key feature of higher authority positions in the workplace, representing increased control and influence as a political outcome. In addition, these positions can increase social recognition when considered legitimate, boosting trust towards ego within the network (Diprete et al., 2011). Among the possible explanations, three key processes have been described: information, influence and social credentials (Lin, 2001). For instance, certain strategic locations in the labour market (e.g. managers) provide meaningful information about job opportunities that could only exist with the tie. Additionally, authority and power positions imply influence on organisational decisions, like collaboration or member inclusion. Moreover, social credentials are attractive for organisations interested in the contacts held by certain positions, which incentivises organisational consolidation.

Expressive outcomes are described as actions in which the expected return is social capital protection and consolidation to avoid any losses toward preserving current embedded resources and guarantee access to them (van der Gaag et al., 2008). The motivation for mobilisation to preserve pooled social resources comprises the broad network members, integrating ego's and alter's interests. In this line, the theory points out three main expressive returns: physical health, mental health and life satisfaction. Expressive actions aim to maintain the primary material and social resources to ensure protection and support against any threat that might harm physical or mental integrity and maintain optimism and satisfaction among family, work and community spheres (Lin, 2000). Both expressive and instrumental actions are not univocally independent and can reinforce each other. For example, physical and mental health is the basis for sustainable job performance or pursuing organisational leadership responsibilities (Lin, 2001).

Methodologically speaking, among the ego-centred network sampling techniques, the position and name generators represent the most used instrument for measuring positions of social contacts. The position generator is a standard method to assess an individual's access to different types of resources located in social positions (Lin & Erickson, 2008). This technique was first proposed by Lin & Dumin (1986) and employs a sample of structural positions representative of resources highly valued collectively, such as occupations, authority, work units, class, or sector (Lin, 1999). Along with the list of positions, a set of questions can be included to describe the relationship between ego and alter, such as if they are friends, family or acquaintances. The position generator has been demonstrated to be a reliable method for capturing ego-centred networks. Still, a trade-off related to the data quality and the number of positions included should be made, where it has been suggested to include questions of at least 15 to 20 occupations (van der Gaag et al., 2008). On the other hand, the focus on labour market active groups has the disadvantage of excluding retired persons or students from the scope. Additionally, given the extensivity of the instrument, questions about each position are not included for the sake of parsimony, which is translated into a lack of detailed description about each tie. However, the hierarchical status nature of the data obtained provides sufficient information to describe the composition (average resources), heterogeneity (resource diversity) and upper reachability of resources (highest resources accessed) embedded in the ego's network, which entails one of the strengths of the position generator (Lin, 2001).

Another widely used instrument is the name generator/interpreter. It follows the same rationale as the position generator but fulfils some disadvantages, providing detailed information about specific contacts to which respondents feel closest or discussing personal and relevant matters (van der Gaag et al., 2008). After selecting connections, respondents fill in the name interpreter, which includes questions such as age, gender, education, occupation, and ethnicity, among others, and in some cases, the respondent can describe possible connections between their close ties, allowing them to richly describe ego's access to social positions and resources (Lin & Er-

ickson, 2008). However, given that the instrument describes around 3 or 5 closer relationships, it is well established that these types of connections tend to be influenced by homophily which is translated into less diverse networks. However, rather than providing access to a wide range of positions (hence resources), close ties are related to friendship and kinship, which are more likely to perform a central role in expressive actions (Lin, 2001). An important remark is that both name and position generators can be employed in a complementary way. However, the name generator is more suitable for studying phenomena associated with the ego's close ties, such as patterns of friendship and kinship. In contrast, the position generator provides information about the ego's extended networks that are often more heterogeneous, including more diverse types of relationships and resources that can include acquaintances that provide access to different types of resources (van der Gaag et al., 2008).

3.3 Class-based inequality in social networks

Recent literature has turned attention to the generative processes of social capital formation (Lin et al., 2017), focusing on access to social capital through structural processes such as intergenerational social mobility and class inequalities. As the social capital theory claims, contact opportunities and association preferences are socioeconomically stratified (Lin & Erickson, 2008). Therefore, it has been demonstrated that access to diverse and higher resources through social ties follows a pattern of capital accumulation that reproduces preexisting inequalities, where class positions have been particularly salient for understanding habits of association that describe exclusion and segregation mechanisms observed through social ties along the class structure.

According to Weber (1978), classes are a common basis for action, defined by the position in the labour market and the access to specific opportunities and goods that come with this standing. In addition, the degree of intergenerational exchange leads to the development of social classes, characterised by particular socialisation patterns and lifestyles that are reproduced over time. The class situation is expressed through sociability practices, marriages, friendships, and social relations between people that belong to a particular status group. Similarly, the formation of classes has been described by Goldthorpe (1992) via two processes. First is demographic identity, where they become identifiable as collectivities by the continuity in which individuals and families retain their class positions across generations. Second is cultural identity, expressed in class members' distinctive shared lifestyles along with their preferred patterns of association. As Bourdieu (1984) suggests in his class *habitus* analysis, cultural capital is the pivotal attribute of these distinctive practices, represented by holding diverse cultural resources among the most salient are educational credentials (Bourdieu, 1984). Hence, this approach suggests that the socialisation of common lifestyles and shared worldviews facilitate the consolidation of classes, which is particularly salient among the upper classes that can choose socially segregated environments that increase their chances of meeting and establishing ties with similar others, therefore maintaining their privileged social positions by excluding others (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1981). Jointly, these processes further reinforce the social distinctions between classes and contribute to the persistence of class structures.

Class-based studies on social tie formation have shown that class permeability in friendship formation is strongly affected by property-based boundaries, in which owners are less likely to connect to the working class through friendship ties. By contrast, routine interactions between supervisors and workers might explain why the authority dimension is highly permeable (Wright & Cho, 1992). Similarly, the upper-middle class held less diverse networks in contrast

to the intermediate class regarding their extended networks, while friendship network diversity increased for those who experienced upward mobility (Cepić & Tonković, 2020). However, the gain in higher-status contacts associated with social mobility is moderated by family background, where upwardly mobile individuals are not able to equalise their social capital compared to the intergenerational stable (Carrascosa, 2023). Moreover, the *u-shape* distribution of ties between the two extremes of the class structure depicts the higher permeability of intermediate classes, where lower class-based homogeneity contrasts with the higher exclusion of the working poor and the self-selected higher status and lower diversity of contacts held by the upper-middle class (Otero et al., 2021). Additionally, the upper class is persistently engaged in formal organisations that increase their chances of bridging with diverse people in terms of skills and resources, in contrast to the homogenous pattern of civic engagement held by the working class (Pichler & Wallace, 2009). The tendency to accumulate resources through social ties is intersected by individual characteristics as well, where the less educated tend to lose contact in contrast to the highly educated, while men gain in terms of high-status contacts compared to women (Lin et al., 2017).

3.4 The role of macro-social conditions

As the social capital theory suggests, access to certain positions in the social structure is influenced by status position, as well as by individual preferences of association (Lin & Dumin, 1986). Consequently, studies on the macro social conditions that influence access to social capital have distinguished between conditions in the (i) political, (ii) normative, and (iii) economic domains (Pichler & Wallace, 2009; Son, 2012; van Oorschot & Arts, 2005). Therefore, it is argued that these macro social conditions can bolster or hinder meeting opportunities, which in turn stratify the diversity and prestige of the accessed social positions, that in the long run shape the conditions for the reproduction of social capital inequalities (Lin, 2000).

Regarding the political dimension, it has been argued that political institutions and regimes can influence the sociability structure of a society. This means that institutions, such as the political system establish to what extent citizens can participate in the public sphere (Son, 2012). For example, in democratic regimes in which civil rights are developed, social services and living standards tend to improve, as well as participation in voluntary organizations. Evidence in this regard has not been conclusive, suggesting that social spending might increase social capital through the number of contacts (Scheepers et al., 2002), but not regarding their prestige (Otero, 2022, p. 115). Additionally, it has been suggested that welfare policies might reduce life uncertainty. In industrialised capitalist societies, there are variations in terms of market dependency and the universality of benefits, in which social democrat or liberal regimes constitute different degrees of welfare generosity (Esping-Andersen, 1990). Consequently, it is expected that in societies in which the political culture emphasises solidarity and egalitarianism, such as the social democrat regime does, social spending could equalise opportunities and improve overall life chances. Whereas, in liberal regimes market dependency is higher and social benefits are not extensive. The evidence has shown that in social democratic regimes and higher social expenditure is associated with an increase in contact frequency, prestige, and diversity (Otero, 2022; Visser et al., 2018).

Cultural orientations understood as the social norms that structure sociability establishing rules regarding how certain status positions are less attractive or needed have been taken into account as a structuring macro-social factor for accessing social capital. Son (2012) suggests that cases like China and Taiwan, in contrast to the United States, crystallise two ideal-typical

cultural orientations. In these societies, the macro institutional arrangement in capitalist and socialist political economies, as well as Western and Confucian cultural traditions have consequences in how social capital is accessed and mobilised. In this regard, for the study of the relational distance between people, he introduces three layers of social relations that work as recipients of social resources: *binding* (family-oriented ties), *bonding* (daily contact), and *belonging* (participation in formal organizations). On the one hand, East Asian societies are described as *collectivist* according to the Confucian tradition that follows family-oriented sociability, in which *binding* ties are crucial for having access to social resources (see Kim & Lee, 2021). On the other hand, Western societies are characterised as *individualistic*, in which the orientation of being associated with others through organisations motivates individuals to develop extended networks outside of the inner circle that may improve life chances, providing greater relevance to the *belonging* dimension as a source of social resources (see Huang, 2021). In this regard, cross-national evidence has shown that individualistic orientations are associated with more prestigious positions, but not with contact diversity (Otero, 2022, p. 116), suggesting that openness of individualistic lifestyles tends to be oriented towards status-seeking rather than appreciation of diversity.

Economic inequality deserves special attention as a macro-social characteristic of societies. As previously reviewed, inequality in access to social positions and resources is strongly stratified. Additionally, the access and accumulation of social resources, particularly by the upper classes could be exacerbated by higher economic inequality. In other words, the rich become wealthier and the poor maintain their living conditions or worsen. Therefore, income inequality can strengthen current disparities in access to social resources between classes, increasing the chances of the upper classes to engage in voluntary associations and decreasing it for the working classes (Pichler & Wallace, 2009). Additionally, it has been shown that inequality in access to prestigious contacts is less pronounced in unequal societies, while it increases the gap in terms of contact diversity, suggesting that income inequality increases the difficulties to meet and establish relationships with the higher class (Otero, 2022). In this regard, it has been shown that in an unequal context, the upper class is segregated in high-status social circles, increasing social distance and disconnection (Carrascosa, 2023; Otero, Volker, Rözer, et al., 2022).

Scaling down the scope from the global or societal level, networks and associations can be also affected by local settings such as neighbourhoods or communities, which can differentially influence social relations in terms of frequency of contact, density and diversity of networks (Lin, 2000, 2001). Related research has demonstrated that spatial inequalities, such as urban segregation and residential choices reflect economic inequality in a local dimension, showing that distance is not only social or subjective, it is physical as well, where the upper classes are self-segregated tending to inhabit privileged and isolated neighbourhood, in which can develop their life project avoiding interaction with lower classes, reinforcing their privileged positions (see Méndez & Gayo, 2019; Otero, Volker, & Rozer, 2022).

Social networks, perceived and preferred inequality

4.1 Social segregation and inequality perceptions

The social network perspective offers an analytical approach from a meso-level perspective that allows linking the macro and micro levels of analysis to study social perception and behaviour (Hedstrom & Ylikoski, 2010). Therefore, networks allow studying social ties that bridge social groups through activities, friendship or family ties (Pichler & Wallace, 2009). However, only some studies have addressed the claimed influence of social environments on how people perceive the magnitude of economic inequality. Consequently, a guiding assumption is that people's awareness of the amount and diversity of resources in their social network is associated with their degree of embeddedness in social relationships that provide significant benefits, such as better information and life chances, as well as the lack of them, that in ultimately shapes their perceptions of inequality (Granovetter, 1973; Lin, 2001).

How people perform inferences about the social world is linked to the degree of segregation in their immediate social environment, which determines the intensity and character of the information that ultimately shapes inequality perception (Mijs & Roe, 2021). Conversations with friends, family and work colleagues shape inequality perception through experience sharing. The socioeconomic diversity of participants in everyday conversations contributes to reconstructing more accurate images regarding income and wealth inequality than isolated individuals (Summers et al., 2022). Persistent economic inequality led to spatially segregated interactions and isolated lifeworlds that provide meaning to social inequality experiences, resulting in doubts about worthiness when the lower classes contrast themselves with extravagant lifestyles from the upper classes, undermining feelings of social inclusion and cohesion (Sachweh, 2012). Similarly, attachment to society weakens when diversity is undermined by class-homogenous networks, which represents the lack of knowledge about others' lifestyles and experiences (Otero, Volker, Rözer, et al., 2022). These ideas resonate with the concept of 'empathy-gulf', understood as the social distance among groups widened by extreme inequality, increasing the barriers to imagining other's lifestyles and goods, which might diminish feelings of injustice and redistributive demands (Sachweh, 2012, p. 19). Therefore, the life of others become more distant and might have consequences on empathy and solidarity toward others, potentially leading to perceiving fellow citizens as strangers (Otero, Volker, Rözer, et al., 2022, p. 758).

Complementary to pure motivational and cognitive processes, attention has increased toward the structural properties of personal networks to explain social perceptual biases. For example, Lee et al. (2019) demonstrate that according to population group size, minority and major-

ity groups overestimate their size when homophily is high. In contrast, both groups tended to underestimate the size when network diversity was high. However, simulations show that estimation accuracy improves when perceptual biases of individuals and peers are combined, which is more pronounced when homophily is low given the higher exposure to peers with opposing attributes, suggesting this as evidence of social learning and consensus mechanisms (p. 6). Similarly, Schulz et al. (2022) modelled the extent to which homophily influences perceived economic inequality. They report that rising economic inequality increases and polarises income-based homophily. Therefore, the discrepancies between actual and perceived inequality may be explained by the increasing distance and selectivity among the middle- and upper-income groups. Suggesting that misperception is not driven purely by cognitive limitations for informational processing; rather, by the limited information set, individuals perform inductively estimate inequality given the available information in their network. Altogether, the studies presented above have contributed to pointing out the relevance of asymmetric homophily in social networks and the mechanisms that might be involved in the formation of perceived economic inequality.

Related survey research should be considered as well. Yet, studies on the relationship between social environment and economic perceptions have been more focused on self-evaluations than perceptions about the distribution of economic resources. For example, in a study on elderly Americans, Buccioli et al. (2019) argued that (1) closeness and frequency of contact with friends and family, (2) having access to supportive networks, (2) being socially engaged in organisations, and (4) feelings of community integration tend to enhance perceived social status, particularly among people who are embedded in supportive family and friendship networks and declare higher neighbourhood social cohesion. However, they also found undermining effects of social ties, which are sources of distress and conflict. Similarly, Huang (2021) suggests that reference groups and social networks embedded in interpersonal relationships boost the perceived status of Australians. Using a social network approach, their study intended to clarify the extent to which social integration and contact processes explain status perception. Their findings suggest that having a reference group, social engagement in organisations, feelings of neighbourhood belonging, and access to resources through social network ties enhanced perceived status. Additionally, Kim & Lee (2021) studied the consequences of social networks on subjective status in four East Asian countries, arguing that the three social capital dimensions analysed (bonding, cognitive, and bridging) increase perceived status, as well as cross-cultural differences among countries, generating changes in the influence of each dimension. They found that, among the three dimensions, social capital increases perceived status through contact frequency with family and friends (*bonding*), trust towards close ties (*cognitive*), and higher network contacts (*bridging*). However, in individualistic countries such as Japan and Korea, social capital is less relevant than individual status positions, unlike collectivist societies such as China and Taiwan.

An exploratory study by Joye et al. (2019) has suggested that individual status position and network resources independently influence people's perception and justification of inequality. On the one hand, perceived and preferred levels of inequality are lower among people with higher economic, cultural and social capital. On the other hand, public support for public welfare policies tends to be higher among people with higher cultural and social resources but is lower for those with higher economic capital (p. 91). This evidence suggests two main remarks: people with higher personal and social resources consider inequality as less problematic and tend to justify it stronger, but other types of capital increase support for public welfare. However, these results need to be scrutinised with attention because they overlooked conceptual distinctions between perceived and preferred inequality combining the same latent factor, which might be

correlated but are conceptually different (Janmaat, 2013).

In theory, evidence has suggested that social networks influence perceived economic inequality as well as subjective evaluations of individual status. Regarding the former, it seems that social networks have a virtuous influence on how people perceive themselves and their economic situation, suggesting that social ties perform a supportive welfare function as an expressive outcome of social capital (Lin, 2001). Additionally, as a consequence of homophily, social network homogeneity might not have the same influence on social perception, showing that isolated and homogenous environments might influence how people infer the size of groups (e.g. poor) as well as holding biased estimations about their position in the economic distribution, therefore under- or over-estimating their social standing, which might have consequences in their feelings of social integration and well being (Olivos et al., 2020; Otero, Volker, Rözer, et al., 2022; Schneider, 2019). Yet, evidence in this regard is scarce and requires further inquiries to clarify the claimed influence of network structure on perceived inequality, as well as their interaction with structural factors that might affect their relation (e.g. social class).

4.2 Social ties on the demand for redistribution and welfare

As mentioned above, social networks influence people's experience of social life and self-evaluations, as well as the surrounding social and economic conditions. Particularly, it has been shown that social perceptions of economic inequality influence their preferences towards it. However, it is less known about how the composition and resources embedded in social networks influence what people prefer in terms of economic inequality, particularly what are their views regarding the role of government in terms of social policy measures, which in turn are expressed in demands for economic redistribution and social welfare. Despite this, there are some insights in the literature that highlighted the role of social networks on redistributive preferences by describing the impact of civic engagement in voluntary organizations, cross-class embeddedness through kinship and friendship ties, as well as socioeconomic network diversity.

As mentioned, the literature has previously addressed efforts to address the link between social networks and redistributive preferences. For example, Yamamura (2012) argues that community participation boosts contact among low- and high-income groups, increasing demand for redistribution more clearly in high-income people. For them, high social contact might trigger envy from the poorer groups toward the wealthy, arguing that negative externalities, such as greater unhappiness and a rise in crime rate, will motivate altruistic behaviour that increases the willingness of high-income people to redistribute income. They show that higher rates of community participation at the prefecture-level increase support for redistribution in Japan, which is more pronounced for those above the median income of each community. Similarly, the altruistic motivation mechanism has been tested in comparative research, suggesting that the wealthy are more willing to support redistribution when experiencing fear of crime or local crime rates are high (Rueda & Stegmüller, 2019), as well as in contexts with pronounced income inequality (Dimick et al., 2018; Franetovic & Castillo, 2022). Therefore, it is argued that the rich engage in altruistic support for redistribution to cope with the negative consequences of income inequality.

A body of research has focused on class-based network analysis, particularly on how embeddedness in cross-class relationships influences people's views on redistribution and welfare, allowing the study of attitudinal change from a synthetic scope that entails class material-interests, socio-cultural or normative views, as well as political preferences (Lindh & McCall, 2020).

Hence, the discussion regarding how social class and network segregation intersect for explaining attitudes can be summarised in two mechanisms: (i) social influence and (ii) socialisation processes.

Employing a nationally representative sample of Swedish citizens, Lindh et al. (2021) scrutinised how social influence and class segregation affect redistributive and social welfare preferences. They argued that people tend to assimilate their opinions and attitudes according to their surrounding peers (*influence*), which is reinforced by the homophilic tendency in tie formation (*segregation*). After accounting by network segregation and current class position, their results suggest that higher contacts in the managerial class negatively impact redistributive demands. In contrast, connections to the working class increase them. Additionally, contact with socio-cultural professionals that entail more inclusive and egalitarian attitudes lowers welfare chauvinism, while it rises with working-class ties that might perceive immigrants as a threat. First, their results account for the independent influence of social networks on redistributive and welfare preferences. Second, provide evidence that attitudes can be strengthened by class homogeneity but can also change through diverse cross-class ties.

Similarly, recent literature has turned attention to class positions in kinship networks, suggesting that aside from the current class position, additional socialisation sources are cross-class ties through the family of origin and partners. For instance, employing repeated cross-sectional samples of Americans Lee (2023) found class positions of the family of origin shape economic preferences toward redistribution and federal taxes independently of personal class. Similarly, he argues that parental class position is crucial for political socialisation processes during childhood and early adulthood, where class interests and norms are nurtured. The evidence shows that after accounting for the current class position, the family class background has an independent influence on attitudes in line with the class interests, showing that those with parents from the upper classes are less supportive of redistribution, as well as having farming or working-class background hold favourable attitudes. Additionally, a study on European citizens by Paskov & Weisstanner (2022) goes further and scrutinised to what extent the class positions of parents and partners shape preferences. As mentioned, the family of origin can socialise individuals in early life stages, but other kinship ties are considered as a source of inter-group contact that could influence individuals as well, suggesting that heterogeneity in class ties can reduce negative prejudices toward out groups as contact theory suggests (Pettigrew, 1998), what in turn might motivate changes in political attitudes (Nathan & Sands, 2023). They show that kinship class position matters for redistributive preferences, where homogeneity leads to polarised preferences between the upper and working class, but this gradient is blurred as heterogeneity increases. For example, they show that after accounting for current class position, having working (upper) class parents (or partner) decreases (increases) redistributive preferences.

In addition to kinship ties, friendship ties are important in the formation of attitudes. To this extent, Londoño-Vélez (2022) conducted a study on a sample of affluent Colombian college students suggesting that increasing socioeconomic diversity at the school level introduces changes in friendship ties that have implications for (i) perceived inequality and (ii) support for redistribution. Her argument relies on the assumption that homogeneous networks constitute a limitation for inferences of economic inequality. As a consequence, she posits that being exposed to more socioeconomically heterogeneous reference groups (e.g. friends) might have consequences in redistributive demands via three mechanisms: self-interest, social mobility and distributive justice. On the one hand, the results show that friendship heterogeneity increases the demand for redistribution. Particularly, contrary to self-interest, exposure to low-income peers improves accuracy in relative income position and poverty rates, increasing high-income

students' redistributive preferences. On the other hand, exposure has a null effect on mobility prospects. Finally, it is suggested that contact triggers higher concerns about the fairness of market-based life outcomes for the poor, which motivate higher support for government intervention. Similarly, Beck (2019) demonstrate that occupational network diversity diminishes justification of unequal access to social services in Chile, suggesting that contact diversity shortens the social distance between low and upper-status groups, providing them with broader images of inequality and the living conditions of others.

Research plan

Considering the theoretical and empirical elements presented above, I would like to contribute to the redistributive preference literature and discuss the role of social networks. As a result, my main research question is *What is the role of social networks on redistributive preferences?* and will be addressed in three independent studies.

5.1 Study 1 (S1)

Economic inequality, social networks, and redistributive preferences: A cross-national study of 33 countries

This study aims to assess the influence of network structure on redistributive preferences from a comparative perspective, employing secondary data from the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) 2017 - “Social Networks and Social Resources” (*International Social Survey Programme*, 2019). This survey includes a version of the position generator, items on perceived economic inequality, and redistributive preferences. Therefore, this study clarifies the influence of contact diversity in social networks on increasing support for redistribution (H1). Second, to test if the influence of network diversity on redistributive preferences is mediated by perceived economic inequality (H2). Finally, to determine if current levels of economic inequality at the country level strengthen the influence of network diversity on redistributive preferences (H3). Multilevel regression models will be used for hypothesis testing to account for the data’s hierarchical structure, including random slope estimations in the cross-level interactions.

5.2 Study 2 (S2)

Residential segregation, social networks and market distribution of social services: longitudinal evidence

In order to clarify causality assumptions, longitudinal studies can provide evidence in that direction. Consequently, this study aims to address how changes in network composition affect preferences for market distribution of social services (e.g. pensions, education, and health), employing national representative panel data from the Chilean Longitudinal Social Survey (ELSOC) (COES, 2018). First, in a similar approach to S1, it is expected that changes in network diversity have decreased the support for the market distribution of social services (H1). Second, the sampling design of the ELSOC allows testing hypotheses at the community level (*Municipalities*). Therefore, residential segregation is expected to increase preferences for marketization (H2) and strengthen the influence of network diversity on preferences (H3). Finally, in terms of

empirical strategy, because repeated observations (t) are nested within individuals (i), which in turn belong to specific communities (j), a longitudinal multilevel strategy is the most suitable for modelling the data, assuming a three-level structure (observation-individual-community).

5.3 Study 3

Diversity, reference groups, and policy preferences: A vignette design

The third part of my research will incorporate elements from the distributive justice literature to provide a complete image of the role of reference groups in redistributive preferences. In this regard, evaluations are affected by observer's and observed characteristics, allowing us to estimate how these factors impact an outcome. Therefore, I propose a factorial vignette design to assess the role vignette's attribute on the observer evaluation of the hypothetical individuals being affected or included by specific social policies (e.g. increased taxes, health or unemployment benefits).

References

- Aalberg, T. (2003). Achieving Justice: Comparative Public Opinion on Income Distribution. In *Comparative Sociology* (Vol. 7). <https://doi.org/10.1163/156913308X263238>
- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity In Social Exchange. In *Advances in experimental social psychology* (New York: pp. 267–299).
- Alesina, A., & Giuliano, P. (2010). Preferences for Redistribution. In J. Benhabib, M. O. Jackson, & A. Bisin (Eds.), *Handbook of social economics* (Vol. 1, pp. 93–131). Elsevier.
- Alesina, A., Stantcheva, S., & Teso, E. (2018). Intergenerational Mobility and Preferences for Redistribution. *American Economic Review*, 108(2), 521–554. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20162015>
- Andersson, A. B., & Lindh, A. (2022). *Occupational skills and subjective social status* [Preprint]. SocArXiv. <https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/ubpg9>
- Andersson, M. A. (2018). An Odd Ladder to Climb: Socioeconomic Differences Across Levels of Subjective Social Status. *Social Indicators Research*, 136(2), 621–643. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-017-1559-7>
- Arigo, D., Mogle, J. A., Brown, M. M., Pasko, K., Travers, L., Sweeder, L., & Smyth, J. M. (2020). Methods to Assess Social Comparison Processes Within Persons in Daily Life: A Scoping Review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 2909. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02909>
- Bargsted, M., Espinoza, V., & Plaza, A. (2020). Pautas de homofilia en Chile. *Papers. Revista de Sociologia*, 105(4), 583. <https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/papers.2617>
- Beck, G. (2019). *Explorando la asociación entre redes de contacto ocupacionales y la justificación de la desigualdad social en Chile* [Master's thesis]. Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile.
- Becker, B. (2021). Significant others? Social groups, income expectations, and redistributive preferences. *Social Science Research*, 100, 102612. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2021.102612>
- Blau, P. (1977a). A Macrosociological Theory of Social Structure. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(1), 26–54. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2777762>
- Blau, P. (1977b). *Inequality and heterogeneity : A primitive theory of social structure*. Collier Macmillan.
- Bobzien, L. (2019). Polarized perceptions, polarized preferences? Understanding the relationship between inequality and preferences for redistribution. *Journal of European Social*

Policy, 095892871987928. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0958928719879282>

- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (1981). *La Reproducción: Elementos Para Una Teoría Del Sistema de Enseñanza*. Laia Barcelona.
- Breznau, N. (2021). The welfare state and risk perceptions: The Novel Coronavirus Pandemic and public concern in 70 countries. *European Societies*, 23(sup1), S33–S46. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616696.2020.1793215>
- Brown-Iannuzzi, J. L., Lundberg, K. B., Kay, A. C., & Payne, B. K. (2015). Subjective Status Shapes Political Preferences. *Psychological Science*, 26(1), 15–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797614553947>
- Buccioli, A., Cicognani, S., & Zarri, L. (2019). Social Status Perception and Individual Social Capital: Evidence from the US. *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy*, 20(1). <https://doi.org/10.1515/bejeap-2019-0071>
- Cansunar, A. (2021). Who Is High Income, Anyway? Social Comparison, Subjective Group Identification, and Preferences over Progressive Taxation. *The Journal of Politics*, 000–000. <https://doi.org/10.1086/711627>
- Carrascosa, J. (2023). Class inequalities in access to social capital in the metropolitan area of Buenos Aires. *Social Networks*, 72, 59–69. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socnet.2022.09.003>
- Castillo, J. C., García-Castro, J.-D., & Venegas, M. (2022). Perception of economic inequality: Concepts, associated factors and prospects of a burgeoning research agenda. *International Journal of Social Psychology*, 37(1), 180–207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02134748.2021.2009275>
- Castillo, J. C., Miranda, D., & Madero-Cabib, I. (2013). Todos somos de clase media: Sobre el estatus social subjetivo en Chile. *Latin American Research Review*, 48(1), 155–173. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lar.2013.0006>
- Cepić, D., & Tonković, Ž. (2020). How social ties transcend class boundaries? Network variability as tool for exploring occupational homophily. *Social Networks*, 62, 33–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socnet.2020.02.003>
- Chen, Y., & Williams, M. (2018). Subjective Social Status in Transitioning China: Trends and Determinants: Subjective Social Status in Transitioning China. *Social Science Quarterly*, 99(1), 406–422. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ssqu.12401>
- Clark, A. E., & Senik, C. (2010). Who Compares to Whom? The Anatomy of Income Comparisons in Europe. *The Economic Journal*, 120(544), 573–594. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0297.2010.02359.x>
- COES. (2018). *Estudio Longitudinal Social de Chile 2018*. <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/H8OVMF>
- Condon, M., & Wichowsky, A. (2020a). *The Economic Other: Inequality in the American Political Imagination*. University of Chicago Press. <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226691909.001.0001>

- Condon, M., & Wichowsky, A. (2020b). Inequality in the Social Mind: Social Comparison and Support for Redistribution. *The Journal of Politics*, 82(1), 149–161. <https://doi.org/10.1086/705686>
- Contreras, D., Otero, G., Díaz, J. D., & Suárez, N. (2019). Inequality in social capital in Chile: Assessing the importance of network size and contacts' occupational prestige on status attainment. *Social Networks*, 58, 59–77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socnet.2019.02.002>
- Dimick, M., Rueda, D., & Stegmuller, D. (2018). *Models of Other-Regarding Preferences , Inequality , and Redistribution*. December 2013, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-091515-030034>
- Diprete, T. A., Gelman, A., McCormick, T., Teitler, J., & Zheng, T. (2011). Segregation in Social Networks Based on Acquaintanceship and Trust. *Source: American Journal of Sociology AJS*, 116(4), 1234–1283. <https://doi.org/10.1086/659100>
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*. Princeton University Press.
- Evans, M. D. R. (2004). Subjective Social Location: Data From 21 Nations. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 16(1), 3–38. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijpor/16.1.3>
- Evans, M. D. R., & Kelley, J. (2017). Communism, Capitalism, and Images of Class: Effects of Reference Groups, Reality, and Regime in 43 Nations and 110,000 Individuals, 1987-2009. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 51(514), 315–359. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069397116677963>
- Evans, M. D. R., Kelley, J., & Kolosi, T. (1992). Images of Class: Public Perceptions in Hungary and Australia. *American Sociological Review*, 57(4), 461. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2096095>
- Evans, M., & Kelley, J. (2018). Strong Welfare States Do Not Intensify Public Support for Income Redistribution, but Even Reduce It among the Prosperous: A Multilevel Analysis of Public Opinion in 30 Countries. *Societies*, 8(4), 105. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc8040105>
- Feld, S. L. (1981). The Focused Organization of Social Ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 86(5), 1015–1035. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2778746>
- Feldman, S., & Steenbergen, M. R. (2001). The Humanitarian Foundation of Public Support for Social Welfare. *American Journal of Political Science*, 45(3), 658. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2669244>
- Festinger, L. (1954). A Theory of Social Comparison Processes. *Human Relations*, 7(2), 117–140. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872675400700202>
- Franetovic, G., & Castillo, J.-C. (2022). Preferences for Income Redistribution in Unequal Contexts: Changes in Latin America Between 2008 and 2018. *Frontiers in Sociology*, 7, 806458. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2022.806458>
- García-Castro, J. D., García-Sánchez, E., Willis, G. B., Castillo, J. C., & Rodríguez-Bailón, R. (2022). Perceived Economic Inequality Measures and Their Association With Objective Inequality and Redistributive Preferences. *Social Psychology*, 53(5), 277–291. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000498>
- García-Sánchez, E., & De Carvalho Galvão, S. (2022). Las creencias que justifican la desigualdad moderan la relación entre el estatus socioeconómico y el apoyo a la redistribución. *Re-*

- vista Internacional de Sociología*, 80(3), e210. <https://doi.org/10.3989/ris.2022.80.3.21.29>
- García-Sánchez, E., Osborne, D., Willis, G. B., & Rodríguez-Bailón, R. (2019). Attitudes towards redistribution and the interplay between perceptions and beliefs about inequality. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, bjs0.12326. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjs0.12326>
- Goldthorpe, J. (1992). Sobre la clase de servicio, su formación y su futuro. In J. Carabaña & A. de Francisco (Eds.), *Teorías contemporáneas de las clases sociales* (pp. 229–263). Editorial Pablo Iglesias.
- Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The Strength of Weak Ties'. *American Journal of Sociology American Journal of Sociology This*, 78(6), 1360–1380. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2776392>
- Gugushvili, A. (2021). Which socio-economic comparison groups do individuals choose and why? *European Societies*, 23(4), 437–463. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616696.2020.1793214>
- Hadavand, A. (2018). Misperceptions: An Analysis of Subjective Economic Inequality. In J. A. Bishop & J. Gabriel Rodríguez (Eds.), *Inequality, Taxation and Intergenerational Transmission* (Vol. 26, pp. 247–281). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S1049-258520180000026011>
- Hedstrom, P., & Ylikoski, P. (2010). Causal Mechanisms in the Social Sciences. *Ssrn*, 36(2010), 49–67. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.012809.102632>
- Homans, G. C. (1951). *The human group*. (pp. xxxiv, 484). Transaction Publishers.
- Huang, X. (2021). Subjective Class Identification in Australia: Do Social Networks Matter? *Sociological Quarterly*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00380253.2021.1997668>
- Hvidberg, K., Kreiner, C., & Stantcheva, S. (2020). *Social Position and Fairness Views* (Nos. w28099; p. w28099). National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w28099>
- International Social Survey Programme: Social Networks and Social Resources - ISSP 2017*. (2019). GESIS Data Archive. <https://doi.org/10.4232/1.13322>
- Iturra, J., & Mellado, D. (2018). Subjective social status in three Latin American countries: The case of Argentina, Chile and Venezuela. *Revista Contenido Cultura Y Ciencias Sociales*, 8, 1–20.
- Janmaat, J. G. (2013). Subjective inequality: A review of international comparative studies on people's views about inequality. *Archives Europeennes de Sociologie*, 54(03), 357–389. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003975613000209>
- Jasso, G. (1990). Methods for the Theoretical and Empirical Analysis of Comparison Processes. *Sociological Methodology*, 20, 369. <https://doi.org/10.2307/271091>
- Jasso, G. (2001). Studying Status: An Integrated Framework. *American Sociological Association*, 66(1), 96–124. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2657395>
- Joye, D., Sapin, M., & Wolf, C. (2019). *Measuring social networks and social resources: an exploratory ISSP survey around the world*. GESIS - Leibniz- Institut für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Karadja, M., Mollerstrom, J., & Seim, D. (2017). Richer (and Holier) Than Thou? The Effect of Relative Income Improvements on Demand for Redistribution. *The Review of Economics*

- and Statistics, 99(2), 201–212. https://doi.org/10.1162/REST_a_00623
- Kelley, J., & Evans, M. D. R. (1993). The legitimization of inequality: Occupational earnings in nine nations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 99(1), 75–125. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2781956>
- Kelley, J., & Evans, M. D. R. (1995). Class and class conflict in six western nations. *American Sociological Review*, 60(2), 157–178. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2096382>
- Kim, J. H., & Lee, C. S. (2021). Social Capital and Subjective Social Status: Heterogeneity within East Asia. *Social Indicators Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-020-02548-9>
- Kluegel, J. R., Mason, D. S., & Wegener, B. (Eds.). (1995). *Social Justice and Political Change: Public Opinion in Capitalist and Post-Communist States* (First). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351328401>
- Kluegel, J. R., & Smith, E. R. (1981). Beliefs About Stratification. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 29–56.
- Kossinets, G., & Watts, D. J. (2009). Origins of Homophily in an Evolving Social Network. *American Journal of Sociology*, 115(2), 405–450. <https://doi.org/10.1086/599247>
- Lee, E., Karimi, F., Wagner, C., Jo, H.-H., Strohmaier, M., & Galesic, M. (2019). Homophily and minority-group size explain perception biases in social networks. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 3(10), 1078–1087. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-019-0677-4>
- Lee, J. (2023). Consider your origins: Parental social class and preferences for redistribution in the United States from 1977 to 2018. *Social Science Research*, 110, 102840. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2022.102840>
- Lin, N. (1999). Social networks and status attainment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 25, 467–487. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.25.1.467>
- Lin, N. (2000). Inequality in Social Capital. *Contemporary Sociology*, 29(6), 785–795. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2654086>
- Lin, N. (2001). Building a Network Theory of Social Capital. In *Social Capital* (First, pp. 3–28). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/978135129457-1>
- Lin, N., Cook, K., & Burt, R. S. (2017). *Social Capital: Theory and Research* (First). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/978135129457>
- Lin, N., & Dumin, M. (1986). Access to occupations through social ties. *Social Networks*, 8(4), 365–385. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-8733\(86\)90003-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-8733(86)90003-1)
- Lin, N., & Erickson, B. (2008). Theory, Measurement, and the Research Enterprise on Social Capital. In N. Lin & B. H. Erickson (Eds.), *Social Capital: An International Research Program* (p. 0). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199234387.003.0010>
- Lindemann, K., & Saar, E. (2014). Contextual Effects on Subjective Social Position: Evidence from European Countries. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 55(1), 3–23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020715214527101>
- Lindh, A., Andersson, A. B., & Volker, B. (2021). The Missing Link: Network Influences on Class Divides in Political Attitudes. *European Sociological Review*, 37(5), 695–712.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jcab010>

- Lindh, A., & McCall, L. (2020). Class Position and Political Opinion in Rich Democracies. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 46(1), 419–441. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-121919-054609>
- Londoño-Vélez, J. (2022). The impact of diversity on perceptions of income distribution and preferences for redistribution. *Journal of Public Economics*, 214, 104732. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2022.104732>
- Maldonado, L., Olivos, F., Castillo, J. C., Atria, J., & Azar, A. (2019). Risk Exposure, Humanitarianism and Willingness to Pay for Universal Healthcare: A Cross-National Analysis of 28 Countries. *Social Justice Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11211-019-00336-6>
- McCall, L., Burk, D., Laperrière, M., & Richeson, J. A. (2017). Exposure to Rising Inequality Shapes Americans' Opportunity Beliefs and Policy Support. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 201706253.
- McPherson, M., & Smith, J. A. (2019). Network Effects in Blau Space: Imputing Social Context from Survey Data. *Socius*, 5, 2378023119868591. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2378023119868591>
- McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L., & Cook, J. M. (2001). Birds of a Feather: Homophily in Social Networks. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27, 415–444. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2678628>
- Meltzer, A. H., & Richard, S. F. (1981). A Rational Theory of the Size of Government. *Journal of Political Economy*, 89(5), 914–927. <https://doi.org/10.1086/261013>
- Merton, R. K., & Rossi, A. (1968). Contributions to the Theory of Reference Group Behavior. *Social Theory and Social Structure*, 279–334.
- Méndez, M. L., & Gayo, M. (2019). *Upper Middle Class Social Reproduction: Wealth, Schooling, and Residential Choice in Chile* (1st ed. 2019). Springer International Publishing : Imprint: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-89695-3>
- Mijs, J. (2018). Inequality Is a Problem of Inference: How People Solve the Social Puzzle of Unequal Outcomes. *Societies*, 8(3), 64. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc8030064>
- Mijs, J., & Roe, E. L. (2021). Is America coming apart? Socioeconomic segregation in neighborhoods, schools, workplaces, and social networks, 1970. *Sociology Compass*, 15(6). <https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12884>
- Moawad, J., & Oesch, D. (2023). *The myth of the middle class squeeze: Employment and income by class in six western countries, 1980-2020*. European Commission.
- Nathan, N. L., & Sands, M. L. (2023). Context and Contact: Unifying the Study of Environmental Effects on Politics. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 26(1), null. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-051421-012551>
- Nolan, B., & Weisstanner, D. (2022). Rising income inequality and the relative decline in subjective social status of the working class. *West European Politics*, 45(6), 1206–1230. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2022.2038892>
- Oesch, D., & Vigna, N. (2022). A Decline in the Social Status of the Working Class? Conflicting Evidence for 8 Western Countries, 1987. *Comparative Political Studies*, 55(7), 1130–

1157. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00104140211047400>

- Olivos, F., Olivos-Jara, P., & Browne, M. (2020). Asymmetric Social Comparison and Life Satisfaction in Social Networks. *Journal of Happiness Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-020-00234-8>
- Osberg, L., & Smeeding, T. (2006). “Fair” Inequality? Attitudes toward Pay Differentials: The United States in Comparative Perspective. *American Sociological Review*, 71(3), 450–473. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240607100305>
- Otero, G. (2022). *The lives of others: Studies on inequality, class, and social capital* [PhD thesis, Utrecht University]. <https://doi.org/10.33540/1082>
- Otero, G., Volker, B., & Rozer, J. (2022). Space and social capital: Social contacts in a segregated city. *Urban Geography*, 43(10), 1638–1661. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2021.1950982>
- Otero, G., Volker, B., & Rozer, J. (2021). Open But Segregated? Class Divisions And the Network Structure of Social Capital in Chile. *Social Forces*, 100(2), 649–679. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/soab005>
- Otero, G., Volker, B., Rözer, J., & Mollenhorst, G. (2022). The lives of others: Class divisions, network segregation, and attachment to society in Chile. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 73(4), 754–785. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12966>
- Paskov, M., & Weisstanner, D. (2022). Cross-Class Embeddedness through Family Ties and Support for Income Redistribution. *European Sociological Review*, 38(2), 286–303. <https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jcab040>
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup Contact Theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49(1), 65–85. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.49.1.65>
- Pichler, F., & Wallace, C. (2009). Social Capital and Social Class in Europe: The Role of Social Networks in Social Stratification. *European Sociological Review*, 25(3), 319–332. <https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jcn050>
- Piketty, T., & Goldhammer, A. (2014). *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*. Harvard University Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt6wpqbc>
- Plaza, A., Cantillan, R., Beck, G., & Espinoza, V. (2022). Juntos, pero no revueltos: Homofilia en relaciones intergrupales mapuche y no-mapuche. *Revista de Sociología*, 37(1). <https://doi.org/10.5354/0719-529X.2022.68147>
- Rueda, D., & Stegmüller, D. (2019). *Who Wants What?: Redistribution Preferences in Comparative Perspective* (First). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108681339>
- Sachweh, P. (2012). The moral economy of inequality: Popular views on income differentiation, poverty and wealth. *Socio-Economic Review*, 10(3), 419–445. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ser/mwr023>
- Scheepers, P., Grotenhuis, M. T., & Gelissen, J. (2002). Welfare States And Dimensions Of Social Capital: Cross-national Comparisons Of Social Contacts In European Countries. *European Societies*, 4(2), 185–207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616690220142781>

- Schmidt-Catran, A. W. (2016). Economic inequality and public demand for redistribution: Combining cross-sectional and longitudinal evidence. *Socio-Economic Review*, 14(1), 119–140. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ser/mwu030>
- Schneider, S. (2019). Why Income Inequality Is Dissatisfying Perceptions of Social Status and the Inequality-Satisfaction Link in Europe. *European Sociological Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jcz003>
- Schulz, J., Mayerhoffer, D. M., & Gebhard, A. (2022). A network-based explanation of inequality perceptions. *Social Networks*, 70, 306–324. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socnet.2022.02.007>
- Smith, H. J., Pettigrew, T. F., & Huo, Y. J. (2020). Relative Deprivation Theory: Advances and Applications. In *Social Comparison, Judgment, and Behavior* (pp. 495–526). Oxford University Press.
- Son, J. (2012). *Social Capital and Institutional Constraints* (Zeroth). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203104743>
- Stantcheva, S. (2021). *Perceptions and preferences for redistribution* (Working Paper Nos. 29370). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Steele, L., & Breznau, N. (2019). Attitudes toward Redistributive Policy: An Introduction. *Societies*, 9(3), 50. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc9030050>
- Summers, K., Accominotti, F., Burchardt, T., Hecht, K., Mann, E., & Mijs, J. (2022). Deliberating Inequality: A Blueprint for Studying the Social Formation of Beliefs about Economic Inequality. *Social Justice Research*, 35(4), 379–400. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11211-022-00389-0>
- Trump, K.-S. (2023). Income inequality is unrelated to perceived inequality and support for redistribution. *Social Science Quarterly*, n/a(n/a). <https://doi.org/10.1111/ssqu.13269>
- van der Gaag, M., Snijders, T. A. B., & Flap, H. (2008). Position Generator Measures and Their Relationship to Other Social Capital Measures. In N. Lin & B. Erickson (Eds.), *Social Capital: An International Research Program* (p. 0). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199234387.003.0011>
- van Oorschot, W., & Arts, W. (2005). The social capital of European welfare states: The crowding out hypothesis revisited. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 15(1), 5–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0958928705049159>
- Visser, M., Gesthuizen, M., & Scheepers, P. (2018). The crowding in hypothesis revisited: New insights into the impact of social protection expenditure on informal social capital. *European Societies*, 20(2), 257–280. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616696.2018.1442928>
- Visser, P. S., & Mirabile, R. R. (2004). Attitudes in the Social Context: The Impact of Social Network Composition on Individual-Level Attitude Strength. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(6), 779–795. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.87.6.779>
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society: An outline of interpretative sociology*. University of California press. (Original work published 1922).
- Wegener, B. (1987). The Illusion of Distributive Justice. *European Sociological Review*, 3(1), 1–13. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/522527>

- Wegener, B. (1990). Equity, relative deprivation, and the value consensus paradox. *Social Justice Research*, 4(1), 65–86. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01048536>
- Wright, E. O., & Cho, D. (1992). The Relative Permeability of Class Boundaries to Cross-Class Friendships: A Comparative Study of the United States, Canada, Sweden, and Norway. *American Sociological Review*, 57(1), 85–102. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2096146>
- Yamamura, E. (2012). Social capital, household income, and preferences for income redistribution. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 28(4), 498–511. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpoleco.2012.05.010>