

Class-based network segregation, Economic Inequality and Redistributive Preferences across societies

Julio Iturra-Sanhueza

04 feb. 2024

1 Introduction

[~500 words]

2 Theoretical views on class, social networks, and redistributive preferences

[~3000 words]

2.1 Class divide in the economic domain

The link between social class and political attitudes constitutes one of the most relevant findings in sociology. Theoretically, studies in the social mobility field have defined classes as structural positions given their difference in labor market situations distinguished by employment relations, skills level, and authority within the workplace, which traditionally has been represented by occupations instead of relative income or educational credentials (Erikson & Goldthorpe, 1992; Erikson et al., 1979). Besides the social stratification studies, political sociologists have systematically demonstrated that classes trace distinctions in other domains of social life as well, including ideological preferences (Evans, 1993), cultural consumption behavior (Chan & Goldthorpe, 2007) and attitudes toward redistribution and welfare (Svallfors, 2006). Regarding the latter, during the last decades, the research on class and political attitudes has developed more extensively regarding the economic domain, addressing the economic interests of classes with an emphasis on redistribution, social security, and social service functions of the welfare state (Lindh & McCall, 2020, p. 421).

Critical views have suggested that economic development and modernization have eroded the link between social class and political attitudes. Around the debate of the “death of class” thesis, it has been argued that due to the increase of material welfare in post-industrial societies, the distributive struggle between classes has been waning, resulting in the salience of

other group identities as more relevant, reorienting the political debate towards post-material concerns (Clark et al., 1993; Inglehart, 1990). However, although modernization has led to changes in citizens' concerns, it is feasible to argue that the distributive struggle between classes has not been wholly displaced but cohabits with people's attitudes in the sociocultural domain (Lindh & McCall, 2020). Empirically, the claimed blurring of the class cleavage has not been strongly supported, whereas class divides indeed shape attitudes in the economic domain in general, such as perceived class conflicts (Edlund & Lindh, 2015; Pérez, 2023), attitudes toward market-based inequality (Andersen & Yaish, 2018; Lindh, 2015), and redistributive preferences in particular (Brooks & Svallfors, 2010; Curtis & Andersen, 2015; Langsæther & Evans, 2020). In the broader context, scholars have identified two competing mechanisms to elucidate the relationship between social class and attitudes towards inequality, commonly referred to as the self-interest and normative value-driven motives perspectives.

Theoretically, self-interest has served as the canonical model to explain redistributive preferences, where the material interests of those with the most to gain from redistribution conflict with those in positions of greater material well-being (Meltzer & Richard, 1981). Similarly, extensions of the model have paid more attention to occupation as a representation of potential unemployment risk, arguing that social classes with greater risk exposure are prone to support redistributive policies as they reduce labor market insecurity (Rehm, 2009). Differently, part of the scholarly discussion has stressed the role of cognitive processes in preference formation for understanding why, even in contexts of greater economic disparities, the lower classes oppose redistributive policies, arguing that misinformation plays a crucial role in linking material conditions with the redistributive policies (Bartels, 2005; Druckman & Lupia, 2000). Similarly, it has been argued that contexts of greater segregation affect the inferences about social and economic inequality (Mijs, 2018; Summers et al., 2022) that ultimately contribute to the decoupling of material interests from economic preferences (García-Castro et al., 2022; Hvidberg et al., 2020).

As material interests might prevail in scarcity, normative or value-driven motivations emerge as an alternative explanation in preference formation when pure self-interest weakens. Thus, values such as self-transcendence or humanitarianism share a common spirit regarding their desire for equality and concern for human dignity, providing the common ground for altruism that ultimately motivates egalitarian preferences (Feldman & Steenbergen, 2001; Kulin & Svallfors, 2013). However, the protagonism of values is indeed conditioned to risk exposure and resource availability, becoming salient under conditions of greater security against market risks and material prosperity and weakening under conditions of greater vulnerability and material precariousness (Maldonado et al., 2019). Related arguments have suggested that skills specificity and work logic represented in occupations play a role in forming political attitudes (Oesch, 2006). Specifically, it is argued that the work logic, together with the performed tasks, socializes individuals given the time spent in their job as well as the provision of goods and services, suggesting that technical and managerial occupations hold more conservative political views compared to those performing interpersonal services (Oesch & Rennwald, 2018). However, it is challenging to disentangle if the class differences in attitudes are indeed ex-

plained through political socialization developed within workplaces because they might result from the internalization of social norms in early-life socialization that motivate self-selection into specific career paths or the organizational hiring logic requirements for interpersonal or managerial positions (Kitschelt & Rehm, 2014).

While prior research has predominantly concentrated on examining the impact of social class through an individualistic lens, it is noteworthy that more attention needs to be devoted to understanding the role of social environments in class relations. This omission is particularly surprising given that class positions are fundamentally rooted in production relations that make them inherently relational, not only in their economic underpinnings but also in the power dynamics entwined within class conflicts (Wright, 1989). Besides, the normative basis of class relations introduces the relevance of the dimensions of solidarity and reciprocity, which have been argued to provide the moral basis of the legitimacy and popular support for welfare schemes (Mau, 2003). Hereby, we argue that the scope of class analysis in attitude formation urges to be extended further to the individual or household situation, stressing the role of social ties and segregation as part of the socialization processes involved in the internalization of shared norms, class identity formation, conflict, and cooperation between classes.

2.2 Class relations and social networks

As social relations within the occupational structure serve as the foundation for class analysis, widening the examination to other dimensions of social life, such as family dynamics, the development of friendships, and diverse social activities, can significantly enrich the scope of class analysis, particularly concerning its relation to attitude formation. In this sense, social stratification scholars have paid attention to the intersection of status positions and group membership as the observable patterns of association referred to as relational networks (Blau, 1977b). Empirically, homophily is one of the most significant findings in network research, whereas the likelihood of tie formation between individuals of similar characteristics is strong (Lazarsfeld & Merton, 1954; McPherson et al., 2001), such as age and gender in tracing friendship and family ties, as well as the segregated social environments alongside ethnicity and socioeconomic status (Bargsted et al., 2020; Plaza et al., 2022). In addition, psychosocial factors such as socialization preferences and group dynamics also play a role in segregation processes, considering that isolated social environments decrease the interchange of world views, reinforcing preferences towards in-group members and polarizing attitudes (Diprete et al., 2011; Visser & Mirabile, 2004). Nonetheless, without denying the relevance of socialization preferences, segregation has been predominantly explained through the lens of social differentiation in social activities that work as foci of contact opportunities that ultimately consolidate social networks (Feld, 1981; McPherson & Smith, 2019). From this scope, we argue that class positions consider differences in economic or cultural resources and patterns of sociability observed in the distribution of social ties.

How classes are formed also provides insights regarding their social relations and sociability practices. In sociology, classes are understood as the everyday basis for action, given their

labor market situation, that ultimately shapes their access to opportunities and resources (Weber, 1978). According to habitus theory, classes incur a series of distinctive practices pivoted in cultural capital as the basis for mutual recognition (Bourdieu, 1984). Thus, classes seek to improve their position through the intergenerational transmission of resources, whereas similarities in friendship and family choices play a crucial role in the reproduction privilege. Additionally, while symbolic resources reinforce status distinctions, access to exclusive social activities in the upper class increases segregation at the expense of excluding the lower classes (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1981). Ultimately, classes consolidate their demographic and cultural identities by mobilizing resources and shared sociability practices, ensuring intergenerational reproduction of their structural positions (Goldthorpe, 1992). Altogether, these processes further reinforce social distinctions between classes and contribute to the persistence of class structures. Hence, the socialization of common lifestyles and shared worldviews facilitates the consolidation of social classes. Access to social resources embedded in social networks follows a pattern of accumulation that reproduces pre-existing inequalities, in which class positions are vital in accounting for mechanisms of exclusion and segregation across the class structure.

Previous research on social class and tie formation has suggested that class permeability, understood as the formation of cross-class social ties, is traced differently across property and authority boundaries. Empirically, evidence from Western industrialized countries has shown that the formation of friendship ties between owners and the working class is very less likely, in contrast to the tendency of higher tie formation between supervisors and workers, suggesting that the authority dimension is much less permeable than authority-based boundaries given that class interests increase the social distance between proprietors and workers, while the intermediate class position of supervisors and contact frequency with workers make friendship tie formation more likely (Wright & Cho, 1992). Similarly, evidence from Chile has shown that the higher permeability of the intermediate classes contrasts with the more homogeneous networks of the working class, suggesting that their limited resources and lower capacity to be socially engaged ultimately result in a lack of social resources that isolate them from others, while the upper class is less permeable and homogenous as a result of its tendency to self-selection as a practice that ultimately seeks to reproduce their privileged status positions (Otero et al., 2021).

In contrast, cross-class embeddedness can be described regarding their social activities as well as through their changes across generations and time. In this regard, Pichler & Wallace (2009) suggest that higher civic engagement in formal organizations increases the chances of bridging with diverse people among the upper class, in contrast to the working class, which tends to be more homogeneous in its civic engagement behavior. Similarly, other studies in Argentina and Croatia have exhibited that the upper and intermediate classes hold increasingly diverse and prestigious social environments than the working classes, where being socially mobile does help to improve both dimensions in tie formation, whereas it does not equalize the weight of class background compared to those intergenerationally stable in the upper class (Carrascosa, 2023; Cepić & Tonković, 2020). Additionally, the few longitudinal evidence suggests that networks change following a dynamic of cumulative advantages regarding its

composition in terms of prestige and diversity, where upper classes improve in both dimensions while the lower class shows more stability across the life course (Volker, 2020).

Theoretically, these studies account for class-based network segregation as the degree of connectedness of an individual to different occupations is meant to vertically represent social resources embedded in social networks (Lin, 2007). Drawing on this approach, the attempts of stratification scholars have been focused on how social connections are distributed across the class structure as a matter of social integration (Blau, 1977a). Therefore, *homogeneity* is described as the lack of cross-class network ties. It is indeed conceptually more proximate to the homophily principle because it is anchored in ego's class position. At the same time, *diversity* is defined as the rate of dissimilar ties or simply the total ties to certain groups that do not necessarily count with a reference position to describe the network composition. Hence, both approaches provide a set of alternatives for the study of social class from a network perspective that has been increasingly discussed in the stratification literature as well as in the scholarly discussion about social class and political attitudes.

3 Data, variables and method

[1500 words]

4 Results

5 Discussion and conclusion

References

- Andersen, R., & Yaish, M. (2018). Preferences for the Distribution of Incomes in Modern Societies: The Enduring Influence of Social Class and Economic Context. *Canadian Public Policy / Analyse de Politiques*, 44(2), 190–205. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/90022701>
- 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>
- Bartels, L. (2005). Homer Gets a Tax Cut: Inequality and Public Policy in the American Mind. *Perspectives on Politics*, 3(1), 15–31. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3688108>
- Blau, P. (1977a). A Macrosociological Theory of Social Structure. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(1), 26–54. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2777762>
- Blau, P. (1977b). *Inequality and heterogeneity : A primitive theory of social structure*. London: Collier Macmillan.

- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (1981). *La Reproducción: Elementos Para Una Teoría Del Sistema de Enseñanza*. Laia Barcelona.
- Brooks, C., & Svallfors, S. (2010). Why does class matter? Policy attitudes, mechanisms, and the case of the Nordic countries. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 28(2), 199–213. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rssm.2010.01.003>
- 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>
- 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>
- Chan, T. W., & Goldthorpe, J. H. (2007). Class and Status: The Conceptual Distinction and its Empirical Relevance. *American Sociological Review*, 72(4), 512–532. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240707200402>
- Clark, T. N., Lipset, S. M., & Rempel, M. (1993). THE DECLINING POLITICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF SOCIAL CLASS. *International Sociology*, 8(3), 293–316. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026858093008003003>
- Curtis, J., & Andersen, R. (2015). How Social Class Shapes Attitudes on Economic Inequality: The Competing Forces of Self-Interest and Legitimation. *International Review of Social Research*, 5(1), 4–19. <https://doi.org/10.1515/irsr-2015-0002>
- 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>
- Druckman, J. N., & Lupia, A. (2000). Preference Formation. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 3(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.3.1.1>
- Edlund, J., & Lindh, A. (2015). The democratic class struggle revisited: The welfare state, social cohesion and political conflict. *Acta Sociologica*, 58(4), 311–328. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0001699315610176>
- Erikson, R., & Goldthorpe, J. H. (1992). *The constant flux: A study of class mobility in industrial societies*. Oxford [England] : New York: Clarendon Press ; Oxford University Press.
- Erikson, R., Goldthorpe, J. H., & Portocarero, L. (1979). Intergenerational Class Mobility in Three Western European Societies: England, France and Sweden. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 30(4), 415. <https://doi.org/10.2307/589632>
- Evans, G. (1993). The Decline of Class Divisions in Britain? Class and Ideological Preferences

- in the 1960s and the 1980s. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 44(3), 449–471. <https://doi.org/10.2307/591812>
- Feld, S. L. (1981). The Focused Organization of Social Ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 86(5), 1015–1035. Retrieved from <https://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>
- García-Castro, J. D., González, R., Frigolett, C., Jiménez-Moya, G., Rodríguez-Bailón, R., & Willis, G. (2022). Changing attitudes toward redistribution: The role of perceived economic inequality in everyday life and intolerance of inequality. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 0(0), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2021.2006126>
- 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). Madrid: Editorial Pablo Iglesias.
- Hvidberg, K., Kreiner, C., & Stantcheva, S. (2020). *Social Position and Fairness Views* (No. w28099) (p. w28099). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w28099>
- Inglehart, R. (1990). *Culture shift in advanced industrial society*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.
- Kitschelt, H., & Rehm, P. (2014). Occupations as a Site of Political Preference Formation. *Comparative Political Studies*, 47(12), 1670–1706. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414013516066>
- Kulin, J., & Svallfors, S. (2013). Class, values, and attitudes towards redistribution: A European comparison. *European Sociological Review*, 29(2), 155–167. <https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jcr046>
- Langsæther, P. E., & Evans, G. (2020). More than self-interest: Why different classes have different attitudes to income inequality. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 71(4), 594–607. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12747>
- Lazarsfeld, P. F., & Merton, R. K. (1954). Friendship as a social process: A substantive and methodological analysis. In T. Morroe & C. H. Page (Eds.), *Freedom and control in modern society* (Vol. 18, pp. 18–66). New York: Van Nostrand.
- Lin, N. (2007). *Social capital: A theory of social structure and action* (Repr). Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Pr.
- Lindh, A. (2015). Public Opinion against Markets? Attitudes towards Market Distribution of Social Services – A Comparison of 17 Countries. *Social Policy & Administration*, 49(7), 887–910. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spol.12105>

- 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>
- 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>
- Mau, S. (2003). *The moral economy of welfare states: Britain and Germany compared*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- 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. Retrieved from <https://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>
- 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>
- Oesch, D. (2006). *Redrawing the Class Map*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230504592>
- Oesch, D., & Rennwald, L. (2018). Electoral competition in Europe's new tripolar political space: Class voting for the left, centre-right and radical right. *European Journal of Political Research*, 57(4), 783–807. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6765.12259>
- 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>
- Pérez, P. (2023). Class politics, collective labor rights, and worker-management conflict in comparative perspective. *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 29(3), 197–219. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09596801221133453>
- 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>
- 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>

- Rehm, P. (2009). Risks and Redistribution: An Individual-Level Analysis. *Comparative Political Studies*, 42(7), 855–881. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414008330595>
- 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>
- Svallfors, S. (2006). *The moral economy of class: Class and attitudes in comparative perspective*. Stanford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781503625624>
- 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>
- Volker, B. (2020). Social capital across the life course: Accumulation, diminution, or segregation? *Network Science*, 8(3), 313–332. <https://doi.org/10.1017/nws.2020.26>
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society: An outline of interpretative sociology*. Berkeley London: University of California press. (Original work published 1922).
- Wright, E. O. (1989). The Comparative Project on Class Structure and Class Consciousness: An Overview. *Acta Sociologica*, 32(1), 3–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000169938903200101>
- 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>